

Buddhism in Early Tokugawa Japan
The Case of Obaku Zen and the Monk Tetsugen Dōkō

Helen Josephine Baroni

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

1993

©1993

Helen Josephine Baroni
All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Buddhism in Early Tokugawa Japan

The Case of Obaku Zen and the Monk Tetsugen Dôkô

Helen Josephine Baroni

This dissertation examines the religious history of the Obaku school of Zen during its early decades of development in Japan in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It explores the religious, sociopolitical, and cultural reasons leading to the emergence of Obaku, a lineage within Chinese Rinzai, as an independent sect in Japan, and explicates the characteristics that distinguish the sect from Japanese Rinzai.

Obaku was transmitted to Japan from China in the mid-seventeenth century by the founder Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i (1592-1673) and a number of his Chinese disciples. The sect then spread throughout Japan through the collaborative efforts of the Chinese founders and the talented group of Japanese disciples they attracted. While the Chinese masters set the Zen style that characterized the sect and determined the monastic code that governed life in Obaku temples, Japanese monks were instrumental in establishing good relations with the secular authorities, founding temples, and promoting the teachings among the common people.

The dissertation is divided into two parts: the first part sets out the early history and characteristics of the sect as a whole, and the second part focuses on the life and work of an individual Japanese master, Tetsugen Dôkô (1630-1682). Part one sets Obaku into the historical context of early Tokugawa Japan, exploring its relations with the existing religious world and the secular authorities. The reaction within the Japanese Buddhist community is described using primary materials highly critical of Obaku. Part two describes the life and work of Tetsugen, the most famous of the first generation of Japanese converts, known for his

woodblock edition of the entire Chinese Tripitaka, relying upon both traditional and modern biographies of the master. Tetsugen's teachings are explored through close readings of his written work and related primary materials from period sources.

Annotated translations of one anti-Obaku tract, the *Obaku geki* of Mujaku Dôchu, and Tetsugen's major composition, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, are included as appendices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CHAPTER	
1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
2. AN HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE OBAKU SECT	14
Where to Begin	
Ming Buddhism	
The Restoration of Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu	
Social conditions in Late Ming China	
The Chinese Community in Nagasaki	
Yin-yüan's Move to Nagasaki	
Yin-yüan's Motivations	
The Welcome in Japan	
Yin-yüan's Move from Nagasaki to Kyoto	
Life at Fumon-ji	
The Foundation of Obaku-san Mampuku-ji	
3. THE SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF OBAKU ZEN	52
The <i>Obaku shingi</i>	
The Combined Practice of Zen and Pure Land	
Dual Practice in Japan	
Obaku's Dual Practice of Zen and Pure Land	
Other Influences on Obaku Zen	
The <i>Sandankaie</i>	
Maintenance of Chinese Cultural Identity	
Other Characteristics	
4. OBAKU IN THE WORLD OF JAPANESE ZEN BUDDHISM	95
Initial Responses to Obaku Zen	
Relations with Myōshin-ji after the Founding of Mampuku-ji	
The <i>Zenrin shuhei shu</i>	
The <i>Obaku geki</i> of Mujaku Dōchū	
Hakuin and Obaku Zen	
Obaku and Sōtō Zen	
5. OBAKU AND THE SECULAR AUTHORITIES	142
Tokugawa <i>Hatto</i> and the Purple Robe Affair	

Obaku Zen and the Emperor Gomizunoo	
The Imperial Dharma Heir	
Obaku Relations with the Tokugawa Bakufu	
Obaku's Growth within the Tokugawa Temple System	
Obaku's Change of Perspective	
6. INTRODUCTION TO TETSUGENDOKO	171
Source Material Related to Tetsugen	
Modern Scholarship	
7. THE LIFE AND WORK OF TETSUGENDOKO	186
Tetsugen's Youth	
Tetsugen's Early Buddhist Training	
Leaving True Pure Land Buddhism	
Tetsugen's First Encounters with Obaku Zen	
Tetsugen's Zen Practice	
The Tripitaka in Japan	
The Beginning of the Tripitaka Project	
The Project's Structure	
Contributions by Other Obaku Monks	
Outside Sources of Support	
Problems with the True Pure Land Sect	
Mu-an's Dharma Heir	
The Monk Who Lectures on the Sutras	
Completion of the Tripitaka Project	
Tetsugen's Social Welfare Activities	
Tetsugen's Work in the Famine of 1681-1682	
Tetsugen's Final Instructions and Death	
Tetsugen's Disciples	
The Continuation of the Tripitaka Project	
8. THE TEACHINGS OF TETSUGEN	265
Popular Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan	
Tetsugen's Teachings	
Themes in Tetsugen's Teachings	
The <i>Kana hôgo</i> of Zen Master Tetsugen Dôkô	
Teaching by Example	
Conclusions	
9. CONCLUSION	299
BIBLIOGRAPHY	306
APPENDICES	
1. The <i>Obaku geki</i> of Mujaku Dôchû	318
2. The <i>Kana hôgo</i> of Zen Master Tetsugen Dôkô	341

EDITORIAL CONVENTIONS

1. Dates have been rendered using western conventions for years and the Japanese lunar calendar for months and days. For example, the date 1655/7/15 refers to the fifteenth day of the seventh lunar month of 1655. Although Japanese lunar and western solar years do not coincide exactly, the dates included here have not been altered to reflect this difference. None of the dates refer to intercalary lunar months.

2. Japanese and Chinese names have been rendered according to the East Asian convention, family name preceding personal name. In many cases, the Japanese pronunciation of Chinese names has been provided parenthetically for individuals well known in the Japanese tradition. Chinese/Japanese characters have been included for the first appearance of each name. Whenever possible, Japanese pronunciation has been based upon the following sources in order of precedence: a) *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten* (Kyoto: Shinbunkaku Shuppan, 1988), and b) *Zengaku daijiten* (Tokyo: Komazawa University, 1985, rev. ed.).

3. Technical terms have been transliterated according to the Chinese pronunciation for events occurring in China, and in Japanese for those occurring in Japan. Alternative pronunciations are given parenthetically where applicable. Characters have been provided for the first appearance of each term.

4. The following abbreviations have been employed for frequently cited sources:

- IBK *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学仏教学研究
T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經
ZZ *Dai nihon zokuzōkyō* 大日本続藏經

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A great number of individuals and organizations helped to make this dissertation possible. First, the Japan Foundation generously funded a year of research in Japan, and the Weatherhead Foundation provided me a fellowship for the final write-up year. At Hanazono Daigaku, where I spent a year doing research, I must thank many individuals who generously gave their time and shared their expertise with me. Yanagida Seizan and Urs App from the International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism supervised my year at the university and aided me with all manner of technical questions. Maeda Naomi, librarian at The Institute for Zen Studies, and her assistant Murakami Takashi made available the extensive resources of the Institute's collection and taught me to use the more difficult materials. Professor Nishio Kenryû, with whom I consulted regularly, introduced me to a number of Obaku specialists and helped arrange my initial contacts with scholars at Mampuku-ji. At Mampuku-ji, the main Obaku monastery, Otsuki Mikio, director of the Bunkaden, allowed me to use the collection. A number of the scholar monks at the Bunkaden, in particular, Tanaka Chisei, patiently answered my many questions about Obaku history, ritual, and life at the monastery today. Professor Tanaka at The Kyoto Center for Japanese Linguistic Studies taught me to read the hybrid language of Tokugawa period official documents and guided me through the most difficult. He also spent hours helping me decipher handwritten manuscripts.

Far too many people at Columbia University have helped me over the years for me to name them all. First and foremost, I must thank my advisor Philip Yampolsky, who encouraged my work, taught me many of the practical skills necessary to do this project, and read my earlier drafts with great care. Professor Paul Watt first suggested this topic when he recommended that I consider a study of the monk Tetsugen and guided me through my first translation of the

Kana hôgo. Professor Ryûichi Abé made several critical suggestions that helped focus my thinking about Obaku and its place in Japanese and Chinese Buddhism. Sarah Thal, a fellow graduate student, spent many hours editing my rough English. Finally, I must thank Rod Low, my husband, who has supported me through all of the years of study and who has been my most trusted critic. All errors are my own.

Chapter One

General Introduction

The Obaku sect (Obaku-shû 黄檗宗) is the third school of Zen in Japan. Unlike the larger Rinzai and Sôtô schools, Obaku had no independent existence in China, where it represented only a single lineage of Rinzai masters at one temple, Huang-po-shan Wan-fu-ssu 黄檗山萬福寺, in Fukien. The Chinese master Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i 隱元隆琦 (1592-1673; J. Ingen Ryûki) transmitted the lineage to Japan in the mid-seventeenth century, several centuries after Rinzai and Sôtô had been transmitted by Chinese and Japanese monks in the Kamakura period (1185-1382). Obaku represents the final Dharma transmission from China, coming after a long period of little or no contact between Chinese and Japanese Zen. Rather than being assimilated into the existing Rinzai organization in Japan, the Obaku lineage emerged as an independent entity with its own structure of temple hierarchy and administration. The sect retained varying degrees of independence over the three and a half centuries of its history, and today remains the smallest of the three Zen schools.¹

When Japanese and Western scholars present a history of Japanese Zen or describe its beliefs and practices, they generally focus on the larger two schools of Zen that survive in Japan today, namely Rinzai and Sôtô. Other schools that once existed in Japan, such as the Daruma school, have not survived, but their story can generally be found as a part of the early history of Zen in Japan. The Obaku sect is most often completely ignored in the large, general

¹ According to a survey done in December 1990, Obaku had 462 temples, 442 monks, 22 nuns, and 353,472 adherents; *Shûkyô nenkan* 宗教年鑑, (1991), pp. 72-73. This makes it larger than any of the various lines (派 *ha*) listed under the Rinzai sect, with the exception of the largest, the Myôshinji-ha. Myôshinji-ha lists 3,417 temples, 3,315 monks, 194 nuns, and 309,421 adherents. Nanzenji-ha, another major Rinzai lineage, lists 427 temples, 691 monks, 60 nuns, and 140,200 adherents. Sôtô-shû, which does not report statistics according to lineages, lists a total of 14,746 temples, 16,915 monks and nuns, and 6,940,814 adherents. Grand totals for all Zen sects came to 21,100 temples, 23,921 monks and nuns, and 8,832,006 adherents.

surveys of Japanese Buddhism as well as those dedicated specifically to Zen.² When I began my research on the Zen monk Tetsugen Dōkō 鉄眼道光 (1630-1682), I became aware for the first time that this third school existed. As my work progressed and I needed more detailed information about Ōbaku as a whole than could be gleaned from dictionaries and encyclopedia, I was surprised to discover that there was almost no mention of it in the scholarly literature of the West. Finding such a lacuna was exciting, but immediately raised questions. Was Ōbaku so unimportant, so uninteresting in its belief and practice that it did not warrant more than the occasional paragraph? Was it really just an odd form of Rinzai that offered nothing new to our understanding of Japanese Buddhism?³

Fortunately, the Japanese literature on the subject was less limited, and I felt that my initial plan to write a brief introduction on Ōbaku history and thought as the background to a larger work on the master Tetsugen was still sound. My plan changed only as I came to realize the nature of the secondary sources I had collected. First, even in the Japanese literature, Ōbaku has inspired little interest beyond the reaches of its own sectarian historians. As I read the short accounts of Ōbaku in histories of Japanese Zen or Japanese Buddhism that do mention it, I found that the same basic description appeared over and over again. As so often happens, the scholarly understanding of Ōbaku had taken on the form of a *teisetsu* 定説, a set explanation, and few scholars sought to broaden this circumscribed description. In its most simplistic form, the explanation for Ōbaku's emergence as an independent school of

² There are two recent exceptions to this generalization, both historical surveys of Zen in Japan: Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2, Japan* and Takenuki Genshō *Nihon zenshūshi*.

³ There has long been a keen scholarly interest in Ōbaku contributions to Japanese art and culture. Several showings of Ōbaku art have been staged both in Japan and in the West, including two major exhibits in 1991, in Nagasaki and in Osaka. Ōbaku painting and calligraphy have been studied by such Western scholars as Stephen Addiss, who asserts in his introduction to a catalogue from one Western showing of Ōbaku art that Ōbaku doctrine has not had much influence on Japanese religion, but that its major contribution lies in its conveyance of Chinese culture. See *Ōbaku: Zen Painting and Calligraphy*, not paginated.

Zen is based on its identification as a form of "Nembutsu Zen"⁴, or, in more forgiving terms, as Ming-style Zen as opposed to the "pure" or Sung style of Japanese Rinzai Zen.⁵

The following entry from Hisao Inagaki's new dictionary, *A Glossary of Zen Terms*, gives as concise a version of the set explanation of Obaku as one may find in the literature.

Obakushū 黄檗宗 Obaku school; one of the three Zen schools in Japan. The founder, Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i 隱元隆 (Ingen Ryūki) (1592-1673) of Mt. Huang-po, Fu-chien 福建 (Fukken) Province, came to Nagasaki in 1654. Under the imperial patronage, he built a temple in Uji, south-east of Kyoto, named Mampuku-ji 萬福寺 of Mt. Obaku 黄檗, which became the head temple of this school. In China, Obaku was not an independent Zen school, but was included in Lin-chi 臨濟 (Rinzai) school. When this tradition of Zen was transmitted to Japan, its strongly Ming style in the system of temple administration and the way of practice, together with the Nembutsu-oriented teaching, necessitated its establishment as an independent school, separate from the Rinzai school, which was transmitted in the Kamakura-Muromachi period.⁶

Although this kind of description seems to explain where Obaku fits into the world of Japanese Buddhism and why it constitutes the third school of Zen, it raises more questions than it answers. How does the Ming style of Zen differ specifically from the Sung style of Rinzai and Sôtô that already existed in Japan? How and why did the Obaku masters combine Pure Land teachings with their Zen practice? What relationship did Obaku have with the secular authorities, the Tokugawa *bakufu* (shogunate) and the imperial family?⁷ How could a new sect take

⁴ The term "Nembutsu Zen" is applied to any style of Zen practice which seeks to incorporate certain Pure Land practices and beliefs, especially the practice of *nembutsu* itself, chanting the name of Amida. However, the term is not value-neutral. It is invariably used as a derogatory label. As will be seen, Obaku Zen did include Pure Land elements in both its monastic and lay practice.

⁵ The extent to which Japanese Zen masters faithfully preserved the Sung style of practice transmitted from China is itself an interesting topic, but one outside the range of this dissertation. There is ample evidence to suggest that Japanese masters were creative in fashioning Zen to suit the differing context of Japan. See for example, Bielefeldt, pp. 26-28.

⁶ Inagaki Hisao, *A Glossary of Zen Terms*, (Kyoto: Nagata bunshodo, 1991), p. 270.

⁷ The reasons for Inagaki's reference to imperial patronage at a time when the military government rather than the emperor held power will become clear in later chapters. While Obaku did enjoy imperial patronage from the early stages of its development in Japan, Inagaki's statement is misleading. In actuality, the main temple of the sect was constructed under the patronage of the Tokugawa bakufu. See Chapter 5 for more information.

shape when other Buddhist sects had already taken on definitive form under the government's regulations and laid their claims on existing temples? How was Obaku perceived by the existing Buddhist world, especially members of the Rinzai school? What precipitated so complete a break from Rinzai that an acknowledged Rinzai line became an independent school?

Until very recently, scholarly material addressing Obaku's emergence as an independent school of Zen in Japan was overwhelmingly sectarian in nature. Rinzai scholars have generally ignored Obaku, dismissing it as an aberrant or even heretical form of Rinzai practice whose study adds nothing significant to the history of Japanese Rinzai. From the early pioneers of this century such as Washio Junkei through contemporary writers like Hayashi Bunshô and Nakao Fumio, Obaku scholars retain a defensive tone in their works, responding to explicit and implicit criticism from the dominant Rinzai community.⁸ Obaku continues to defend itself against "slandorous accusations" that it believes have been directed against it since the early years of the founder's work in Japan. They are eager to present Obaku in ways that reject such stereotypes as "Nembutsu Zen"; they strive to project on the sect's history and doctrine a positive interpretation, shaped according to the individual scholar and his times.⁹ Even when Obaku scholars are not obviously on the defensive, they generally tend to accentuate positive qualities in their early leaders and to gloss over or completely omit any negative qualities or actions. This may be seen as a natural tendency in any religious group's presentation of its own sacred history.

In the recent past, scholars have attempted to describe the development of Obaku from less apologetic, non-sectarian perspectives. These histories represent a great

⁸ Although Washio Junkei was actually a member of the True Pure Land sect, I have included him here among the Obaku scholars because of the deep sympathy for the Obaku position displayed in his writings. Hayashi Bunshô and Nakao Fumio are both Obaku monk-scholars.

⁹ I will have more to say on this issue later. For the present, I will mention the major example of this trend. Obaku scholars, especially Akamatsu Shinmyô, writing before and during the Pacific War were at some pains to paint a picture of Obaku as especially close to the imperial family and to downplay its relations with the Tokugawa bakufu. In the post war period, this trend has abated, and Obaku scholars have fully described relations with the bakufu in accurate terms in recent works.

improvement on the earlier works. In seeking a less value-laden, more detached point of view, however, they have tended to reformat the argument, turning their attention away from the religious issues dividing Ōbaku from Rinzai, and re-casting the schism in terms of social and political pressures. Some maintain that the separation of Rinzai lineages into distinct schools resulted from cultural exclusivism: the Japanese rejected the foreignness (Chineseness) of Ōbaku while at the same time the Chinese masters were haughty toward their Japanese hosts.¹⁰ Others stress competition within the Buddhist world for the limited resources available at the time; in this case, Ōbaku is seen as a drain on the material and human resources of Rinzai, which lead to infighting and ultimately irreconcilable differences.¹¹

Neither the sectarian nor the non-sectarian approaches provide an adequate explanation for Ōbaku Zen's establishment and growth in Japan. While their conclusions all have some basis in historical fact, their answers remain too limited, too simplistic and often too biased to describe the complex process by which the Ōbaku lineage took hold in Japan and became the third, independent school of Zen. It is evident that what is needed is a balanced portrait of Ōbaku, one that explains the qualities that set it apart from its larger relative, Rinzai, and tries to clarify its position in the world of Tokugawa Buddhism and the larger social and cultural framework of the Tokugawa period. What was originally intended as a brief introduction to a larger work on an individual monk has grown by necessity into an extended treatment of the sect as a whole, with Tetsugen serving as an individual example of early Ōbaku masters. Toward this end, I have focused my work not only on the primary and secondary sources produced within the Ōbaku sect, but used sources external and sometimes hostile to the sect as a means to balance the portrait. Not only do anti-Ōbaku texts like Mujaku Dôchû's *Ōbaku geki* 黄檗外記 and the anonymous *Zenrin shûhei shû* 禪林執弊集 provide alternative and

¹⁰ See, for example, Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, pp. 85-86, 98-99, 100-103, and 106-107.

¹¹ See Hirakubo, *Ingen*, pp. 225-6, Hayashi, "Ōbaku o kataru", p. 16, and Otsuki, "Ōbakushû", p. 40.

decidedly less saintly views of Obaku masters, they also provide a wealth of information about the Rinzaï response to Obaku at the time of its establishment.

In seeking a new approach that preserves the contributions of earlier works on Obaku while carrying the project beyond the limitations inherent in those works, it is useful to consider Carl Bielefeldt's reflections on Zen scholarship in his study of Dôgen, *Dôgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*. Although Bielefeldt was investigating the Sôtô school during a different period in the history of Chinese and Japanese Zen, he also had to address issues that led to intra-sectarian disputes. For example, in discussing the scholarly interpretations of Zen debates on meditation, Bielefeldt observes,

Where traditional treatments preserved the model of the *shôbô genzô* by explaining the discontinuities of Ch'an and Zen history apparent in its various factional disputes as the ongoing struggle between the true *dharma* and its heretical interpreters, some modern treatments have tended in effect to explain away these disputes as mere theological decoration on what was "really" political and social competition. My own approach here tries to avoid both these forms of reductionism and seeks rather to view the discontinuities in terms of the recapitulations, under various historical circumstances, of certain continuing tensions inherent in the Ch'an teachings themselves— tensions, for example, between exclusive and inclusive visions of the school's religious mission, between esoteric and exoteric styles of discourse, and especially between theoretical and practical approaches to its meditation instruction.¹²

Bielefeldt's observation that the sectarian and the more strictly academic approaches are both forms of reductionism can be applied equally to the existing treatments of Obaku. Sectarian presentations of Obaku often seem to depict an underlying struggle between the true Dharma and heretical practice, however that may be understood by the particular author. This is especially clear in the work of the twentieth century Obaku scholar Akamatsu Shinmyô who defended the sect's teachings as a true form of Zen.¹³ Scholars seeking a more neutral

¹² Bielefeldt, *Dogen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*, pp. 10-11.

¹³ Akamatsu argues strenuously that Obaku expresses the true meaning of Rinzaï Zen. He defends the use of Pure Land practices with a detailed explanation of the proper Obaku belief in Amida Buddha and the Pure Land within the self and the use of the *nembutsu* as a kôan. He suggests that to teach Zen without the balancing influence of Pure Land is to one-sidedly exclude the practice of compassion. Such an exclusion necessarily entails forsaking the needs of people of moderate and low capacity. Because of its balance between high level practice and the moderating influence of more

position are preoccupied with other, less religious factors that lead to the schism.¹⁴ Bielefeldt's proposal that the tensions within Zen teaching itself could contribute to internal disputes suggests another direction for rethinking Obaku's history that might prove fruitful.

First, combining the valid aspects of the sectarian and the non-sectarian approaches, that is, recognizing that significant philosophical differences as well as political and social competition contributed to the emergence of Obaku as an independent school, produces a much more nuanced portrait than limiting the focus to one side or the other. It recognizes the nature of living religions, which are not only concerned with preserving and transmitting beliefs and practices, but must also function within the sociopolitical realities of a particular historical context. Suggesting that either philosophical dissention or sociopolitical competition is "really" going on to the exclusion of the other oversimplifies the picture. Next, the realization that disputes may arise within Zen schools from tensions inherent in the teachings themselves, and not only from corruption or heretical interpretations of the teachings, may provide an alternative basis for evaluating the reasons that Obaku split apart from Rinzai, one that precludes the assumption that one or the other school has superior claim to the true Dharma.

For purposes of analysis, the reasons for Obaku's schism from Japanese Rinzai, its emergence as a third school of Zen, and its success in taking root and spreading throughout the country can be classified into four basic spheres: 1) internal matters of belief and practice, 2) political and social factors of the period, 3) cultural tensions between the Chinese and Japanese principals, and 4) the talents of the Chinese founders and their first generation of Japanese disciples. The issues involved in each of these areas are tightly interrelated. For accessible practices, then, Obaku rather than Japanese Rinzai fulfills the true meaning of Rinzai Zen. "Obaku kôyô", pp. 17-34.

¹⁴ A prime example of a scholar taking the more neutral position is Takenuki Genshō. While recognizing that philosophical differences existed between Obaku masters and Japanese Rinzai masters, Takenuki does not discuss them. Instead, he stresses the role which competition played in the schism. He maintains that the Rinzai sect, the Myōshin-ji line in particular, felt the need to defend its human and material resources from the encroachment made by Obaku. Takenuki, *Nihon zenshūshi*, pp. 231-233.

the present it is useful to set them out in broader strokes.

1) As Bielefeldt has noted, when arguments over doctrine have broken out in Zen schools, the issue almost always involves a matter of practice, usually meditation.¹⁵ This is in keeping with Zen's basic preference for stressing practice over theory. Most of the internal tension between Obaku and Japanese Rinzai arose in relation to their divergent understanding of Zen practice in the broad sense, but not specifically to differences in the practice of meditation itself. The differences go far beyond the most obvious distinction: that Obaku incorporated certain Pure Land practices into its Zen style. The conflicts encompass such major issues as the proper interpretation of the monastic precepts and discipline, the role of study and interpretation of the Buddhist scriptures and the Zen corpus, the role and usage of kôan, as well as a host of minor concerns. It has long been recognized that many problems arose between the two factions as a result of the differences between the Sung style of Zen from which Japanese Zen had developed and the later, Ming style which Obaku represents. Nonetheless, this recognition often assumes that Ming Zen had been corrupted by influences from other Buddhist schools and had become an impure form. On the other hand, it is possible to see the Obaku or Ming style of practice as a different but still valid configuration of Zen practice; in the mid seventeenth century, Ming masters and their Japanese Rinzai counterparts found themselves on opposing sides of the spectrum on a number of issues arising from tensions inherent in the Zen teachings. In this sense, tension between Obaku and Japanese Rinzai can be seen as internal competition within the Rinzai school between factions proposing alternative ways of understanding Zen practice and the best methods for revitalizing the school. The matters at issue were of such basic importance for Zen practice, that it would be a mistake to dismiss the disputes as mere camouflage for political and social competition.

2) When one considers the political and social realities that prevailed in Tokugawa Japan during the first decades of the seventeenth century, however, it becomes immediately

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 2.

apparent that external forces contributed to the shaping of Obaku history. The first and most obvious obstacle that Obaku had to surmount was the newly completed government policy that legally forbade Chinese nationals, including Buddhist masters, from emigrating to Japan outside the confines of the port city of Nagasaki.¹⁶ Some level of government cooperation was therefore necessary for Obaku masters to settle permanently in Japan. Once this initial hurdle was crossed, Obaku monks and temples faced the same array of political strictures that the government had placed on all Buddhist schools. During the first half of the seventeenth century, Japanese Buddhism fell under increasing government control as the Tokugawa bakufu consolidated its power over all segments of society. For example, the government set strict limits on the freedom to construct new temples and compelled all existing temples to be incorporated into a fixed hierarchy. While many established Buddhist sects enjoyed a comfortable level of economic security as a result of other bakufu policies, notably the mandatory family registration at local temples, a new group like Obaku would find little opportunity to build a financial base or increase its number of temples without encroaching on the resources of existing groups. Moreover, the intense personal interest generated by Obaku in large numbers of Japanese monks threatened other groups with significant losses of human talent. Obaku, therefore, did compete on several levels with other Buddhist groups during its first formative decades in Japan. Undeniably, the school most effected by this competition was Japanese Rinzai. Modern scholars have rightly interpreted Rinzai's negative reaction to Obaku as, in part, a defensive response to the drain on their human and financial resources.

3) Cultural differences further widened the sharp divisions between Obaku and Japanese Rinzai. Judging from descriptions of early encounters, both the Chinese and the

¹⁶ Regulations limiting foreign trade were issued gradually, but the basic structure of the so-called "closed country" policy was in place by the year 1641, when Dutch traders were transferred to Deshima Island in Nagasaki Bay and foreign trade with China was restricted to the city of Nagasaki under direct bakufu control. Scholars have recently made it clear that Japan was not actually closed off from foreign contact as the expressions "closed country" and "national isolation" (*sakoku* 鎖国) suggest. See Toby, *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan*, and Jansen, *China in the Tokugawa World*.

Japanese felt a certain superiority over each other. Once they had seen and evaluated the state of Ming Zen as exemplified by the Obaku monks, many Japanese Rinzai monks came to believe that the Japanese had actually surpassed their former masters, the Chinese. They felt that their own lineages had managed far better to preserve the original style of Zen that had been transmitted from China centuries earlier. In some cases, they found the Chinese practices and styles abhorrent, apparently for their very foreignness. For their part, the Chinese masters maintained aspects of life known to them in China that we would tend to classify as culturally, rather than religiously, important, including the language used in ritual, the design of monastic robes and shoes, hair styles, etc. They seemed committed to preserving their cultural identity as Chinese in the face of the dominant Japanese culture surrounding them. As native speakers of Chinese, they also expressed some skepticism about the ability of the Japanese to fully understand and utilize the large corpus of Zen literature written in Chinese.

Naturally, both the Chinese and the Japanese benefited from the cultural exchanges in some respects. Many individual Japanese were initially drawn to Obaku because they found its Chinese quality to be exotic and appealing; in particular, many Japanese artists and classical scholars considered the Chinese masters invaluable resources of Chinese culture and language. The Chinese masters could only succeed in spreading their Zen style to a wider Japanese audience through the translation of their words, ideas, and symbols by their Japanese disciples. The early years of growth represent the effective collaboration of Chinese and Japanese masters.

4) The founding generation of Chinese masters, especially Yin-yüan and his Dharma heirs Mu-an Hsing-t'ao 木庵性瑫 (1611-1684; J. Mokuan Shôtô) and Chi-fei Ju-i 即非如一 (1616-1671; J. Sokuhi Nyoitsu), attracted a remarkable group of talented Japanese converts that I refer to as the first generation of Japanese disciples. Tetsugen Dôkô is arguably the best known today of this group, but at the time he was one among a number of highly gifted and motivated individuals who worked to spread Obaku throughout Japan. It was these

Japanese converts who facilitated early relations with the Tokugawa bakufu, laid the groundwork for imperial support, and then worked among the common people to establish Obaku's teachings on the popular level. While the Chinese masters were largely responsible for determining the character and monastic style of the main temple, Mampuku-ji, where future generations of monks were trained, the first generation of Japanese disciples founded a large percentage of the Obaku branch temples that constituted the broader framework of the sect.

The primary goal of this dissertation is to draw an accurate portrait of Obaku Zen in its early stages, during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Attention will be given to the characteristics which distinguished Obaku from other schools of Zen, relations between Obaku and the other schools, and Obaku's place within the broader scope of Tokugawa society, especially its relations with the secular authorities. Among the foremost questions to be answered are: how and why the sect became independent, how the fledgling sect prospered in the constricted world of Tokugawa Buddhism, and what roles the Chinese masters and their Japanese converts played in building a new organization.

In order to fill out the general portrait of Obaku Zen, research on the life and work of Tetsugen Dōkō, originally intended as the primary focus of the dissertation, is presented as a specific example of the first generation of Japanese converts. Like the other Japanese monks who actively sought to promote the new sect, Tetsugen founded temples, guided the practice of a large number of disciples, and worked among the lay people to popularize Obaku. Although not the most prominent Obaku master at the time, Tetsugen is remembered both as a scholar and a teacher, whose work had the most lasting impact of any Obaku monk on Japanese Buddhism. Tetsugen's teachings are preserved in Dharma lessons (hōgo 法語) in classical Chinese and vernacular Japanese that he wrote to instruct his lay and ordained disciples. However, his greatest contribution to Buddhist scholarship in the early modern period is undoubtedly his woodblock edition of the Chinese Tripitaka, which occupied more than twelve

years of his life.

One of the basic challenges in writing an historical portrait of Obaku Zen is to sort through the varying perspectives in the primary and secondary source materials in an attempt to see Obaku as it would have appeared in the seventeenth century. At the present time, as a result of generations of cross influence, Obaku is not very different from Rinzai Zen. While contemporary Obaku scholars are eager to de-emphasize the differences between Obaku and Rinzai, those differences were sharp enough in the early Tokugawa period to create a schism within the Rinzai school. Moreover, a majority of the materials from earlier time periods show signs that writers manipulated the history of the sect to serve the purposes of the authors and their times. Rinzai scholars from the Edo period cast aspersions on the sect by recounting stories that showed the sect's founders in the worst possible light. Obaku scholars from the same period record the lives of the early masters in the style of stories of the saints, without wart or blemish. The most blatant example of manipulation in the secondary literature is the tendency of modern scholars to portray the sect as a favorite of the imperial line while underplaying the close ties it had enjoyed with the Tokugawa bakufu. Viewing Obaku through the existing materials has been very much like looking at an image through a series of distorting lenses. The portrait that follows is a composite, drawn from both primary and secondary material keeping the biases of each in mind whenever possible. In general, I have tried to present Obaku in sympathetic terms, giving primary weight to believers' interpretations of their own history.

This dissertation is divided into two parts: part one (chapters 2 through 5) concerns Obaku Zen as a whole, concentrating on the early history of the school in Japan and its distinctive beliefs and practices; part two (chapters 6 through 8) focuses on the Obaku master Tetsugen Dôkô as a specific example of the first generation of Japanese converts. Chapter Two provides a brief historical sketch of the transmission of the Obaku line to Japan from China, its establishment in Japan and initial period of growth. This chapter is intended as an historical

framework for later chapters, although it necessarily introduces many of the pertinent issues surrounding Obaku's emergence as an independent school. In Chapters Three through Five, I have tried to flesh out many of the issues raised in this introduction, discussing in detail both the philosophical differences and the sociopolitical conditions that led to the schism between Obaku and Rinzai Zen. Chapter Three describes the characteristics that set Obaku apart from Japanese Rinzai, specifically delineating where Obaku masters stood on pivotal issues that emerge from Zen teachings. I have relied upon both primary source material from the period and work by Obaku scholars of this century, who have tried to describe in their own terms the unique qualities of their Zen style. Having set out Obaku's place in the philosophical landscape of Zen Buddhism, attention then shifts to Obaku's place within the specific context of the religious and sociopolitical world of Tokugawa Japan. Chapter Four describes relations between Obaku and other schools of Buddhism in Japan, particularly the Rinzai school. This chapter elucidates how Obaku came to fit into the existing Buddhist world, giving special attention to the Japanese response to Obaku. For this purpose, a number of Rinzai documents critical of Obaku are examined in some detail. Finally, chapter five explores Obaku's place within the political and social arena of Tokugawa Japan, concentrating on its relationships with the two secular powers, the Tokugawa bakufu and the imperial family.

After a brief introduction in Chapter Six to the basic issues in part two and to the literature related to Tetsugen Dōkō, Chapter Seven provides a biographical sketch of his life and work. Tetsugen not only played an instrumental role in popularizing the Obaku sect in the late seventeenth century, his life story has been used in the modern period to promote Obaku Zen on the popular level. Tetsugen is the most prominent of the early Japanese converts to Obaku Zen, known for having produced the first woodblock edition of the Chinese Tripitaka ever printed in Japan. Chapter Eight then describes Tetsugen's teachings as seen in his small corpus of writings, with a close reading of his major work, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hōgo* 鐵眼禪師假名法語

Chapter Two

An Historical Sketch of the Obaku Sect

Where to Begin

In writing a history of the Obaku sect in Japan, the first issue is where to locate its beginning. As is often the case with historical phenomena, upon reflection, the choice is not obvious; several possibilities exist. While each choice has some validity, some basis in historical fact, each one involves an interpretation of those facts that may ally one, wittingly or not, to some sectarian apologia or polemic. As Herman Ooms observes in his introduction to *Tokugawa Ideology*, "Beginnings pertain to an epistemological order rather than the order of things. To talk of a beginning is to engage in a highly interpretive discourse, and a very problematical one.... Such talk of beginnings often serves concrete interests and is thus itself ideological."¹ Rather than accepting one option without examining its interpretive implications, we will begin by considering the several possibilities and the purposes which they may serve.

Four basic options for the beginning point of the Obaku sect can be drawn from existing historical accounts:

1. The work of Obaku's founder, Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i 隱元隆琦 (1592-1673; J. Ingen Ryûki) in China, which represents the culmination of the restoration of the temple Huang-po-shan Wan-fu-ssu 黃檗山万福寺 in Fukien province. This process continued under three successive masters, Yin-yüan being the third, whose stated purpose was to revitalize the Zen style of the T'ang period Zen Master Huang-po who had resided on the mountain for some time and took his name from it. Their restoration work began in the late sixteenth century and ended when Yin-yüan left for Japan in 1654.

2. The arrival of Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i in Japan in 1654. From the time he entered the

¹ Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 4-5.

gate of Kōfuku-ji 廣福寺 in Nagasaki in the seventh month, he immediately assumed the leadership of a community comprising both Chinese and Japanese monks.

3. The founding of the main temple of the sect, Obaku-san Mampuku-ji 黄檗山万福寺 in Uji in 1661. Yin-yüan served as founder and first abbot, modeling his new temple on Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu in design and organization.

4. The official recognition of Obaku as an independent sect, separate from the Rinzai sect, by the Meiji government in 1876.

It is not uncommon for brief accounts of Obaku Zen to speak of its transmission to Japan from China in such a way as to leave the distinct impression that the sect existed in some form on the Asian mainland.² Although Obaku clearly has its roots in Ming period China, to claim that the sect began in China is overly simplistic and poses a host of problems. Strictly speaking, there never was an Obaku sect in China, but rather a specific line within the Lin-ch'i 臨濟 (J. Rinzai) tradition. On the other hand, this approach does serve to emphasize the strong Chinese character of the Obaku sect at a time when Zen in Japan had otherwise become thoroughly Japanese. Yin-yüan taught a style of Zen advocated by his two predecessors at Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu, his master Fei-yin T'ung-jung 費隱通容 (1593-1661; J. Hiin Tsūyō) and Fei-yin's master Mi-yun Yüan-wu 密雲圓悟 (1566-1642; J. Mitsuun Engo). Culminating with Yin-yüan's efforts as abbot, these three men rebuilt the temple and consciously sought to restore the classical Lin-ch'i style of Zen.³ On departing for Japan, Yin-yüan left behind a large group of Dharma heirs and disciples in China, and his line continued to thrive there for some time. These Chinese monks at Wan-fu-ssu contributed to Yin-yüan's endeavors in Japan for years after he left, providing support for the successful transmission of the line to

² See, for instance, the short sections on Obaku Zen in Daigan and Alicia Matsunaga's *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism*, vol. II, pp. 262-264, E. Dale Saunderson's *Buddhism in Japan*, pp. 252-253, and Dumoulin's early volume, *A History of Zen Buddhism*, pp. 228-231.

³ The style of Zen which Mi-yun, Fei-yin, and Yin-yüan promoted incorporated elements of Pure Land teaching, as did those of all Zen masters in China at the time. Therefore modern scholars would not accept it as an authentic revival of Lin-ch'i's Zen style. Nonetheless, the masters viewed their work in these terms.

Japan, where it became known as the Obaku sect. Any complete portrait of Obaku must include this Chinese background, but few scholars would refer to the Lin-ch'i lineage that practiced on Mount Huang-po as the "Obaku sect". The sectarian divisions characteristic of Japanese Buddhism were never as sharply drawn in China, even in the Zen context where lineage was a crucial means of legitimation. Moreover, the Lin-ch'i line from which Japanese Obaku descended cannot be singled out as independent from other Lin-ch'i lines of the time. It represents one form of Zen practice in late Ming China, but it never stood alone as a third school of Zen along with Rinzai and Sôtô. It would therefore be an anachronism to speak of an Obaku sect in China. Nonetheless, the origin of the Obaku Zen style lies in the late Ming style of the three masters from Wan-fu-ssu.

Scholars sympathetic to Obaku, such as Washio Junkei, often refer to Yin-yüan's arrival in Japan as the beginning of the Obaku sect in Japan.⁴ This is accurate in the sense that from the very beginning of his teaching in Nagasaki at Kôfuku-ji and Sôfuku-ji 崇福寺⁵, Yin-yüan's influence extended beyond the Chinese community of Nagasaki to the larger world of Japanese Zen. Many of the earliest Japanese converts to Obaku such as Tetsugyû Dôki 鉄牛道機 (1628-1700) and Tetsugen Dôkô went to Nagasaki and joined the community there upon hearing of Yin-yüan's arrival. Many other Zen practitioners also paid their respects or practiced under Yin-yüan for periods of time without actually joining the Obaku community permanently. Having accepted Japanese monks and lay people as his disciples, Yin-yüan began to teach them the Ming style of Zen familiar to the Chinese members of his group. However, one cannot argue that in so doing he had any intention or awareness of founding a new, independent Zen sect. In the eyes of Yin-yüan himself and of those who came to practice under him, he was a Rinzai master, albeit from an alternative line than those represented in Japanese Rinzai. Positing this as the beginning of the Obaku sect suggests a degree of

⁴ Washio Junkei, "Obaku kairitsu no jidai", in *Nihon zenshûshi no kenkyû*, p. 98.

⁵ Also read Sôfuku-ji. Here and elsewhere I have followed the preferences of Obaku sources in the reading of Obaku names.

independence and distinction from Rinzai Zen that did not yet exist. This approach serves the purpose of those within the sect who continue to defend themselves against various negative stereotypes. Specifically, by presenting Obaku as an independent entity from the time of Yin-yüan's arrival, they reject any characterization of Obaku as a peripheral or even heterodox form of Rinzai.

Currently, most scholars writing about Obaku prefer to use the date of the founding of Obaku-san Mampuku-ji in 1661 as the beginning of the Obaku sect.⁶ The term Obaku-shû 黄檗宗 first came into use around that time⁷, although the term Obaku-ha 黄檗派 was equally common. Earlier in the century, the Edo bakufu had mandated that all temples be organized under a main temple/branch temple system. It was common to identify divisions within the various sects according to main temples. In this usage, lines of Rinzai were designated as Myōshin-ji-ha, Daitoku-ji-ha, etc., and the Obaku line was referred to as the Obaku-ha. By granting Yin-yüan official permission to found a new main temple, the Edo bakufu conferred on the Obaku line an official degree of independence to govern itself and follow its own form of the Buddhist monastic code. Under the eyes of the law, from the time the main monastery, Mampuku-ji, was founded, Obaku-ha enjoyed the same degree of independence as its main rival, Myōshinji-ha. As a Rinzai lineage, one can still say that it was a part of the Rinzai sect, but its differences from existing Japanese Rinzai lines in style and belief already tended to set it apart from the rest.

⁶ See for example Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Japan*, p. 303; Takenuki Genshō, *Nihon zenshūshi*, p. 218; and Minamoto Ryōen, *Tetsugen*, p. 74. Takenuki actually uses the date of the opening ceremonies in 1663, when Yin-yüan and his disciples took up residence at the temple, but this does not significantly alter the argument.

⁷ The term obviously refers back to the mountain name of the temples in Uji and in China. However, Obaku masters themselves tended to prefer the term Rinzai shōshū 臨濟正宗 (True Rinzai sect), the designation chosen by Mi-yun and Fei-yin to symbolize their dedication to restoring Lin-ch'i's Zen style. The term Rinzai shōshū did not originally have any polemical intentions as regards to the Rinzai lines in Japan, but rather towards other Chinese lineages. According to Hayashi Bunshō, Obaku monks continued to use it until 1874, when Obaku was officially placed under the Rinzai sect by the Meiji government. See Hayashi, "Obaku o kataru", pp. 8-9. However, one can still find examples of its use on memorial stones made since the Second World War.

In the most literal sense, Obaku cannot be said to have existed as an independent sect along side Sôtô and Rinzai until the Meiji government officially recognized it as such in 1876. Two years earlier, in 1874, as a part of its reorganization of laws related to religious groups, the Meiji government had placed Obaku under the Rinzai sect. This arrangement suited neither Obaku nor Rinzai officials, and after some petitioning, was abandoned.⁸ Obaku scholars reject the fourth option of using 1876 as the beginning of their sect because they see this as a means to disparage Obaku. By dismissing Obaku as "just a part of Rinzai", it has been possible until very recently to write histories of Japanese Zen without so much as mentioning the existence of a third school.

Ming Buddhism

By all accounts, Buddhism had entered a phase of stagnation and decline in China by the Ming period. Perhaps for that reason, scholars have paid little attention to Ming Buddhism and rarely go beyond a few generalized characterizations of it. It is commonly held that by the Ming period, only two schools of Buddhism remained active in China, Zen and Pure Land, although the teachings of other schools, especially T'ien-tai and Hua-yen, were still studied.⁹ The primary characteristic of Buddhist thought during the period was its syncretism. One sees this tendency in Buddhist attitudes towards non-Buddhist systems of thought, primarily Taoism and Confucianism, as well as between Buddhist schools. Indeed, in this regard, Buddhism seems to reflect the intellectual mood of the time, and shared this interest with Confucian and Taoist thinkers who also spoke of the three ways being one (*sankyô itchi* 三教一致).¹⁰ Within the realm of Buddhist teachings per se, syncretism commonly took the form of combining and harmonizing the practices of the two dominant schools, Zen and Pure Land.

⁸ Ibid, p. 9.

⁹ Kenneth Ch'en, *Buddhism in China, A Historical Survey*, pp. 435-436.

¹⁰ For a description of this tendency from a Confucian perspective, see Judith A. Berling, *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*, especially pp. 14-61.

Although some Buddhist masters of earlier periods had advocated such a syncretic approach, by the Ming period one can say that it had become the dominant position advocated by all of the leading Zen masters.

Throughout most of the Ming period, the Chinese government maintained strict control over Buddhist monastic and lay practice. It limited the number of ordinations for monks and established a registry of monks in order to prevent those without officially sanctioned ordinations from entering the monastery. All temples were classified according to the government's own system, which recognized three ranks of temples, Ch'an 禪, *chiang* 講 and *chiao* 教¹¹, designated according to their function. Among these classifications, Ch'an temples were the highest category, and it was from these temples that the leading monks of the period came. Pure Land Buddhism was the other dominant form of the religion that survived into the Ming dynasty, but it had no monastic organization comparable to that of the Ch'an temples. Nonetheless, Pure Land practices were common throughout all monasteries of the day, regardless of their classification, and it was not uncommon for Ch'an masters to promote Pure Land teachings especially among lay believers. Pure Land Buddhism was also widely practiced among the common people, and their lay organizations likewise came under government constraint. Lay groups such as the White Lotus and the Maitreya societies which had promoted the lay practice of chanting *nien-fo* 念佛 (J. *nembutsu*), were banned by the Ming dynasty's founder in 1370, since they were also known as breeding grounds for political rebellion.¹²

Although Zen remained an active tradition, it too suffered from the same malaise as the rest of the Buddhist world and no longer attracted the best minds of the day, as it had in its golden age during the T'ang and Sung periods. Confucianism had regained its ascendancy in the Chinese intellectual arena, and Buddhism held sway predominantly on the popular level.

¹¹ In earlier periods, temples had been classified as Ch'an temples, teaching temples 教, or Vinaya temples 律. The Ming government used a somewhat modified system. For a detailed discussion of this temple system, see Chang Sheng-yen, *Minmatsu chûgoku bukkyô no kenkyû*, pp. 54-59.

¹² Ch'en, op.cit., pp. 434-435.

As noted above, Zen masters commonly taught both Zen and Pure Land practices, so that exclusively Zen temples no longer existed.¹³ In fact, Dumoulin goes so far as to say that the story of Zen in China ends in or before the Ming period and continues elsewhere, primarily in Japan.¹⁴ Other scholars are more generous in their appraisal, and have singled out creative masters and lay movements that represent a revival of Buddhism towards the end of the period. For example, Chang Sheng-yen divides the era into three parts to offer a more nuanced depiction of it. He maintains that while the middle Ming period, roughly 1425 through 1572, was indeed a sort of dark ages for Buddhism, the late Ming period was characterized by a resurgence of Buddhism under four Zen masters, Yun-ch'i Chu-hung 雲棲株宏 (1535-1615; J. Unsei Shukô), Tzu-po Chen-k'o 紫柏真可 (1543-1603; J. Shihaku Shinka), Han-shan Te-ch'ing 寒山德清 (1546-1623; J. Kanzan Tokusei), and Ou-i Chih-hsu 藕益智旭 (1599-1655; J. Guyaku Chigyoku).¹⁵ It should be noted that all of these masters sought to harmonize Zen and Pure Land in their thought and practice.

The Restoration of Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu

The resurgence of Buddhism in late Ming China is also evidenced by the restoration of the temple on Mount Huang-po in Fukien province of southern China.¹⁶ The temple was

¹³ The existence of Zen as a self-consciously exclusive tradition in China before the Sung Dynasty is currently under debate among Zen scholars. It has been argued that such a tradition never actually existed in China, although Ch'an monastic codes from the Sung dynasty create the impression that it did. Foulk maintains that even in the Sung period, Ch'an temples were highly syncretic, incorporating practices from various schools of Buddhism, and that by the Ming period, there is no distinction at all between Ch'an Buddhism and Chinese Buddhism. Foulk, *The "Ch'an school" and its place in the Buddhist monastic tradition*, especially pp. 1-21.

¹⁴ Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History; Volume 1 India and China*, p. 287.

¹⁵ Chang, op.cit., pp. 53-54. Chang centers his work on the life and thought of Chih-hsu, making comparative reference to the other masters. See also Sung-peng Hsu, *A Buddhist Leader in Ming China, The Life and Thought of Han-shan Te-ch'ing, 1564-1623*, and Chun-fang Yu, *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*.

¹⁶ Primary source material on the history of Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu can be found in the *Huang-po shan ssu chih*, originally edited by Yin-yüan, reprinted in the *Chung-kuo fo ssu chih* series, volume 4. Secondary accounts of the temple's history include Fan Hui, "Ingen zenji to chûnichi ryô

originally founded in 789 by Cheng-kan 正幹 (n.d.), a monk in the Sixth Patriarch's line, and called Po-jo-t'ang 般若堂. It was soon enlarged and renamed Chien-fu-ssu 建福寺. During the T'ang dynasty, the famous master Huang-po Hsi-yün 黃檗希運 (d. 850) took his vows there; he later named his temple in Kiangsi Huang-po-ssu after the mountain in Fukien.¹⁷ The temple was restored early in the Ming dynasty in 1390 by the Zen master Tai-hsiu 大休 (n.d.), but was burned to the ground in 1555 in a time of civil unrest. Master Cheng-yüan 正圓 (n.d.) tried to restore the temple during his time as abbot, from 1567 through 1572, but his efforts centered on obtaining a copy of the Tripitaka for the temple from the authorities in Peking. His petitions were not answered before his death, but his two disciples, Hsing-shou Chien-yüan 興壽鑑源 (n.d.) and Hsing-tz'u Ching-yüan 興慈鏡源 (n.d.), were determined to fulfill his mission. After repeated requests to the authorities and several trips to the capital, they received an edition of the Tripitaka in 1612.

Mi-yun Yüan-wu began the actual restoration of temple buildings when he became abbot in 1630. Yin-yüan was Mi-yun's disciple and came to the mountain with him to serve as his attendant. In 1633, Mi-yun retired and his Dharma heir Fei-yin became abbot, naming Yin-yüan as his head disciple. In 1637, Yin-yüan became abbot for the first time, serving from 1637 until Mi-yun's death in 1642; he served a second term from 1646 until his departure for Japan in 1654. The bulk of the restoration work was completed under his direction. During his tenure, some thirty buildings were erected and hundreds of disciples were said to have gathered at the temple to practice under his guidance.

The abbots of Wan-fu-ssu sought not only to restore the physical and economic structure of the temple, but to revitalize the Zen style of their Lin-ch'i line. Mi-yun, Fei-yin and Yin-yüan regarded themselves respectively as the thirtieth, thirty-first, and thirty-second generation descendents from Lin-ch'i.¹⁸ They referred to their line as the Lin-ch'i chêng-tsung Obakusan no yurai", pp. 118-123.

¹⁷ Miura, *Zen Dust*, p. 209.

¹⁸ The full lineage is described in several secondary sources. See Otsuki, et.al., *Obaku*

臨濟正宗 (J. Rinzai shôshû) or Lin-ch'i chêng-ch'uan 臨濟正伝 (J. Rinzai shôden), reflecting their belief that they had inherited the orthodox or true lineage from Lin-ch'i.¹⁹ They made use of those elements characteristically associated with the Lin-ch'i style, kôan, slaps, and shouts. However, in keeping with the dominant syncretic nature of Ming Buddhism, they also made use of a variety of Pure Land, T'ien-t'ai, and folk practices.²⁰

Social Conditions in Late Ming China

During the years that Wan-fu-ssu was being restored, the Ming dynasty was falling apart and the Ch'ing dynasty was being established.²¹ The late Ming emperors were ill equipped to deal with the crises facing their empire. Manchu invasions from the north and rebellions from within left the country torn apart by war. Political and social discord was compounded by a series of natural disasters that lead to famine in various parts of the empire. Even the wealthy southern coastal regions such as Fukien, which had been successful in overseas commerce from the 1590's onwards, were hard hit by high rice prices, famine, and the resulting rioting *bunka jinmei jiten*, p. 406, and Dieter Schwaller, *Der japanische Obaku-Mönch Tetsugen Dôkô*, p. 211.

¹⁹ Fei-yin, in particular, became embroiled in the arguments over Zen lineage then raging in China. He wrote his major work, the *Gotô gentô* 五燈嚴統 (C. *Wu-têng yen-t'ung*), in response to these arguments, and set forth his own and Mi-yun's understanding of Zen lineages from the seven Buddhas of the past through the late Ming period. In the *Gotô gentô*, Fei-yin not only sought to rectify lineage problems within his own line, but in other lines as well. He invalidated the lineage claims made by several prominent monks of the period, including Han-shan Te-ch'ing and Yun-ch'i Chu-hung. Not surprisingly, the publication of the *Gotô gentô* in 1653 set off heated opposition from other groups. The dispute eventually lead to a public debate before government officials between Fei-yin and a Sôtô master, Yung-ch'ueh Yüan-hsien 永覺元賢 (1578-1657; J. Eigaku Genken). As a result of the judgement against Fei-yin at the debate, the original wood blocks of the *Gotô gentô* were destroyed in 1654, a few months after Yin-yüan had left for Japan. Yin-yüan republished the work in Japan in 1657. See Torigoe Fumikuni, *Hiin zenji to sono cho- Gotô gentô*, Nagai Masano, "Minmatsu ni ikita zenshatachi- Hiin Tsûyô ni yoru *Gotô gentô* no seiritsu", pp. 327-342, and Miura, op.cit., pp. 430-432.

²⁰ Most of what is known about the practices at Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu is actually drawn from information about Obaku-san Mampuku-ji in Japan, which was modelled on the Chinese temple. Some information can also be drawn from Yin-yüan's recorded sayings from before his emigration to Japan. For a detailed discussion of that material, see chapter three, following.

²¹ *The Cambridge History of China, Volume 7, The Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644, Part 1*, Frederick W. Mote and Denis Twitchett, eds., gives a detailed account of the disintegration of the Ming dynasty, including the years known as the Southern Ming, 1644-1662 when Ming loyalists continued to oppose the Ch'ing forces. See especially pp. 585-725.

and banditry in the 1640's.

On April 25, 1644, the Ch'ung-chen emperor committed suicide in the face of advancing rebel troops. Most historians use this date as the end of the Ming period and regard Ch'ung-chen as the last Ming emperor. In actuality, the political situation was quite complicated, and it was almost twenty years before the Ch'ing dynasty had completely suppressed the last of the Ming resistance. This period, from 1644 until 1662, is known as the Southern Ming, since the loyalist stronghold was south of the Yangtze River.

Within a few weeks of Ch'ung-chen's death, Manchu forces had taken the city of Peking and made it the capital of the Ch'ing empire, which they had proclaimed eight years earlier in 1636. The Manchus first proceeded to suppress the internal rebellions that had torn Ming China for decades and then moved south to quell the resistance movements of the last of the Ming loyalists. Ming forces continued to resist the "barbarian invasion" under the banner of a succession of Ming emperors until 1662 when the Manchus finally captured and executed the last claimant to the Ming throne, Yung-li, and his heir.

The heart of Ming resistance was situated in Fukien province, and led by the former pirate Cheng Chih-lung 鄭芝龍 and his son Cheng Ch'eng-kung²² 鄭成功 (1614-1662; J. Tei Seikô). Cheng wealth and power were based upon their dominance in Fukien maritime commerce, and they used that power to oppose the Ch'ing.²³ As leaders in the Chinese sea trade, the Chengs had strong connections to the Chinese merchant community in Nagasaki as well as with local Japanese leaders. Ch'eng-kung had actually been born in Japan to a Japanese woman which proved an advantage. Using their connections in Japan, the Chengs

²² Cheng Ch'eng-kung is commonly known in the West as Coxinga, the Europeanized version of his name. Coxinga has been the subject of numerous historical and literary works. For further information, see Keene, *The Battles of Coxinga*, and F'occardi, *The Last Warrior*.

²³ The Chengs first supported the Prince of T'ang who assumed the title of Emperor Lung-wu in 1645. Lung-wu adopted Ch'eng-kung and named him as his heir. When the senior Cheng, Chih-lung, surrendered to Ch'ing forces after his defeat in Foochow in 1646, Ch'eng-kung refused to follow his father's lead. He took control of his father's position as maritime leader in Fukien. He then consolidated his position so securely in Fukien, that he was able to lead an offensive drive northward into Ch'ing territory between 1655 and 1659. When that movement failed, he and his forces fled to Taiwan in 1661.

initiated a series of requests between 1645 and 1647, asking the Tokugawa government for military support in the name of the Ming emperor.²⁴

The Chinese Community in Nagasaki

Starting in the late sixteenth century, Chinese merchants began actively participating in overseas commerce. Although trade between China and Japan had been officially banned by both countries, Chinese ships regularly came to port in Nagasaki, one of the region's leading trade centers. Long before Japanese national isolation laws limited Chinese traders to that city in 1639, Nagasaki had a thriving Chinese community. This merchant community became the conduit for bringing Chinese Zen masters to Japan, and Nagasaki served as a way station for contacts between the Obaku sect in Japan and the original community on Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu far into the Tokugawa period.

As the Tokugawa bakufu became progressively secure in its power in the seventeenth century, Japanese laws regulating international trade and domestic religious practice began to impinge on the Chinese traders, especially the expatriate merchant community in port cities like Nagasaki. Starting in 1587, Japanese leaders began promulgating laws prohibiting Christianity. Initially these laws did not directly effect commercial activities, and in any case, were not systematically enforced. The founder of the Tokugawa shogunate, Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1542-1616), pursued policies intended to eliminate Christianity from the country without harming international trade. However, the second Tokugawa shogun, Hidetada 秀忠 (1579-1632) and his successor Iemitsu 家光 (1603-1651), later turned to a policy of national isolation that combined restrictions on religion, foreign trade, and international travel for Japanese. Bans on Christianity were strictly enforced, and by 1639, all Western nationals except the Dutch were banned entirely from entering the country, even for purposes of trade.

²⁴ For details about Ming requests for Japanese military assistance from the Chinese perspective, see *The Cambridge History of China, Volume 7*, pp. 699-700. For the Japanese perspective, see Takenuki, *Nihon zenshūshi*, pp. 212-213.

Japan's international trade partners were effectively limited to the Dutch, the Chinese and the Koreans. The Tokugawa bakufu further consolidated its control over international trade by limiting these remaining foreign contacts with Japan to Nagasaki, a city under their direct rule. Dutch and Chinese merchants were welcome there, but their living quarters were limited to prescribed areas within the city; travel to other areas of the country was strictly forbidden.

In spite of these growing restrictions, Chinese trade with Japan increased throughout the first half of the seventeenth century, and Chinese merchants became a significant minority group in Nagasaki. Although many of the Chinese were Buddhist as was the Japanese host community, as their presence grew more established, they felt the need for temples of their own.²⁵ Chinese merchants from different areas of China banded together and built three Chinese temples, Kōfuku-ji 廣福寺 in 1623, Fukusai-ji 福濟寺 in 1628, and Sōfuku-ji 崇福寺 in 1635.²⁶ They invited Chinese monks from their home regions to come and serve as founders and abbots.

At first, the temples served only the most basic religious needs of the community, primarily the conduct of funeral and memorial services. Reflecting the eclectic nature of Ming religion, the temples included elements of Chinese folk religion that were not Buddhist in the

²⁵ It is believed that these temples actually began as shrines to Chinese folk gods, especially Ma-tsu 祖 (J. Maso), the feminine protective deity of seafarers. Chinese seaman customarily carried an image of Ma-tsu with them on board and paid homage to the image throughout the journey, praying to it for a safe journey. Upon arrival at their destination, they would take the image ashore and enshrine it temporarily, making offerings of thanksgiving for their safe passage. Upon their departure, they would once again install the image on board ship. Although they may have used their own residences as temporary shrines at first, it was more traditional to use a small community shrine, and soon such shrines were built in Nagasaki. All of the Chinese temples in Nagasaki include a Ma-tsu hall among their buildings, a feature unique to them in Japan. For a more explanation and a review of the historical documents related to the founding of each temple, see Ri Kenshō, "Nagasaki santōji no seiritsu", pp, 73-90.

²⁶ Merchants from the Yangtze river basin built Kōfuku-ji, and was known alternatively as Nanking Temple. In a similar fashion, Fukusai-ji was built by people from the Chang-chow area of Fukien and is called Chang-chow Temple, and Sōfuku-ji is known as Foochow Temple for the people who built it. A fourth Chinese temple, Shōfuku-ji 聖福寺, was built in 1677 by people from the Canton area. It is not always included in treatments of the other Chinese temples, since it was founded by a disciple of Yin-yüan and was a branch temple of Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji from the start. All four of these temples still exist and are all Ōbaku branch temples. Only Fukusai-ji was destroyed completely by the atomic bomb in 1945; the others have buildings, images, and art dating back to the early seventeenth century.

strict sense, but were common to any Chinese temple of the time.²⁷ The early Chinese monks who made their way to Nagasaki were not masters of great distinction. Their primary concerns were performing funerals and holding Chinese-style ceremonies on the important holidays of the year, such as the Buddha's birthday and Obon. It is commonly believed that most of them came to escape the civil unrest in Ming China, and that their sole purpose in Japan was to serve the expatriate Chinese community. In this early stage, the Chinese temples and their monks had little or no influence on Japanese Buddhism.

The situation changed when monks of higher caliber came over from China and attracted Japanese disciples. The first of these was Master Tao-che Ch'ao-yüan 道者超元 (1602-1662), known to the Japanese as Dôsha Chôgen.²⁸ Tao-che was a native of Fukien province, and came from the same Dharma line as Yin-yüan.²⁹ He arrived in Nagasaki in 1651, and took up residence at Sôfuku-ji where he served as abbot until 1655. Tao-che was the first Chinese monk to spread the Zen style of the Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu masters in Japan, and his work

²⁷ In addition to the Ma-tsu shrines, the Chinese temples also had images of such Chinese folk deities as Kuan-ti 關帝 that were closely associated with merchant life. Kuan-ti was an historical military leader from the Three Kingdom period (220-280 CE) who was worshipped originally as a warrior deity. Gradually he became associated with financial success, and became a common deity for the merchant class. Obaku-san Mampuku-ji has an image of Kuan-ti enshrined as the main image in the Geran-dô 伽藍堂. See Takahashi Ryôwa, *Obakusan Mampukuji*, pp. 128-132, for a description of the hall's history. Although the practice of incorporating these folk deities into Buddhist temples is not at all unlike the Japanese custom of building a Shinto shrine within temple grounds, images of gods unknown to the Japanese caused some problems for the Chinese at this time. During the worst of the Christian persecutions, and especially after the Shimabara revolt of 1638, the Chinese may have felt a special need to assert their Buddhist identity. It has even been suggested that the three Nagasaki temples were built primarily to demonstrate to the Japanese authorities that the Chinese expatriates were indeed Buddhist. See Ri Kenshō, *op.cit.*, p. 74.

²⁸ Most sources follow the *Zengaku daijiten* and list Tao-che's year of death as 1660 and date of birth unknown. I have given here the dates provided by the entry in Otsuki, *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten*, p. 263. Almost nothing is known about Tao-che except for his years in Japan. There are two short volumes of his recorded sayings from that period, the *Nanzan Dôsha zenji goroku* and the *Dôsha zenji goroku*, each one fascicle. Tao-che is also mentioned by several monks who practiced under him in their recorded sayings and sermons. For a complete summary of these materials see Furuta Shôkin, "Dôsha Chôgen no raichô to sono eikyô", pp. 343-365. See also Tsuji Zennosuke, *op.cit.*, pp. 296-300. For brief accounts in English, see Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2 Japan*, p. 300 and p. 313, and Peter Haskel, *Bankei Zen*, pp. xxv-xxvi.

²⁹ Tao-che's master was Hsueh-feng Keng-hsin 亘信行弥, a Dharma heir of Fei-yin. This made Yin-yüan his Dharma uncle.

eased the way for Yin-yüan who would follow a few years later.

News of Tao-che's arrival in Nagasaki quickly spread in the Japanese Zen world, and several Japanese monks came to practice under him at Sôfuku-ji. The majority seem to have been from the Sôtô school,³⁰ but some Rinzai monks joined his assembly as well. A short list of monks who visited or practiced under him includes Dokuan Genkô 独庵玄光 (1630-1698), Gesshû Sôko 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696), Tesshin Dôin 鉄心道印 (1593-1680), Kengan Zen'etsu 賢巖禪悦 (1618-1690), Egoku Dômyô 慧極道明 (1632-1721), Chôon Dôkai 潮音道海 (1628-1695) and Unzan Guhaku 雲山愚白 (1619-1702). However, Tao-che is probably best known for his relationship with the Rinzai master Bankei Yôtaku 盤珪永琢 (1622-1693). Bankei had heard of Tao-che's arrival and joined his assembly in 1651, staying for perhaps a year. He received Tao-che's *inka*, but he does not seem to have been completely satisfied with the master's abilities and did not perpetuate Tao-che's Dharma line.³¹

Although Tao-che taught numerous Japanese monks and bestowed *inka* on several of them, he was not successful in establishing his line in Japan. This was due in large part to his abrupt return to China in 1658.³² When he left, most of his disciples turned to other

³⁰ Furuta Shôkin maintains that Tao-che was influential in the nascent movement to reform Sôtô through his contact with Sôtô monks who later became leaders of the revival. Furuta, *op.cit.*, p. 350.

³¹ Bankei said as much in one of his sermons. "Among the Zen masters of that time, only Dôsha was able, to this modest extent, to confirm for me my experience of enlightenment; but, even so, I wasn't fully satisfied. Now looking back, today I wouldn't even find Dôsha acceptable. If only Dôsha had gone on living till now, I might have made a better man of him." Translation by Peter Haskel, *op.cit.*, p. 9. For the original, see Akao Ryûji, *Bankei zenji zenshû*, pp. 11-12.

³² The reason for Tao-che's return to China is unclear. There are several stories and theories, but none is certain. By all accounts, Tao-che left after some sort of friction between himself and Yin-yüan's disciples. Furuta Shôkin suggests that the problem was probably related to his position as abbot at Sôfuku-ji. Yin-yüan's disciple Yeh-lan had been invited to serve there as abbot in 1651, but died on the way from China. Yin-yüan's disciples may have felt that Sôfuku-ji was therefore Yin-yüan's by right and bullied Tao-che into leaving. Furuta notes that there is no evidence to suggest that the friction marred the relationship between Yin-yüan and Tao-che themselves. See Furuta, *op.cit.*, pp. 361-363. Tsuji presents an alternative story in which the source of tension revolved around a letter sent to Tao-che by his master in China. According to this account, Mu-an, Yin-yüan's leading disciple, intercepted the letter and Tao-che later learned of this. See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, pp. 298-299. Norman Waddell provides a translation of a document supporting Tsuji's account. According to it, Mu-an intercepted and destroyed a letter certifying Tao-che's Dharma transmission; he then accused Tao-che

masters, even some like Dokuan who had already received his *inka*. The majority became disciples of Yin-yüan or one of the other leading Ōbaku masters. For this reason, Tao-che is commonly regarded as a forerunner of the Ōbaku sect.

Yin-yüan's Move to Nagasaki

By the middle of the seventeenth century, it had become common practice for the Chinese lay believers in Nagasaki and/or the Chinese monks who served them to send invitations to particular monks in China when one of their temples required a new abbot. In 1651, Sōfuku-ji was in need of an abbot, and they sent an invitation to one of Yin-yüan's leading disciples, Yeh-lan Hsing-kue 也賴性圭 (1613?- 1651; J. Yaran Shōkei).³³ Yeh-lan had entered monastic life in 1630 at Wan-fu-ssu and practiced under Mi-yun, Fei-yin and Yin-yüan. He became Yin-yüan's Dharma heir in 1646, and had been serving as the abbot of Feng-huang-shan when he received the invitation from Sōfuku-ji. He accepted and soon set sail for Nagasaki with Yin-yüan's approval. During the crossing, his ship broke up on a reef; though there were many survivors, Yeh-lan was lost at sea. Yin-yüan seems to have been deeply affected by this loss, and later indicated that it was a primary factor in his own decision to leave for Japan.

Less than a year after Yeh-lan's death, I-jan Hsing-jung 逸然性融 (1601-1668; J. Itsunen Shōyū), the abbot of Kōfuku-ji, began a campaign to bring Yin-yüan himself to Nagasaki.³⁴ Until that time, no prominent monks of Yin-yüan's stature had come to serve at of teaching without credentials. See Waddell, *The Unborn*, note 26, pp. 30-31. Tao-che left Sōfuku-ji in 1655 and spent his last three or four years in Japan on Hirado at the invitation of Lord Matsuura Shigenobu.

³³ According to Dumoulin, Yeh-lan was invited by the abbot at Kōfuku-ji; *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2 Japan*, pp. 300-301. The abbot there at that time was I-jan Hsing-jung, another of Yin-yüan's disciples. I-jan was instrumental in bringing Yin-yüan to Nagasaki, and it is possible that he was involved in Yeh-lan's invitation as well. However, all other sources indicate that the invitation came from Sōfuku-ji. According to Hirakubo Akira, the lay believers at Sōfuku-ji invited Yeh-lan at the suggestion of Wu-hsin Hsing-chien 無心性覺, a friend of Yeh-lan who was already in Nagasaki. See Hirakubo, *Ingen*, pp. 78-9.

³⁴ According to Hirakubo Akira, it was Wu-hsin who actually suggested the idea to I-jan after

the Chinese temples there. I-jan sent a series of four invitations between 1652 and 1653.³⁵ Although Yin-yüan at first refused these invitations on the grounds of his advanced age, he was moved by the repeated requests. He himself seems to have been inclined to accept the offer from the start, but deferred to the wishes of his master Fei-yin. Fei-yin objected to Yin-yüan undertaking such a dangerous voyage when he was needed by the assembly in China.³⁶ Finally, after receiving the fourth letter from I-jan, Yin-yüan agreed to the trip, writing his acceptance in the twelfth month of 1653.

Preparations for the journey took some time, and Yin-yüan was not ready to depart until the sixth lunar month of 1654. His disciples pleaded with him to change his mind, but Yin-yüan felt that he could not disappoint the people waiting for him in Nagasaki. From letters that he wrote later, it seems that he made a promise to the monks at Wan-fu-ssu before he left that he would return to China after three years in Japan. He appointed his Dharma heir Hui-men Ju-p'ei 慧門如沛 (1615-1664; J. Emon Nyohai)³⁷ as his successor at Wan-fu-ssu and left with a company of some twenty or thirty monks.³⁸ Most of these monks were young and not especially advanced in their practice. Half of them remained with Yin-yüan in Japan, and the others returned to China after about a year in Nagasaki. Yin-yüan left behind his most advanced disciples, including Mu-an Hsing-t'ao 木庵性瑤 (1611-1684; J. Mokuan Shôtô) and Chi-fei Ju-i 即非如一 (1616-1671; J. Sokuhi Nyoitsu) both of whom who later joined him in Japan. he heard about Yeh-lan's death; *ibid.*, p. 79.

³⁵ These letters were dated 1652/4/6, 1652/8/27, 1653/3, and 1653/11/3. The second never arrived, so some sources refer to only three invitations. For details, see *ibid.*, pp. 79-82.

³⁶ Yin-yüan suggests this in a letter he wrote to Fei-yin from Japan. The letter is given in full in the *Ingen zenshû* vol. 5, pp. 2196-2200. For a translation into Japanese see Tsuji Zennosuke, *op.cit.*, pp. 320-300. A partial translation is given below, pp. 35-36.

³⁷ Hui-men remained at Wan-fu-ssu until his death, but his line became one of the most important in the Ōbaku sect. One of his eleven Dharma heirs was Kao-ch'üan Hsing-tun 高泉性淳 (1633-1695; J. Kōsen Shōton), the fifth abbot of Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji.

³⁸ I have found no complete list of this group and doubt that any exists. The most complete list of twenty names can be found in Akamatsu, "Ōbakushû kōyō", p. 59, but he indicates that there were others in the group. Partial lists can be found in Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, p. 89 and Tsuji, *op.cit.*, p. 320.

Yin-yüan's Motivations

Scholars have paid a great deal of attention to Yin-yüan's reasons for leaving China and settling in Japan. Determining the actual motives of an historical figure may be impossible, but all of the modern scholars who discuss Ōbaku feel compelled to express an opinion on the matter. This is perhaps because the issue of why Yin-yüan came to and settled in Japan has been under debate since at least the early eighteenth century. Discussions about a founder's motivation can be strong weapons in religious polemics, and arguments about Yin-yüan's purpose in coming to Japan often reflect sectarian biases. In some cases, those honestly striving for scholarly objectivity have become unwitting participants in these debates simply because they did not recognize the battle lines for what they were. Since a discussion of this type has been a standard feature in the Japanese literature, a summary of the interpretations of Yin-yüan's intentions is given here, with special attention paid to the polemical and apologetic tendencies of each.

Hirakubo Akira provides the most complete review of the various theories that earlier scholars have developed and analyzes most of the primary source materials supporting each of them.³⁹ Based on his presentation, one can divide the explanation into four basic types with minor variations: a) Yin-yüan came to Japan to escape the turmoil and hardship in China; b) he came to spread the Dharma in Japan; c) he came in response to invitations from Japan; and d) he came to complete his disciple Yeh-lan's mission.

Starting with Tsuji Zennosuke, the majority of modern scholars believe that Yin-yüan came to Japan, at least in part, to escape from the serious social and political upheavals in China at that time or because he could not reconcile himself to Ch'ing rule of China.⁴⁰ When

³⁹ Hirakubo's treatment of the issue can be found in his biography of Yin-yüan, *op.cit.*, pp. 68-85. I have drawn heavily from his work, but have added materials that he did not discuss, especially Mujaku's *Ōbaku geki*.

⁴⁰ Tsuji acknowledges that on the face of it, Yin-yüan was responding to invitations from the community in Nagasaki, but that the underlying reason was to flee China's unrest. See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, p.

Yin-yüan left China in 1654, Ming loyalists were still fighting the Ch'ing army, and his native region of Fukien remained a loyalist stronghold. There are examples of monks in that region going deep into the mountains to escape the turmoil⁴¹ and no doubt some went to Nagasaki for much the same purpose. It is believed that many of the expatriate Chinese living in Nagasaki were there to escape the violence, so it would not have been strange if Yin-yüan had similar motivations. However, Hirakubo and other Obaku scholars take offense at the suggestion that this was a primary motivation for Yin-yüan, since they believe it relegates his teaching in Japan to a secondary concern, a mere afterthought to his own comfort and safety.

Tsuji supports his contention that Yin-yüan was fleeing the violence by suggesting that there is evidence in Yin-yüan's *nempu* 年譜 (year by year biography) that the master himself experienced hardships and injustices while in China.⁴² In response to Tsuji, Hirakubo denies finding any such evidence in his own exhaustive research on Yin-yüan's life. While Hirakubo acknowledges that Yin-yüan moved around during the worst years of the fighting, he argues that this was not directly related to the war. He provides examples from the *nempu* to show that Yin-yüan witnessed first-hand the suffering of other people in Fukien, but was not himself a victim.⁴³ What is obvious from Yin-yüan's writings is that he grieved for the fall of the Ming empire and abhorred the injustices and violence inflicted on the Chinese people during the difficult years of transition. Yin-yüan and other monks at Wan-fu-ssu were personally acquainted with members of the Ming resistance and sympathized with their cause. They

held memorial services for the casualties in their area, especially after the fall of Foochow in 319-321. It is worth noting that Tsuji regards all of the monks, scholars and artists who came to Japan in the seventeenth century as refugees from the chaos in China. He gives a list of fifty-three such individuals on pp. 286-290. He extends the list well past the Southern Ming period to include individuals who came as late as 1719. Many of the monks from the later period emigrated at the invitation of Obaku-san Mampuku-ji to serve as its abbot, since the temple's monastic rule specifically required a Chinese monk to fill that post. Other scholars who follow Tsuji's lead include Takenuki Genshō, *op.cit.*, pp. 214-215 and Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2 Japan*, p. 300 and note 7 on p. 355.

⁴¹ Yeh-lan lived in seclusion in the mountains for two years, from 1647 until 1649.

⁴² See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, p. 321. Unfortunately, he does not document this claim with examples.

⁴³ See Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, pp. 84-85.

1647, when thousands of people were said to have been killed.⁴⁴

One can find some support for Tsuji's theory in the *Obaku geki* 黄檗外記, one of the earliest accounts of the establishment of Obaku in Japan.⁴⁵ The episode in question would have occurred in 1654, two months after Yin-yüan's arrival in Nagasaki.

On the ninth day of the ninth month, when Master Jikuin was living at his retreat at Zenrin-ji, Yin-yüan came there one morning while he was still asleep accompanied by seven or eight disciples.... Jikuin sat up in bed and said, "Why have you come so early in the morning?" Yin-yüan replied, "Although I thought I should return to China, the Ch'ing Dynasty has not yet quelled the rebellion. Since Japan is a country where the Buddhist Dharma flourishes, I think that I should stay here if I can. Since you know many of the *daimyō*, perhaps you would act as my intermediary and I could build a two-mat hut and hang out my Dharma banner."⁴⁶

If accurate, this would indicate that conditions in China were indeed a crucial factor in Yin-yüan's thinking from the outset and were specifically relevant to his decision to stay on in Japan. However, the *Obaku geki* is by no means an unbiased history of Obaku Zen, and one cannot accept everything in it as factual. One must first bear in mind that Mujaku was writing nearly seventy years after the fact and that he himself was not a witness to this episode.⁴⁷ Of greater importance, his purpose in writing the piece as a whole was to criticize Yin-yüan and his Obaku line, so that he included as many unflattering details as possible. In the case of this particular episode, for example, there is reason to doubt that Yin-yüan had actually decided to

⁴⁴ Minamoto Ryōen gives some examples to this effect from Yin-yüan's writings, op.cit., pp. 57-58. For the originals, see Hirakubo, *Ingen zenshū*, vol. 3, pp. 1192-1193 and 1537.

⁴⁵ The *Obaku geki* was written by the Myōshin-ji scholar Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠 in 1720. Although the document is polemical in tone, it provides a good general outline of Yin-yüan's early years in Japan. The manuscript circulated among monks in the Myōshin-ji line, and seems to have been intended for internal consumption. It contains a series of episodes that show Yin-yüan and other Obaku monks in an unfavorable light. For a complete translation, see Appendix One below.

⁴⁶ *Obaku geki*, pp. 1b-2a. This translation is my own, based on the original document, written in Mujaku's own hand. See p. 123, note 61 for more information about versions of the *Obaku geki*.

⁴⁷ The first parts of the *Obaku geki* were based largely on Jikuin's version of events. Jikuin was Mujaku's master, and Mujaku wrote with confidence about what he had learned from him. However, when this was written in 1720, Jikuin had already been dead for 33 years. It is also important to bear in mind that Yin-yüan and Jikuin parted on bad terms in 1656 or 1657, so that Mujaku's source was hardly impartial.

remain in Japan permanently at this early juncture. Yin-yüan was to express later his desire to return to China several times over the years that followed, and his Japanese supporters certainly seem to have taken those feelings seriously.⁴⁸ It is therefore difficult to gauge the accuracy of the above episode.

Another version on the same theme can be found in a second eighteenth century document, the *Zenrin shûhei shû* 禪林執弊集,⁴⁹ written by the Myôshin-jî line monk. According to this account, Yin-yüan and his disciples fled China because their line had been discredited when Fei-yin was humiliated by his defeat in a public debate.⁵⁰ In this version, the Ôbaku line monks were fleeing not social and political upheaval, but the failure of their own line in China.

⁴⁸ Tsuji maintains that in several cases, when Yin-yüan spoke of going home, he was speaking rhetorically or as a ploy to convince the authorities to expedite his case. He concedes that in some instances, Yin-yüan's desire to return to China was probably quite genuine, especially when he was living under house arrest at Fumon-jî and was therefore uncomfortable. See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, pp. 334-336. Tsuji follows Mujaku's lead here. When sorting out the actual order of events, based on the written sources at his disposal, Mujaku comments on a letter of petition to the authorities indicating that Yin-yüan wanted to leave Japan. Mujaku indicates that he doubts the sincerity of that emotion, except when life at Fumon-jî proved unacceptable. The relevant passage, written with Mujaku as first person reads, "I say that there is a letter at this temple [Ryôge-in], addressed to the counselors, with the three seals of Ryôkei, Tokûô, and Jikûin. Under the circumstances, it seems that they never sent it. In the letter, they explain that Yin-yüan wanted to return to China. How can that be? According to Tôshuku, Yin-yüan thought that he should return to China because he had been told that it would be difficult for them to decide on his petition to the Edo government while he was staying in Tonda. It was probably a note from that period. It seems that this petition was written in the first month. After staying the winter retreat [at Fumon-jî] in Tonda, Yin-yüan asked to return to China. It was written by Tokûô and Ryôkei." *Obaku geki*, 9b. It is possible to interpret Yin-yüan's statements in a more sympathetic light. Yin-yüan became quite serious about returning home to China after 1657, when he had been in Japan for nearly three years. He had promised his disciples in China that he would return home to Wan-fu-ssu after a period of three years. He received several letters from his disciples in China, encouraging him to return and reminding him of his promise. By that time, he was living under much less constrained circumstances and had made some powerful allies in the Edo bakufu, but may have preferred returning home despite his improved circumstances.

⁴⁹ The *Zenrin shûhei shû* was first published in 1700 in two fascicles. Its preface identifies the author as "an anonymous Hanazono monk", but it is generally believed that the author was actually Keirin Sûshin 桂林崇琛 (1652-1728). The first fascicle contains 22 sections, each describing some persistent evil that characterized the Zen sect of that time. The second fascicle bears the title *Zoku zenrin shûhei shû* 續禪林執弊集, with an additional 15 cases, believed to be by the same author. Scholars generally refer to the two volumes as a single work. Several of the sections are critical of Ôbaku practice. The section at issue here is the fourteenth in the second volume, pp. 14b-15b. For a detailed discussion of the work, see chapter 4 below. Hirakubo also makes reference to this passage, see Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, p. 70.

⁵⁰ See p. 22, note 19.

In Yin-yüan's case, the chronology of events does not support this argument, since he left before Fei-yin's unsuccessful debate in 1654, though only by a matter of months. Interestingly, the *Zenrin shûhei shû* concedes that Chinese monks of Yin-yüan and Mu-an's stature had not previously come to Nagasaki, but specifically denies that they came out of dedication to spreading the Dharma. The text thus stands in direct contradiction to the second type of theory about Yin-yüan's motives which stress his dedication to spreading Buddhism.

The second interpretation, that Yin-yüan came primarily for the purpose of spreading the Dharma is obviously the one most congenial to Ōbaku believers. As Hirakubo points out, this explanation is based on some of Yin-yüan's reflections about himself found in his recorded sayings, and that this was the view taken by Yin-yüan's immediate disciples.⁵¹ Over the years before he emigrated, Yin-yüan was in contact, directly and indirectly, with the Chinese expatriate community in Nagasaki. He knew that the Buddhist monks and lay people at the Chinese temples there sought his guidance and he had heard glowing reports of Japanese dedication to Buddhism in Japan. He had reason, therefore, to believe that he would be greeted by a receptive audience and be able to contribute something to the advancement of Buddhism there.⁵² He was, in fact, successful in spreading his Zen style in Japan, and firmly established his Dharma line with both Chinese and Japanese Dharma heirs. Even if escaping the political turmoil were one of his motivations for leaving China, once in Japan, he dedicated his life to teaching.

There are at least three versions of the third theory that have circulated at various times, attributing Yin-yüan's coming to invitations he received from Japan. As already described, the abbot of Kōfuku-ji sent Yin-yüan four invitations, and Yin-yüan finally accepted the fourth. In the most literal sense, I-jan's invitation was the immediate catalyst for Yin-yüan to sail for

⁵¹ See Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 69.

⁵² Hirakubo makes reference to these reports in op.cit., p. 82. Minamoto Ryōen does not make direct reference to them, but indicates that Yin-yüan regarded Japan as a suitable location for spreading the Dharma. He suggests that having succeeded in his work in China at Wan-fu-ssu, Yin-yüan was eager to try his hand in Japan. See Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 60-61.

Nagasaki. However, it has also been suggested that either the emperor Gomizunoo or the fourth Tokugawa shogun Ietsuna were actually responsible for I-jan extending his invitation.⁵³ Depending on the source, one or the other secular authority is supposed to have requested that a prominent Chinese Zen master be brought to Japan in order to provide a spark to revitalize Japanese Rinzai. During the Tokugawa period, these stories generally focused on the shogun, but after the Meiji restoration, the emperor replaces him in the role of patron. There is no historical evidence to support either of these claims. Although neither leader was involved in the plans to bring Yin-yüan to Japan, these stories have been used by scholars to foster the image that Obaku was a sect marked out for special favor either by the Tokugawa shogunate or by the emperor.

Finally, the claim that Yin-yüan came primarily to complete the mission of his disciple Yeh-lan is Yin-yüan's own explanation for his decision to leave China. As noted earlier, Fei-yin did not approve of Yin-yüan making the trip to Japan, but ultimately Yin-yüan disappointed his master and left. Once he was in Nagasaki, Yin-yüan tried to explain his decision to Fei-yin in a New Years greeting sent from Japan in 1655. "Originally, Yeh-lan was invited to Japan, but he did not fulfill his vow. Since he lost his life, I couldn't ask anyone else. [I came myself,] like a father paying his son's debt. Previously I had written to refuse their [invitation], because I had acquiesced to your stern admonition.... When they invited me a fourth time, I was moved by the sincerity of those far away and promised them [I would come]."⁵⁴ The needs of the

⁵³ The earliest example of this is found in the *Nagasaki jitsuroku taisei*, compiled in 1760. It says that Ietsuna wanted to follow the example set by the Ashikaga shogun and build a great Zen temple. He ordered I-jan to invite a prominent Chinese monk to be its founder, and this resulted in Yin-yüan being invited. This story was then repeated in Obaku materials published during the Edo period. Hirakubo theorizes that the source of this claim is the wording in Yin-yüan's *nempû* (biography), where reference is made to I-jan receiving an official order. Most likely this was based on an interpretation of I-jan's fourth letter that mentions the shogunate's official in Nagasaki (Kurokawa Masanao). Hirakubo believes that this official gave I-jan his permission for the invitation and then simply notified Edo later. However, the term used in the *nempû*, *omei* 王命, could be interpreted to mean I-jan received a direct command from either the emperor or the shogun. See Hirakubo, op.cit., pp. 71-76. Washio Junkei mentions a similar story then circulating that Emperor Gomizunoo had been responsible for Yin-yüan's invitation and dismisses it as mistaken. See Washio, op.cit., p. 98.

⁵⁴ For the complete text in the original Chinese, see *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 5, pp. 2198-2200.

Nagasaki community and their persistence obviously influenced Yin-yüan's decision, but by his own estimation, the crucial factor was his feeling of responsibility toward Yeh-lan. While one cannot claim that this explanation exhausts the relevant conditions leading up to Yin-yüan's decision to leave China or to settle permanently in Japan, as his own version of events, it should carry special significance.

The Welcome in Japan

When Yin-yüan and his disciples arrived in Nagasaki in the seventh month of 1654, it was not only Chinese expatriates who came out to greet them.⁵⁵ In the months after Yin-yüan's acceptance letter had arrived, word passed throughout the Japanese Zen Buddhist world that the prominent Chinese master was coming. Several factors contributed to the enthusiasm with which he was welcomed. First, the Japanese had traditionally looked to China as the source of renewal for Buddhist teaching and practice, much as the Chinese Buddhists had looked to India and Central Asia. Like other forms of Buddhism in earlier periods, Zen was transmitted to Japan by Japanese monks who visited China and studied under Chinese masters and by Chinese monks who came to Japan in the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. However, during nearly four hundred years prior to the Edo period, contact with Chinese Buddhism had been severely limited, and it was only in the mid-seventeenth century that renewed contact became practical. Several Japanese monks expressed a desire to travel to China to study there as a means of renewing Buddhism in their own country, but national

Hirakubo includes an excerpt of the letter, translated into Japanese in *op.cit.*, pp. 82-83. Tsuji Zennosuke includes a similar section, also in Japanese, but he seems to have been using an alternative source, *op.cit.*, pp. 320-321.

⁵⁵ Hirakubo gives a quotation from Yin-yüan's *nempû* which I have been unable to find in the original. The passage suggests that thousands came to hear Yin-yüan preach at the official ceremony when he assumed the position as abbot held only twelve days after he arrived. Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, p. 92. The *nempû* does list numerous Japanese officials and other prominent individuals who came to pay their respects during his time in Nagasaki, *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, pp. 5198-5219. According to the account given by Kyorei Ryôkaku 虚極了廊, seventy Japanese monks joined the twenty Chinese monks in Yin-yüan's group for his first winter retreat held three months after his arrival. For more information on Kyorei's letter, see below, pp. 96-100.

isolation laws made that impossible. The arrival of Chinese masters like Tao-che had whetted the Japanese interest, but Yin-yüan represented the first Chinese master of high reputation to come to Japan. Many Japanese Buddhists were eager to see first hand what his Zen style would be like. Of course, the changes that had occurred in Chinese Buddhism, especially in Zen, during the intervening centuries were to be a shock for many, but that will be addressed later.

As is well known, in the early decades of the Edo period, Buddhism faced serious internal problems, including corruption and decadence among the clergy; Zen was no exception in this regard. Not only had its temples lost their former influence on social affairs, but monastic practice had become routinized and lifeless. However, there were some talented Zen masters of the period, who like Buddhist masters from other schools, decried the sorry state of their own sect and called for reform. In both Rinzai and Sôtô temples, reform movements began to take shape in the seventeenth century which would culminate later with such masters as Manzan 叢山, Menzan 面山, and Hakuin 白隠.⁵⁶ One such movement had taken root at Myôshin-ji, one of the leading Rinzai temples of the day. Monks within that movement looked to Yin-yüan as a possible resource in their plans to revive Rinzai Zen at Myôshin-ji.

Monks favoring reform at Myôshin-ji disagreed about the best means to revive the sect and had split into factions. One faction favored a strict interpretation of the monastic rule and the other a less literal interpretation, stressing the spirit rather than the letter of the law.⁵⁷ The leaders of the former faction were Isshi Monju 一絲文守 (1608-1646) and Ungo Kiyô 雲居希膺 (1582-1659).⁵⁸ The faction also included such men as Ryôkei Shôsen 龍溪性潜

⁵⁶ Dumoulin briefly reviews the reform-minded monks who preceded Hakuin, although he says that no real reforms took place under their guidance. He also describes the work of the Sôtô masters Manzan and Menzan. *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2 Japan*, pp. 309-340.

⁵⁷ The standard history of Myôshin-ji, *Myôshinjiishi* by Kawakami Kozan, explains the positions taken by the participants in this dispute and suggests that Yin-yüan became a party to it because of his strong emphasis on Jikai Zen 持戒禪 (maintain the precepts Zen); see pp. 453-454. See also Ogisu Jundô, "Ingen zenji to Obakusan", pp. 17-18, and Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 104.

⁵⁸ Isshi Monju (also read Bunshu) originally studied under Takuan Sôhō 澤庵宗彭 (1573-

(1602-1670), Tokuô Myôkô 徳翁良高 (1611-1681), and Jikuin Somon 竺印祖門 (1610-1677) who played major roles in bringing Yin-yüan to Kyoto and in the establishment of Ôbaku-san Mampuku-ji.⁵⁹ Ryôkei had been abbot at the Myôshin-ji branch temple Ryôan-ji, and then served twice as abbot of Myôshin-ji, first in 1651 and then again for a short time in 1654. It was in his capacity as abbot the second time that he extended an invitation for Yin-yüan to visit Myôshin-ji. He and his supporters had in mind installing the Chinese master as abbot. Although none of these monks had ever met Yin-yüan, they were familiar with his teaching through his recorded sayings that had come to Japan sometime before 1651.

According to the *Obaku geki*, three years before Yin-yüan came to Japan, Tokuô had purchased two volumes of Yin-yüan's writings by chance from a book dealer in Kyoto. He read them and spoke highly of them to Ryôkei and then actually loaned them to him. Ryôkei was equally impressed.⁶⁰ Further information about the circulation of these volumes is not available, but it is likely that other Rinzai monks in the Myôshin-ji line also has some access to them through Tokuô's generosity. When Ryôkei and Tokuô heard that Yin-yüan planned to come to Kôfuku-ji, they were pleased at the prospect of meeting the man himself and began to plan their invitation. Since Yin-yüan took a strict view of the monastic rule throughout his teachings, Ryôkei and the others may have seen in him a new and powerful ally for their cause. However, inviting Yin-yüan to Kyoto did not prove an easy task. They faced formidable opposition from other factions within Myôshin-ji as well as technical difficulties in gaining permission for Yin-yüan (1645), but later went to Myôshin-ji where he practiced under Gudô Tôshoku 愚堂東寔 (1577-1661) and Ungo Kiyô 雲居希膺 (1583-1659). He became Gudô's Dharma heir, but the two disagreed on a number of issues, notably the proper interpretation of the precepts. His early death was a loss in many respects, but may have been a relief to his master who was disappointed in the direction Isshi had taken. Ungo Kiyô studied at Myôshin-ji and received *inka* from his master Itchu Tômoku 一宙東默 (n.d.). He is best known as the restorer of Zuigan-ji in Matsushima and as an advocate of Nembutsu Zen.

⁵⁹ The other faction was led by Gudô Tôshoku, one of the most influential Zen monks of the day. Ultimately, his faction won and became the dominant force at Myôshin-ji. The great 18th century reformer Hakuin came from Gudô's line. More will be said of Gudô and his faction in Chapter 4.

⁶⁰ *Obaku geki*, p. 8b.

to travel. Gudō Tōshoku 愚堂東寔 and his faction effectively blocked any hope of a unanimous welcome at Myōshin-ji. Even getting Yin-yüan to Kyoto was complicated by the lengthy process of petitioning the appropriate authorities, since as a Chinese national, Yin-yüan did not enjoy freedom of movement within Japan.

Yin-yüan's Move from Nagasaki to Kyoto

After arriving in Nagasaki, Yin-yüan took up residence as abbot at Kōfuku-ji where he sought to establish a higher level of Zen practice than had previously been known there. To the extent possible under crowded conditions, he followed the same monastic code and style of practice used at Wan-fu-ssu. In addition to the welcome from Chinese expatriates, Yin-yüan received hundreds of Japanese visitors from all ranks of society, and his assembly included a large number of Japanese monks. Exact numbers are unclear, but the community expanded so rapidly that tight finances and overcrowding became major concerns. In the spring of 1655, the community at Kōfuku-ji managed a much needed expansion of the temple living quarters and meditation halls to relieve the overcrowding; it is not clear how they acquired the funds for this project, but it suggests that the financial constraints of the first months had eased. At about that time, in the early months of 1655, Yin-yüan was invited by a group of Chinese lay believers to come to Sōfuku-ji; there he assumed the post of abbot that his disciple Yeh-lan had originally accepted. From then on, he served the two temples simultaneously, holding a joint summer retreat for the two assemblies that year.

One of the many Japanese monks who came to pay respects and practice under the master was Kyorei Ryōkaku 虛木了廓 (1600-1691) from Zenrin-ji in Hiroshima. Kyorei was from the Myōshin-ji line and a close friend of Tokuō. It was at Tokuō's suggestion that Kyorei made the trip to Nagasaki just a month after Yin-yüan's arrival. Yin-yüan must have been impressed by Kyorei, because he quickly invited him to stay on to help direct the Japanese monks during the first winter retreat. Kyorei's letter to Tokuō written during the retreat gives a

surprisingly candid account of his observations.

There are now about seventy Japanese monks and more than thirty Chinese monks. Yin-yüan opened the winter retreat on the fifteenth day of the tenth month, and the monks will meditate until the fifteenth day of the first month. The rule is being strictly observed. Japanese and Chinese monks are mingled together, but they cannot communicate. Moreover, both the Japanese and the Chinese monks are highly conceited, and there have been occasional incidents. I am troubled as you can well imagine. However, things are generally tranquil now....

This is Master Yin-yüan's first retreat in Japan, and he is quite nervous. He entrusted the Japanese assembly to me, and concerns himself with the harmony of the whole assembly.⁶¹

The letter as a whole is an excellent resource for understanding the impression that Yin-yüan and his Zen style initially made on a sympathetic Japanese observer. In the course of the letter, Kyorei spells out more fully the causes for the tensions he alludes to here. Since he was aware of plans to invite Yin-yüan to Myôshin-ji, he may well have been thinking ahead to the possible consequences of such an undertaking. Kyorei further reports that he had already passed along messages from Tokuô and Ryôkei to Yin-yüan, presumably expressing their desire to invite him to Myôshin-ji in the near future. Kyorei indicates that Yin-yüan seemed amenable to the idea. Kyorei voices his own support for the plan, but expresses doubt that the assembly at Myôshin-ji would ever be able to come to a consensus and agree to it.

The internal problems at Myôshin-ji alluded to in Kyorei's letter proved insurmountable, and Ryôkei and the others never realized their dream of installing Yin-yüan as abbot at Myôshin-ji. Although Ryôkei had extended his invitation to Yin-yüan while he was abbot, he did not remain in the post for more than a few months. Opposition to the invitation may well have played an important role in his decision to withdraw from the post so quickly. His successor was Gudô Tôshuku, the powerful leader of the other faction at Myôshin-ji and Ryôkei's adversary in the reform debate. Gudô bitterly opposed the plan to invite Yin-yüan and fought it as a direct threat to the Myôshin-ji line. He maintained that Myôshin-ji was limited exclusively to the line

⁶¹ Tsuji Zennosuke provides the text of Kyorei's letter in *op.cit.*, pp. 322-325. Yin-yüan's own letters to Fei-yin from this period confirm the makeup of the group. See Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, pp. 99-100.

descending from its founder, Kanzan Egen 關山慧玄 (1277-1360). Gudō argued, therefore, that as an outsider Yin-yüan was not even a potential candidate.⁶² This exclusion of Yin-yüan from Myōshin-ji ultimately led to the establishment of Obaku as an independent sect. Gudō succeeded in blocking Yin-yüan's invitation to Myōshin-ji, but he could not prevent his eventual move to Kyoto.

Faced with the failure of their original plan, Ryōkei and his supporters changed their tactics. They decided instead to invite Yin-yüan to Ryōkei's own temple, Fumon-ji 普門寺 in Settsu,⁶³ and initiated the official procedures necessary to do so. As a Chinese, Yin-yüan would require special permission to leave Nagasaki and take up residence elsewhere in Japan. According to the *Obaku geki*, Jikuin played the primary role in obtaining this permission, although he seems to have been acting on behalf of his superiors, Ryōkei and Tokuō. Jikuin began the process by consulting with the shogunate's governor in Kyoto (*Shoshidai* 所司代), Itakura Shigemune 板倉重宗 (1586-1656).⁶⁴ On Itakura's recommendation and with his financial assistance, Jikuin made his way to Edo and submitted an official petition to the bakufu signed by Ryōkei, Tokuō, and himself.

While in Edo, Jikuin gained the support of two leading bakufu officials, the Great Counselor Sakai Tadakatsu 大老酒井忠勝 (1587-1662) and the Senior Counselor Matsudaira

⁶² Kawakami, *Myōshinjinshi*, p. 453-454; Tamamura Takeji, *Rinzaishūshi*, p. 251; Itō Kokan, *Gudō*, pp. 120-121; Ogisu Jundō, *Myōshinji*, p. 96.

⁶³ Fumon-ji is in Tonda, a small town between Kyoto and Osaka, in the province of Settsu. The temple was founded in 1390. According to Mujaku Dōchū's *Myōshin-ji shi* 妙心寺史, it was a branch temple of Tōfuku-ji for about three hundred years. Other sources indicate that it was actually affiliated with Kenchō-ji in Kamakura. See Takenuki, op.cit., p. 215-216. At the time of the eighth abbot, Chūshitsu Genkatsu 籌室玄勝 (n.d.), it became a branch temple of Ryōan-ji, and so came under the Myōshin-ji line. Ryōkei entered the temple when he was 16, in 1617, and became the ninth resident monk just three years later, at the age of 19, when Chūshitsu died.

⁶⁴ Itakura Shigemune was the oldest son of Katsushige 勝重; both men fought at Sekigahara for Tokugawa Ieyasu. Afterwards, Katsushige was appointed to the position of *shoshidai* of Kyoto in 1601. Shigemune succeeded his father to the office in 1620 and served until 1654. Even after retiring from that post, he continued to use his influence to help Jikuin and Yin-yüan. He visited Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji twice in late 1655, and became his lay disciple, receiving the Dharma name Dokushin Shōku 独真性空. In 1656 he became *daimyō* and was given the domain of Sekiyado (in present day Chiba prefecture), where he died that same year.

Nobutsuna 老中松平信綱 (1596-1662).⁶⁵ When the petition came under consideration by the council, these two men spoke in its favor and eventually secured its approval in the fifth month of 1655.⁶⁶ However, the council was suspicious of Yin-yüan and believed that he might be a Ming spy. It had received repeated requests for military aid from the Ming loyalists, and Yin-yüan was known to have connections with them. In fact, it was the leader of the loyalists, Coxinga (Cheng Ch'eng-kung) himself who had provided Yin-yüan and his entourage passage to Nagasaki. In granting permission for Yin-yüan to visit Fumon-ji, the council remained extremely cautious and severely limited his access to Japanese society. It did not yet grant him permission to stay on in Japan indefinitely, nor did it grant him freedom of movement in the country. While his case remained under consideration, the authorities simply allowed him to move from the confines of Nagasaki to Fumon-ji under conditions amounting to house arrest.

Having gained official permission to invite Yin-yüan to Fumon-ji, Ryôkei, Tokuô and Jikuin drafted an invitation to Yin-yüan, and Jikuin again traveled to Nagasaki to deliver it in person. Initially, Yin-yüan declined the invitation, indicating that at his age he had traveled far enough. Jikuin repeated his requests to the master and enlisted the help of the bakufu administrator in Nagasaki, Kurokawa Masanao 黒川正直 (1602-1680) to intercede for him as well.⁶⁷ Between them, they seem to have persuaded Yin-yüan and he eventually accepted the offer. Yin-yüan left Kôfuku-ji in the eighth month of 1655 with a number of his Chinese disciples and arrived at Fumon-ji about a month later.

⁶⁵ According to the *Obaku geki*, Matsudaira built Ryuge-in 龍華院, Jikuin's subtemple at Myôshin-ji, at this time in order to bolster Jikuin's social status and thereby improve the chances for the petition's approval. As a young and unimportant monk without a temple of his own, Jikuin did not have the prominence necessary to gain the council's trust. See *Obaku geki*, p. 3b.

⁶⁶ Tsuji provides the texts of the letters of instruction sent out to the shogunate's officials in Nagasaki, Osaka, Settsu, and Kyoto regarding this decision, all dated 1655/6/1. See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, pp.329-331.

⁶⁷ Hirakubo suggests that this invitation came as a complete surprise to Yin-yüan. He includes the relevant passage from Yin-yüan's recorded sayings, translated into Japanese, Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, pp. 105-106. I have been unable to identify the passage in the original texts.

Life at Fumon-ji

Under the conditions arranged with the shogunate, Yin-yüan initially lived at Fumon-ji under house arrest. He was not allowed to leave the temple compound for any reason, nor were any visitors allowed entry to see him. Jikuin once again turned to his friend Itakura Shigemune for help. Itakura came personally to meet with Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji and to assess both his character as a monk and his motives for coming to Japan. Itakura had already retired from his post as governor in Kyoto, but used his influence to have the constraints loosened somewhat so that a few visitors could enter.⁶⁸ Unfortunately, permission was delayed and was yet to arrive on 11/4/1655 when Yin-yüan held the opening ceremonies and assumed the post as abbot. Ryôkei, Tokuô, and Itakura were the only dignitaries in attendance.

According to the account in the *Obaku geki*, word spread quickly that a Chinese monk was living at Fumon-ji, and the restrictions that only a few visitors at a time be allowed to enter the temple became meaningless. A group of Shinshû believers, attending services commemorating the anniversary of Shinran's death at a nearby True Pure Land temple, crowded the gates of Fumon-ji, eager for a glimpse of the foreigner. The monks at Fumon-ji were unable to maintain control of the crowd and the situation got out of hand. When word of the incident reached government officials, Jikuin was summoned by Shigemune and asked for an explanation.⁶⁹ Although Shigemune severely reprimanded Jikuin for the episode, he apparently accepted Jikuin's apology, since no steps were taken to impose new restrictions.

In 1656, Yin-yüan expressed his intention of returning to China. He had recently received letters from Wan-fu-ssu requesting that he come home; Yin-yüan had been absent for almost three years, and his disciples in China reminded him of his promise to limit his stay in

⁶⁸ Hirakubo includes the a portion of the text of the letter from the bakufu confirming this provision. The letter was sent to Shigemune and the new governor of Kyoto, Makino Chikashige 牧野親成, dated 1655/11/8, and signed by Sakai Tadakatsu and Matsudaira Nobutsuna among others. See Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 110.

⁶⁹ *Obaku geki*, pp. 4a-5a.

Japan to that time span. In his letter of reply, Yin-yüan explained that he had found it impossible to refuse Ryôkei's hospitality at Fumon-ji, but that they could expect him sometime after the new year, in 1657. For their part, Ryôkei and the other Japanese disciples, who had gone to great lengths to secure Yin-yüan's invitation to Kyoto, wanted to prevent or at least postpone Yin-yüan's return to China. They petitioned the bakufu once more, requesting that Yin-yüan's case be settled immediately and that all the restrictions of house arrest be lifted. This time, the bakufu's response was far more positive, but still retained a modicum of caution. Yin-yüan was granted limited freedom of movement and the rules of isolation were greatly eased according to terms spelled out in an official letter from the bakufu dated 7/26/1656.⁷⁰ The specifics were as follows: 1) Yin-yüan could travel freely within the Kyoto region (including the cities of Kyoto, Nara, Osaka, Sakai and Otsu) for periods of up to ten to twelve days with the escort of Ryôkei, Tokuô or Jikuin, but travel outside of that area would require special permission from government authorities; 2) up to two hundred Japanese monks could practice under his direction at Fumon-ji; and 3) lay people could meet with Yin-yüan at the discretion of Ryôkei and Tokuô, but only believers were to be admitted. However, the request that his leading disciple Mu-an Hsing-t'ao be allowed to join him in Kyoto was rejected.⁷¹

At about this time, relations between Ryôkei and Jikuin deteriorated, culminating in Jikuin's withdrawal of his support for Yin-yüan. According to the *Obaku geki*, the final break with Ryôkei was precipitated by a dispute concerning a purple robe that Ryôkei had procured for Yin-yüan without proper permission.⁷² The deeper cause for Jikuin's alienation from Yin-yüan

⁷⁰ The text of the letter can be found in Tsuji, op.cit., pp. 338-339. There is no way to know how many Japanese monks actually joined Yin-yüan's assembly. From his recorded sayings and other sources we know that many monks from Kyoto, including a number from Myôshin-ji, visited him and some stayed for either summer or winter retreats. Yin-yüan first exercised his new freedom to travel in the autumn of 1656 when he made a tour of Kyoto.

⁷¹ Mu-an actually arrived in Nagasaki in 1655/7, a few months before Yin-yüan left for Fumon-ji. He came at Yin-yüan's invitation, and became the abbot of Fukusai-ji. He did not leave Nagasaki until 1660 when Yin-yüan's relations with the bakufu were completely normalized. He joined Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji and then accompanied him to Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji when it opened.

⁷² *Obaku geki*, pp. 4b-5b. The dispute probably occurred in 1656, because Ryôkei began

seemed to be his growing sense that Yin-yüan preferred Ryôkei, who, with his higher status, was better able to secure for him the trappings of high rank, a purple robe, a large temple, and an audience with the shogun. The scholar Ogisu Jundô suggests that although Jikuin had done more work than anyone else to bring their plans to fruition, Ryôkei and Tokuô took all the credit for the younger man's efforts, hastening a breakdown in relations.⁷³ In any case, Jikuin officially resigned, notifying the bakufu in person that he would no longer be representing Yin-yüan.

After Jikuin's resignation, Ryôkei began to handle personally direct dealings with the bakufu. He was seriously concerned that Yin-yüan would decide to leave Japan, and he took action in the hopes of preventing that possibility. In 1657, he made two trips to Edo in an effort to settle the matter once and for all before the bakufu council. He intended to improve significantly Yin-yüan's circumstances in Japan, and thus dissuade him from returning to China. On his first trip to Edo, Ryôkei failed in his quest for a purple robe for Yin-yüan, but managed to acquire a monthly government stipend of fifteen *koku* of rice (enough to support approximately 100 people) for Fumon-ji. It was becoming clear to Ryôkei that the bakufu would never accept Yin-yüan fully unless the authorities could evaluate his character for themselves. On his second trip he arranged for an official summons calling Yin-yüan to Edo to meet with the council and have an audience with the fourth shogun, Ietsuna at Edo castle. He then returned to Kyoto and had to convince Yin-yüan that the long trip would be worthwhile. In a now-familiar pattern, Yin-yüan was at first disinclined to go, but eventually agreed. He once again wrote to his disciples in China and postponed his return. At this point he did not indicate that he had decided to remain in Japan permanently.

The trip, which took place at the end of 1658, was a great success, and connections established at that time led directly to the founding of Obaku-san. Yin-yüan seems to have making trips to Edo himself in 1657. He definitely petitioned the bakufu to grant Yin-yüan a purple robe in 1657, perhaps in response to Jikuin's criticism. The petition was rejected.

⁷³ Ogisu Jundô, "Ingen to Obaku-san", pp. 16-17.

made a very favorable impression on the young shogun, who was then only eighteen. He also secured the powerful high counselor Sakai Tadakatsu as his ally. Sakai demonstrated his respect for the master by asking Yin-yüan to perform the memorial service for the 33rd anniversary of his father's death while he was in Edo. After returning to Fumon-ji, Yin-yüan continued to exchange letters with Sakai, and through him remained in contact with the shogun.

In 1659, Yin-yüan wrote to Sakai and announced his intention to return to China, in effect asking the shogun for permission to go. Sakai's response, dated 5/3/1659, indicated that Yin-yüan's visit to Edo had changed his standing with the bakufu significantly. The promises made in this letter precipitated Yin-yüan's decision to stay on in Japan permanently. Sakai wrote that he fully understood Yin-yüan's feelings and had tried to convey them to the shogun. Sakai then described the shogun's response, "What Yin-yüan says is truly understandable. His moral character affected me when we met. Moreover, he is old, and there are [dangers] of storms on the long journey [to China]. I will be uneasy unless he remains in this country. Therefore, let him choose some land in the Kyoto area, and I shall grant it to him as temple grounds."⁷⁴ The shogun's promise of land and permission to build a new temple convinced Yin-yüan to stay in Japan. He composed a grateful acceptance to Sakai and a letter of apology to his disciples in China, explaining that he would not be returning to China.⁷⁵

Bakufu permission was essential for building a new temple, since the laws governing Buddhist temples and clergy (*jiin hatto* 寺院法度) strictly forbade any new construction of temples. Land grants were also the exclusive right of government authority, and had to be officially documented with the bakufu's red seal certificate. Official documentation granting ownership of the land followed several years later, but based upon the shogun's offer, Yin-yüan

⁷⁴ Tsuji gives the text in Chinese, *op.cit.*, p. 351. Hirakubo includes a photo of the original document, the Chinese text and a Japanese paraphrase, Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, pp. 124-125.

⁷⁵ Mu-an also wrote a letter to Wan-fu-ssu explaining his perception of the situation. In it he stated quite frankly that he believed that Yin-yüan did not have the freedom to leave. Apparently, both Mu-an and Yin-yüan's other leading disciple Chi-fei Ju-i feared that Yin-yüan was being held against his will. They were not convinced otherwise until after they were reunited with Yin-yüan and spoke with him directly. Hirakubo, *op.cit.*, p. 125.

began searching for an appropriate site immediately. It is not known for certain whether or not Ryōkei had planted the idea for this offer by petitioning for permission to open a new temple for Yin-yūan in earlier negotiations. Some sources suggest that this is a possibility, but offer no concrete evidence to support the contention.

The Foundation of Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji

Yin-yūan chose a plot of land to the south east of Kyoto, in the hills of Yamashiro province known for the excellent tea grown in the region.⁷⁶ The land was situated in the Owada district within the small city of Uji. It belonged to the Konoe family, who were members of the imperial (*kuge*) class. They had controlled the land from the Heian period, and their rights to it had been confirmed by Oda Nobunaga, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and the Tokugawa shogunate. Although it is not at all clear whether or not the Konoe family or the imperial court had any involvement in the choice of land, much was later made of the imperial connection. Emperor Gomizunoo's mother had an imperial retreat on these grounds, and it was said that she voluntarily withdrew in order to express her support for the founding of Mampuku-ji. In any event, when the bakufu exercised its right to transfer the ownership of the land to the temple, the Konoe family was duly compensated for it with a deed to land in Settsu province from the bakufu's holdings. The transfer involved land valued at a total of 1,400 *koku* of rice annually, of which Mampuku-ji received 400 *koku* and the bakufu retained the balance. The official red seal certificate granting the land to Mampuku-ji, dated 7/11/1665, deeded an area of 90,000 *tsubo* of land to the temple and included a yearly stipend of 400 *koku* of rice.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Apparently Yin-yūan had first intended to rebuild Jikishi-an 直指庵, a small temple in northern Saga, to the north and west of Kyoto. Although a Jōdo shinshū temple today, Jikishi-an was then affiliated with Myōshin-ji. Its abbot was Dokushō Shōen 独照性圓 (1617-1694), who had been a disciple of Takuan and later Isshi Monju. He inherited the temple from Isshi when he died in 1646. Dokushō went to Nagasaki while Yin-yūan was still at Kōfuku-ji and became one of his attendants. He later attained enlightenment and received Yin-yūan's *inka* in 1670. The basic problem with using this temple as the site for Yin-yūan's new monastery seems to have been its proximity to Daitoku-ji, another major Zen temple of the time. The idea was dropped due to objections from Daitoku-ji.

⁷⁷ Takenuki, *Nihon no zenshūshi*, pp. 217-218.

Building began in the fifth month of 1661, and the dedication ceremonies were held in the first month of 1663. Yin-yüan and his disciples actually took up residence in the autumn of 1661 in order to oversee the work, long before the opening ceremonies. Construction continued steadily for about eighteen years, with the bulk of it taking place under the guidance of the second abbot, Mu-an.⁷⁸ The monastery received financial support for the project from both government and private sources. The shogun donated 20,000 *ryô* of silver and 450 teak trees, and provided the services of his own administrator of construction, Aoki Shigekane 青木重兼 (1606-1682), and the Akishino 秋篠 carpenter clan.⁷⁹ Sakai Tadakatsu willed the temple 1,000 *ryô* for the construction at his death in 1662.⁸⁰

From the beginning, Yin-yüan intended to model the temple, in the layout of the buildings and grounds and in its administration, on his home temple in China, Huang-po Wan-fu-ssu. He symbolized this by giving the new temple the same mountain and temple names, pronounced in Japanese Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji.⁸¹ In nearly all respects, Mampuku-ji was built as a Ming-style temple. Yin-yüan and his successors commissioned Chinese artisans to carve the images found throughout the temple buildings. He and his fellow monks contributed their skills as calligraphers and painters, and samples of their work could be seen on the temple sign boards and adorning the walls.⁸² Yin-yüan produced his own version of the

⁷⁸ Sasaki Gôzo provides a chart of the original buildings, dates of completion, and where available, provides the names of the donors, in *Mampukuji*, pp. 16-17.

⁷⁹ Aoki Shigekane was at this time the *daimyô* of Kai province, but had previously been assigned to the Settsu region. He met Yin-yüan while he was living at Fumon-ji and already had a long-standing relationship with Yin-yüan and other Ōbaku monks before he received this assignment.

⁸⁰ Takenuki gives a more complete listing of the donations, Takenuki, *op.cit.*, pp. 218-220.

⁸¹ Since the characters are identical in Chinese and Japanese, it became customary to add the characters "old" and "new" to the names to distinguish the two temples. This rubric is unnecessary in translation and has been replaced by transliterating the Chinese and Japanese pronunciations respectively.

⁸² There are a number of descriptive books about Mampuku-ji that give some historical information about the buildings and art. See for example Sasaki Gôzo, *Mampukuji*, Takahashi Ryôwa, *Obakusan Mampukuji*, and Fuji Masaharu and Abe Zenryô, *Mampukuji*.

monastic code for the governance of life and practice at Mampuku-ji to insure that the Ming tradition would survive after his passing. Particularly crucial was the code's explicit stipulation that all future abbots be Chinese.

In 1664, Yin-yüan retired and appointed his Dharma heir Mu-an as his successor at Mampuku-ji. Mu-an had received Yin-yüan's *inka* while still in China in 1650, and came to Japan at Yin-yüan's request in 1655. He joined his master at Fumon-ji in 1660 and from that time on was able to participate in all the plans for building Mampuku-ji. Mu-an's contributions to the establishment and spread of Ōbaku in Japan were considerable. As abbot of Mampuku-ji he directed the construction from 1664 until its completion in 1679. His Dharma heirs alone constitute a significant legacy to the sect's future. They number some forty-three, including many Japanese, and represent a majority of the major lines of transmission within the sect.⁸³ He founded a number of temples throughout Japan, including Zuishō-ji 瑞聖寺, the sect's headquarters in Edo. When he retired in 1680, Mu-an appointed another of Yin-yüan's Dharma heirs, Hui-lin Hsing-chi 慧林性機 (1609-1681; J. Erin Shōki), as his successor.

Hui-lin was old and ailing when he assumed the position of abbot and he served less than one year. His short tenure did not allow him time to make a significant mark on the temple. In due course, Hui-lin recommended Tu-chan Hsing-jung 獨湛性瑩 (1628-1706; J. Dokutan Shōkei) to succeed him. Tu-chan had accompanied Yin-yüan to Nagasaki in 1654 at the age of 27, and remained with him during the years at Fumon-ji. Tu-chan served as abbot for ten years, from 1682 until 1692. He was forced to retire after losing a dispute with Kao-ch'üan Hsing-tung 高泉性潼 (1633-1695; J. Kōsen Shōton), who then succeeded him as abbot.⁸⁴

⁸³ There is some indication that the sheer number of Mu-an's Dharma heirs led others to question his abilities as a master. See Nakamura Shusei, "Mokuan zenji to sono wasō shihōsha", pp. 11-13. In Mu-an's defense, one should bear in mind that he served as abbot for seventeen years and that Yin-yüan entrusted many of his own disciples, especially the Japanese disciples, into the younger man's care.

⁸⁴ The dispute centered on naming one of Ryōkei's disciples as his designated Dharma heir after Ryōkei died in a flood tide in 1570. The situation was complicated by the involvement of Emperor Gomizunoo. For a detailed discussion, see below, pp. 152-157.

Tu-chan was known as "Nembutsu Dokutan", because he advocated a style of *nembutsu* practice more in keeping with Japanese Pure Land sects than with the style of Yin-yüan and the other Obaku masters. Because of this, Obaku scholars regard his years as abbot as a period of decline for the temple.⁸⁵

Kao-ch'üan came to Japan in 1661, sent by the abbot at Wan-fu-ssu, Hui-men Ju-p'ei 慧門如沛 (1615-1664), to convey the good wishes of all monks there on the occasion of Yin-yüan's seventieth birthday. Although Kao-ch'üan came with the intention of escorting Yin-yüan home to China, he, too, remained in Japan and took up residence at Mampuku-ji, becoming one of Yin-yüan's closest assistants in his last years. Kao-ch'üan served as abbot at Mampuku-ji for only four years, but he had a lasting influence on Obaku Zen. He wrote extensively and was highly regarded for the quality of his prose. He was often asked to write introductions and postscripts for editions of recorded sayings by other monks, and Yin-yüan had him compose a number of pieces. His writings include a reworking of Yin-yüan's monastic code into its present form, the *Obaku shingi*, a series of biographies of the Chinese Obaku masters who had come to Japan, and even a biography of famous Japanese monks.⁸⁶

Kao-ch'üan was the last of the truly talented masters to come over from China. After his death, Chinese monks continued to serve as abbot for several generations, but they left behind little more than their names. It gradually became more difficult to find qualified Chinese candidates, and after the death of the twenty-first abbot in 1784, all of the abbots have been Japanese. Even in the first few decades of Obaku's development in Japan, one must turn to the Japanese Obaku masters like Ryōkei, Tetsugen, and Chōon to understand its vitality and integration into the world of Japanese Buddhism.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Washio, *op.cit.*, p. 102.

⁸⁶ *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten* gives a complete listing of his writings at the end of his biography, Otsuki, p. 117.

⁸⁷ Using figures drawn from the *Obakushū kanroku*, the official sectarian lineage tree, Otsuki provides some indication of Obaku's growth and vitality in Japan: The 33rd generation, Yin-yüan's disciples, numbered 10; the 34th numbered 123, the 35th 564, the 36th 962, and the 37th 1014. The

37th generation was the largest in the sect's history, and dates approximately one hundred years after the founding, "Obakushû" , p. 40.

Chapter Three

The Special Characteristics of Obaku Zen

Obaku scholars often introduce their comments on the distinctive aspects of Obaku practice with the observation that Obaku Zen has much in common with Rinzai Zen. The reason for this is obvious; as a line descending from Lin-ch'i I-hsuan 臨濟義玄 (d. 866; J. Rinzai Gigen), the Obaku sect inherited much the same tradition as Japanese Rinzai which had been imported during the Sung and Yüan dynasties. Most of the differences between the two schools can be attributed to changes that occurred in Zen practice and thought in China after the Yüan dynasty, when contact between the Chinese and Japanese Zen communities diminished. Chinese and Japanese Rinzai continued to develop separately, in ways appropriate to their respective cultural and historical contexts. For all that, what they shared remains more important than their differences.

As a tradition of Zen Buddhism, the Obaku sect makes meditation the central feature of its practice. Obaku may find a different balance between the elements of monastic practice—meditation, ritual observance, and scholarly pursuit—than do the other Zen schools, but it shares with them the common basis of meditation as its primary concern. Moreover, Obaku practitioners describe their purpose in familiar Zen terms, "seeing one's own nature and becoming a Buddha" (*kenshō jōbutsu* 見性成佛). Like the other Zen lineages, Obaku makes use of such images as direct transmission of the Dharma from mind to mind, a special transmission outside of the written scriptures (*kyōge betsuden* 教外別伝), to describe itself. For this reason, practice of Obaku Zen takes on the usual Zen format of masters directing the progress of a group of disciples, with special emphasis on transmission from master to disciple. As the descendants of Lin-ch'i, Obaku masters use the same teaching methods that one associates with Rinzai practice. Glancing through their biographies or recorded sayings, one finds the

frequent use of shouts and slaps in encounters between master and student. Masters give their disciples *kôan* 公案 to focus their meditation, engage in *mondô* 問答 to evaluate their progress, and confer *inka* 印可 upon them to certify their enlightenment experience. Obaku masters make use of the same Zen corpus for their instructions as do other Zen masters, especially the *Rinzai roku* 臨濟錄, *Hekigan roku* 碧巖錄, *Mumonkan* 無門関, *Lankavatara Sutra* (楞伽經; J. Ryôga-kyô), etc.¹ The teachings of individual Obaku masters are recorded in the Zen genre of recorded sayings (*goroku* 語録) and Dharma talks (*hōgo* 法語), forming a sub-corpus specific to Obaku.²

Similarities do not arise exclusively from the common historical heritage shared by Obaku and Rinzai Zen. Once the Obaku line had been established in Japan and contact was thus re-established between Chinese and Japanese Rinzai styles, a certain degree of mutual influence became inevitable. Based on the pattern of Japanese adoption and adaptation of earlier influxes of Chinese Buddhism, one would expect to find a gradual process of enculturation of Obaku Zen into the existing world of Japanese Zen, a Japanization of it, as it were. To some extent this has occurred. Obaku scholars today recognize the influence of Hakuin's Zen style as well as that of other Japanese Rinzai and Sôtô masters on their sect. As things stand now, Obaku monks generally get their academic training at Rinzai universities,

¹According to Hayashi Bunshō, Yin-yüan used the *Rinzai roku* as the basis for his own recorded sayings. Hayashi does not provide examples to illustrate his point, but one finds evidence to support his contention with a quick review of the index to the *Ingen zenshū*. Under Lin-ch'i's name alone, there are approximately two dozen direct references to Lin-ch'i's words. A true evaluation of Hayashi's claim would require a study of Yin-yüan's recorded sayings. This is far beyond the scope of this dissertation. Interestingly, Hayashi quotes Yanagida Seizan to the effect that Yin-yüan's direct use of the *Rinzai roku* itself, rather than portions found in the *Hekigan roku*, had a direct influence on Japanese Rinzai. Heretofore, the *Hekigan roku* had been the formative text in Japanese Rinzai, but influenced by Yin-yüan, the Japanese rediscovered the original text and came to study the *Rinzai roku* directly. Hayashi, "Obaku wo kataru", pp. 5 and 8.

² Woodblock editions of the recorded sayings of most of the prominent Obaku masters were published at Mampuku-ji, and copies are preserved in the library there, where they are readily available to sectarian scholars. With the exception of a modern edition of Yin-yüan's complete works (Hirakubo, ed., *Ingen zenshū*), no modern editions of the recorded sayings of the other Chinese Obaku masters have appeared. Plans are currently underway to rectify the situation, beginning with an edition of Mu-an's complete works. See Hirakubo, "Mokuan zenshū no henshū ni tsuite", pp. 1-2.

especially Hanazono University in Kyoto, thus re-enforcing the common bonds.

The current generation of Obaku scholars' appear to wish to minimize the differences between Obaku and Rinzai. This makes it somewhat difficult to evaluate the common elements and differences observable in the mid-seventeenth century or to trace the actual pattern of historical change within Obaku practice. However, there is a wealth of textual evidence upon which to begin the process. This evidence is basically of two types: internal Obaku texts and external texts, predominantly of a critical nature, reflecting Japanese reactions against Yin-yüan and his school. A full evaluation of all this textual material would require a detailed study far beyond the scope of this dissertation. This chapter will merely suggest the general contours of the issues involved. It will focus primarily on internal Obaku sources, allowing Obaku's image of itself to emerge whenever possible. However, where appropriate, external documents will be used to complete the picture.

Most treatments of Obaku's special characteristics begin with a discussion of its combination of Zen and Pure Land practices. Although such a combination certainly sets Obaku apart and has lead to its identification in the popular mind as "Nembutsu Zen", this is not the dominant theme found in the early writings of members of the sect. We will begin, therefore, with the definition of Obaku Zen practice as seen in the work of the first generation of Chinese monks.

Yin-yüan seems to have recognized the inevitability of enculturation and sought to preserve the distinctly Chinese qualities of his Dharma style. To this end, toward the end of his life, he wrote instructions to guide his disciples after his passing, particularly for the sake of the generations who would come after his immediate heirs were themselves gone. These instructions form the basis of the Obaku monastic code, known as the *Obaku shingi* 黄檗清規³. Since this text became the guiding blueprint for the newly established sect, any

³The *Obaku shingi* is included in the Taishō edition of the Tripitaka, volume 82, no. 2606, pp. 766-785. Original copies of the first woodblock editions as well as the woodblocks themselves are still preserved at Mampuku-ji. I have preferred using the woodblock edition because it is much easier to

consideration of unique characteristics should begin with a brief review of it. Through this text, the first generation of Chinese masters, especially the founder Yin-yüan, preserved the characteristics that set Obaku apart from other Zen schools of the time.

The *Obaku shingi*

The *Obaku shingi* was first published in 1673, the year of Yin-yüan's death. Although commonly attributed to Yin-yüan, the actual history of the text is somewhat more complicated. As the text itself indicates, it was revised by Mu-an and compiled by Kao-ch'üan Hsing-tun. In actual fact, the bulk of the text was written by Kao-ch'üan, but tradition maintains that he was following Yin-yüan's own instructions and recorded matters previously determined by the master. Yin-yüan did directly author portions of the text, including the *Yoshokugo* 予囑語, a set of instructions that he had written as an independent document in 1671, when he was 80 years old. This document, consisting of an introduction and ten articles, is included in the *Obaku shingi* as an appendix under the same title. Other portions of the text directly attributed to Yin-yüan include the preface, dated 1672, and the postscript.⁴

The *Obaku shingi* belongs to the genre of monastic codes (*shingi* 清規, literally "pure regulations") written specifically for Zen monasteries. Clearly, a review of the history of Zen codes is beyond the scope of this dissertation, particularly since that history is currently a topic of scholarly debate.⁵ However, a few words about the genre and its history are helpful in understanding the *Obaku shingi*. In general, although Zen monastic codes detail such elements as daily manual labor, which we associate specifically with Zen monastic practice, they do not read than the Taishō. It includes *kambun* markings, indicating the sect's own manner for reading the text. I have followed these in all translations included here. The Taishō version does not include all of these *kambun* markings, but otherwise the texts appear identical.

⁴ According to Hirakubo, even the preface was ghost written by Kao-ch'üan under Yin-yüan's direct supervision, *Ingen*, p. 167.

⁵ Theodore Griffith Foulk, *The "Ch'an School" and its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition*, pp. 1-25.

diverge radically from the more general Buddhist monastic codes of the Vinaya tradition. In fact, they build upon that tradition, taking for granted its existence and enduring importance. For example, Zen monks are ordained using the same sets of precepts (e.g. the ten precepts for novices and the 250 for monks) as found in the Vinaya texts.

Tradition has it that the T'ang master Pai-chang Huai-hai 百丈懷海 (720-814; J. Hyakujō Ekai) wrote the first Zen code, the *Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* 百丈清規 (J. Hyakujō shingi), and thus established the institutional independence of the Zen school in China. Although it now seems likely that no such document ever existed⁶, most of the codes compiled from the Sung dynasty on refer to it as their basis. The oldest extant example of the genre dates from the Sung dynasty, the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* 禪苑清規 (J. Zen'on shingi), compiled in 1103.⁷ This monastic code became the basis for numerous later editions in China and was transmitted to Japan sometime around 1200. It was especially important for Eisai 榮西 (1141-1215) in his efforts to establish Rinzai temples according to the tradition he had learned in China.

The *Obaku shingi* itself is based more closely on a Yüan dynasty text, the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* 敕修百丈清規 (J. Chokushu Hyakujō shingi)⁸, compiled between 1336 and 1343. Although the title suggests that it is based upon Pai-chang's code, it was actually based on various Sung dynasty texts, and is not very different in scope from the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei*. As the title indicates, it was compiled under imperial auspices and was intended as a guide for all Ch'an temples of the day. By the Yüan dynasty, Buddhist temples had come under closer governmental supervision, and this is reflected in the first and third sections, which express gratitude and loyalty to the imperial court and obligations of service to the state.

The *Obaku shingi* represents a subcategory in the genre of Zen monastic codes, since it was designed to govern the conduct of an individual temple rather than to serve as a

⁶ For a discussion of Pai-chang's code, see Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, pp. 136-138.

⁷ For a brief description of the contents, see Collcutt, *op.cit.*, pp. 141-145. See also Kagamishima, *Yakuchū Zen'en shingi*.

⁸ T. 48, no. 2025.

more general guideline, such as the *Ch'an-yüan ch'ing-kuei* and the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*. It was quite common practice for founders or restorers of Zen temples to write such specialized codes, designed to meet the specific needs of their assembly. The *Obaku shingi* was designed to regulate life at the head monastery, Mampuku-ji, and was later applied to its branch temples, with appropriate modifications. The monastic life described in the code sounds very much like life in any Zen monastery: The monks rise early and begin the day with the morning services before dawn. Then they meditate until breakfast is served at about sunrise (literally, when the cook can see his hand). Meals are simple affairs with rice and vegetables as the staples; the monks eat communally and in silence. (The Chinese style of food known in Japan as *Fucha ryōri* 布茶料理 for which Obaku is famous is not the norm for the monks themselves except on special occasions or when a benefactor sponsors the meal.) After the first meal, they return to the meditation hall until lunch is served at noon. During the day each monk engages in some form of manual labor, cutting grass, raking the grounds, begging in the city, and so on. In the late afternoon, they gather again for the evening service. They then have another session of meditation; at this point, the students have the opportunity to meet with their master until it is time to retire at nine pm.⁹

The main body of the *Obaku shingi* has ten chapters, loosely patterned after the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*, but much shorter and more specific than the latter.¹⁰ The

⁹ For a detailed description of the daily routine at Mampuku-ji for the monks in training, see Akamatsu Shinmyō, "Obakushū kōzō", pp. 40-46.

¹⁰ The *Ch'ih-hsiu pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* consists of four (or sometimes eight) fascicles, divided into nine sections. It is considerably longer than the *Obaku shingi*, which consists of only one fascicle. Since it provides a general monastic rule for use in various Zen monasteries throughout Yüan China, it is much less specific in its regulations than a text composed for an individual monastery, like the *Obaku shingi*. For example, in the fourth section, it indicates that memorials should be celebrated honoring the monastery's founder and the abbot's Dharma master, mentioned by title only, along with specific memorials for Bodhidharma and Pai-chang. The *Obaku shingi* makes explicit reference to Yin-yüan as founder, along with references to Bodhidharma, Pai-chang, and Lin-ch'i in its comparable third section. The correspondence between sections of the two documents is not exact. The first four sections of the *Obaku shingi* correspond in title and subject matter with the first, third, fourth and fifth sections respectively of the *Ch'ih-hsiu pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*. After that, although they cover similar matters, the parallels break down.

following is a section by section synopsis of the *Obaku shingi*:

Section 1, *Shukuri* 祝釐, gives instructions for offering prayers and blessings to the ruler and high officials for their protection of the Buddha's Dharma.

Section 2, *Hôhon* 報本, compares the debt of gratitude owed to the Buddhas with that owed to one's parents, and spells out the prayers of thanksgiving used to commemorate events from the life of the historical Buddha, his nativity, realization of the Buddhist path, and final entry in Nirvana, as well as the nativity of two bodhisattvas, Avalokitesvara and Maitreya.¹¹

Section 3, *Sonso* 尊祖, provides memorial verses for Bodhidharma, Pai-chang, Lin-ch'i and several special memorials for Yin-yüan as founder of the temple.

Section 4, *Jûji* 住持, determines the daily responsibilities of the abbot as the guardian of the Dharma.

Section 5, *Bongyô* 梵行, stresses the importance of keeping the precepts, that is, living by the "pure practice" (bongyô), lest the monks lose their primary purpose. This section includes the long, detailed instructions for the Obaku service of conferring the precepts on novices and advanced monks, known as the *Sandan kaie* 三壇戒会, literally the three platform ceremony for conferring the precepts.

Section 6, *Fuju* 諷誦, describes the order of the morning and evening services, determining the sutras and *dharani* included, the details for musical accompaniment and movements of the monks. Both the content and the style of these services show some Pure Land influences. Not only are Pure Land sutras included among the sutras for daily recitation, along with the *Heart sutra*, but the monks are instructed to chant the *nembutsu* at these services as they enter and depart the hall. The section also provides instructions for other less regular services such as the small *segaki* 施餓鬼 (ceremony for feeding hungry ghosts usually

¹¹ According to Oishi Morio, the inclusion of Avalokitesvara and Maitreya reflect the popularity of these two bodhisattvas in China; by the Ming period, they were included in the ritual practice at most temples, "Obaku shingi no kenkyû", p. 146.

held at Urabon-e), known as the *shōsejiki* 小施食¹², releasing live animals, making offerings on behalf of petitioners, chanting for the dead, etc.

Section 7, *Setsujo* 節序, gives a listing of seasonal events and celebrations month by month, with detailed instructions following. These include the summer and winter retreats, the celebratory rituals and memorials listed in sections 2 and 3, and other major events such as Obon. Some of these events are unique to Obaku in Japan, although they may have been common in Ming China; for example, the *Kanrinbō* 寒林榜, a ceremony conducted for the sake of the departed, is held in the temple cemetery on the 15th day of the 7th month.

Section 8, *Raihō* 禮法, describes the behavior appropriate to the temple grounds. These include instructions for entering and leaving the hall, behavior inside the hall, special instructions for the first and fifteenth days of each month, rules pertaining to the bath, the proper manner for admitting novices, proper sitting order within the dining hall, and a listing of temple offices. There are separate rules governing the sick room (*Shōgyōdō* 省行堂) and procedures for the head of the novices to lecture in the abbots stead (*Rissō hinpotsu* 立僧乘拂). Inserted into this section is a text written by Mi-yun Yüan-wu, one of Yin-yüan's predecessors at Wan-fu-ssu, advocating strict adherence to the precepts.

Section 9, *Fushin* 普請, explains the meaning of manual labor in the monastery.

Section 10, *Senge* 遷化, describes matters related to the death of a monk.

There are, in addition to these chapters, several appendices attached at the end, including a series of illustrations of Obaku musical instruments, religious implements, signboards, etc. Many of these articles differ significantly from their Japanese counterparts, in common usage at the beginning of the Tokugawa period. The most important of the appendices is Yin-yüan's *Yoshiyokugo* 予囑語, which explicitly sets out Yin-yüan's wishes for the temple, and sets in action a system that preserved the Chinese quality of Obaku practice

¹² Normally *segaki* is associated with Urabon-e festivities, and Obaku temples are famous even today for their Chinese version of this service held at several of their larger temples. However, Yin-yüan made provision for a shorter version of the service, to be held at the abbot's discretion.

that exists even today.

The *Yoshiyokugo* consists of ten articles, many of them general in nature. In them, Yin-yüan stresses such themes as mutual cooperation, continued preservation of the Dharma style, and the importance of strict observance of the precepts. However, most importantly, Yin-yüan gives detailed instructions for the selection of future generations of abbots.¹³

Select the third abbot and so on from among my Dharma heirs according to their rank. After they have served in turn, go on to the next generation of disciples [literally, Dharma grandchildren]. By all means, select virtuous monks already deserving of esteem who will successfully promote the Dharma style....

Historically, when one looks at the Dharma heirs of the succession of founders who came over from China in the past, after three or four generations, the line ends and the founder's place is left vacant. Previously, the lay believer Sakai [Tadakatsu] suggested an idea to defend our sect [from this]. He said that from now on, when there is no one [qualified] at the main temple, we should invite someone to come from China, so that the Dharma line will never be cut. This suggestion is quite appropriate. Future generations should act accordingly.¹⁴

Yin-yüan's instructions in this regard were followed, and Mampuku-ji continued to have Chinese abbots for as long as it was possible to find qualified Chinese monks to come to Japan. For over a century, until the last Chinese abbot died in 1784, Mampuku-ji had a flow of new Chinese monks who maintained the Chinese cultural influence on the sect. This allowed for a remarkable continuity of a number of Chinese elements in the both the Dharma style and everyday life at the temple that might otherwise have been lost in the face of the dominant Japanese cultural and religious environment. Details pertaining to purely cultural elements such as language, clothing, food, etc. will be discussed later, but one finds here the basis for their preservation. Yin-yüan thus preserved what is in general terms the most outstanding characteristic of Obaku Zen, its Chineseness.

Recognizing that the *Obaku shingi* is fundamentally similar to other Zen codes, one

¹³ When Yin-yüan wrote this document in 1671, he had already named Mu-an as his successor and been living in retirement for seven years. By means of this final testament, he extended his control over the choice of future abbots for several generations.

¹⁴ T. 82, pp. 780-781.

can still find in it elements indicating Ōbaku's unique characteristics vis-a-vis Japanese Rinzai. First, in the daily services, one sees Pure Land influences foreign to Japanese Zen, as well as esoteric influences. Though equally strong, inclusion of esoteric practices caused less of a sensation among Japanese observers. Next, in the religious calendar there are several ceremonies, like the *Sandan kaie* and the *segaki*, unknown or rare in Japanese Zen temples. One can also identify a number of tendencies not unique to Ōbaku Zen, but nonetheless characteristic of it in the relative emphasis they receive. Those worthy of mention include the emphasis on the sutras and academic pursuits, encouragement for monks to work among the common people, and the strict observance of the precepts. None of these elements would have set Ōbaku Zen apart in Ming China, but taken as a whole, they were sufficiently distinctive for Ōbaku to become a separate Zen school in the Japanese context.

Before turning to look at these characteristics in more detail, a brief note on the influence that the *Ōbaku shingi* had on Japanese monastic codes of the time is in order. Because the Ōbaku line was transplanted from China to Japan, the school faced unique problems inherent in trans-cultural situations. I have therefore preferred to present the *shingi* as a means of preserving the Chinese character of the school within the Japanese context. However, when one is working in a single cultural framework, monastic codes are more often indicative of reform movements. As such, they may set one monastery or movement within a sect apart from other elements in the same sect. During the period following Ōbaku's transmission to Japan, in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, we find monastic codes playing just such roles. Several monks from both the Rinzai and Sôtô sects became interested in writing new monastic codes or republishing and studying old codes in order to restore discipline and revitalize the tradition.¹⁵ This renewed interest in monastic codes was one facet of the

¹⁵ For example, within the Sôtô school, an edition of the *Eihei shingi* 永平清規 (T. vol. 32, no. 2584), written in the thirteenth century by Dôgen, was first published in 1667; Gesshû Sôko 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696) wrote and published his own code for Daijô-ji 大乘寺, the *Undô jôki* 雲堂常規, in 1674; in 1679, he produced the first published edition of the *Keizan shingi* 瑩山清規 (T. vol. 82, no. 2589), compiled by Keizan Jôkin 瑩山紹瑾 (1268-1325) in the 14th century; Gesshû's disciple Manzan

growing reform movements characteristic of the period. Not only can the Obaku code be seen as a part of this general trend, it also contributed directly and indirectly to the work of several monks. For example, two Sôtô monks, Gesshû Sôko 月舟宗琳 and his disciple Manzan Dôhaku 叡山道白, deeply influenced by Obaku masters, wrote monastic codes for their own Sôtô temple Daijô-ji 大乘寺, the *Undo jôki* 雲堂常規 and the *Shôjurin shingi* 栴樹林清規 respectively, drawing directly from the *Obaku shingi* in addition to relying on existing Sôtô codes. The later Sôtô reformer Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769) criticized Gesshû and Manzan for this, and sought to restore a purely Sôtô code, devoid of Obaku accretions. In a similar manner, Mujaku Dôchû used his work with historical monastic codes as a means to purify Japanese Rinzai from any Obaku influences.

The Combined Practice of Zen and Pure Land

Obaku Zen has unmistakable elements of Pure Land influence in its practice, and this was obvious from the very beginning to the Japanese monks who encountered Obaku masters. Kyorei, the Myôshin-ji line monk who wrote the earliest report on Obaku practice in Japan, noted, "if one looks closely, the outer form looks like Jôdo-shû, but the inner looks like Zen-shû."¹⁶ Kyorei was giving a kind and sensitive interpretation of what he had seen, but not all observers would be so generous. The combined practice of Zen and Pure Land caused Obaku Zen considerable trouble in Japan, and indeed still does so. Such a combination was quite foreign and even abhorrent to many Japanese Zen monks, reacting as they naturally would from their own knowledge and experience of Japanese Pure Land. Combined practice Dôhaku 叡山道白 (1636-1715) republished the *Keizan shingi* in 1682 and produced his own study of monastic codes, the *Shôjurin shingi* 栴樹林清規 between 1680 and 1691. In the Rinzai school, Mujaku Dôchû wrote codes for individual temples and produced his own major commentary on the *Ch'ih-hsiu pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*, known as the *Chokushû Hyakujô shingi sae* or the *Hyakujô shingi sakei* 敕修百丈清規佐範, in 1718.

¹⁶ See Tsuji Zennosuke, op.cit., p. 325 for the original Japanese of Kyorei's letter written from Kôfuku-ji in 1655. See below p. 97-98 for a complete English translation.

would have appeared quite different to a Chinese monk than to his Japanese counterpart due to the historical and cultural differences in the Buddhism practiced in their respective countries. To the Japanese, Zen and Pure Land appeared as complete opposites, one totally self-reliant and the other totally dependent on the Buddha Amida. The Chinese had a long history of combined practice, and its absence, in Ming Buddhism in particular, would have seemed far stranger to them.

To understand Obaku's use of Pure Land teachings, one must first understand the history of combined practice in China and the methods for reconciling apparently contradictory practices. On the other hand, to comprehend the Japanese reaction, one must also bear in mind the history of Zen and Pure Land in Japan before the arrival of Obaku masters. A great deal of scholarly work has been done on these topics and related issues, and it would be redundant to repeat those efforts here.¹⁷ Therefore what follows is a brief review of the salient points of the history and theory behind joint practice, leading up to a detailed description of Obaku's use of Pure Land teachings.

A history of combined practice ought properly to include two different aspects of the tradition, those approaches taken to reconcile practice from the Zen side and those from the Pure Land side. Few individuals transcended these traditional divisions so thoroughly as to allocate equal status to the two types of practice. Most Buddhists who advocated dual practice were either Zen masters who in some way incorporated Pure Land teachings into their Zen

¹⁷ Articles and books related to the subject are too numerous to allow for a complete listing here. The most prolific writer on the subject is Fujiyoshi Jikai. In addition to numerous articles, his work includes two books, *Zen to Jōdokyō*, which includes a sampling of his writings found elsewhere, and *Zen to nembutsu, Sono gendaiteki igi*, a compendium of scholarly articles which he edited. The following are examples of other scholars' works representing a variety of approaches to the issue. Historical reviews include: David Chappell, "From Dispute To Dual Cultivation: Pure Land Responses to Ch'an Critics"; Kōchi Eigaku, "Chūgoku ni okeru zenjō kankei"; Hirada Hiramichi, "Chūsei zenshū to nembutsu zen"; Chun-fang Yu, *The Renewal of Buddhism in China*, especially pp. 29-63. Theoretical articles include Hattori Eijun, "Zenjō yūgō shisō ni okeru jōdo no kaimei"; D.T. Suzuki, "Zen and Jōdo, Two Types of Buddhist Experience"; Heng-ching Shih, "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism". For a more psychological approach, D.T. Suzuki, "The Koan Exercise, Part II", in *Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series)*, pp. 146-199; and Onda Akira, "Zen to nembutsu no shinrigakuteki hikaku kōsatsu", pp. 1-7.

practice or Pure Land masters who advocated the use of Zen meditation in addition to the central practice of the *nembutsu*. This review will stress the former approach, that is from the Zen perspective, as the more relevant to Obaku Zen. It is actually possible to extend the history of joint practice back to the fourth century before one can properly speak of either the Zen or the Pure Land school in any meaningful sense.¹⁸ However, the early material is sparse and uninformative for the present purposes.

In discussing the attitude of Zen toward Pure Land teachings, it is customary to begin with the teachings of Hui-neng 慧能 (638-713), the sixth patriarch of Zen, found in *The Platform Sutra*. Hui-neng's fundamental criticism of Pure Land belief was that it sought for salvation outside of the self instead of turning inward to examine the self. Once when Hui-neng was asked by a visitor to comment on rebirth in the Pure Land, he replied,

At Sravasti the World-honored One preached of the Western Land in order to convert the people, and it is clearly stated in the sutra, '[The Western Land] is not far.' It was only for the sake of people of inferior capacity that the Buddha spoke of farness; to speak of nearness is only for those of superior attainments.... The deluded person concentrates on Buddha and wishes to be born in the other land; the awakened person makes pure his own mind. If only the mind has no impurity, the Western Land is not far. If the mind gives rise to impurities, even though you invoke the Buddha and seek to be reborn [in the West], it will be difficult to reach.¹⁹

Starting with this text, the classical Zen tradition took the basic attitude that while Pure Land practice may be appropriate for those of lesser capacities, in fact, it has little real value in moving an individual along on the path to enlightenment. Any teaching that focused one's attention outward was actually guiding one in the wrong direction.

Before Hui-neng's time, there is some evidence that this attitude had not yet become firmly established. The fourth patriarch Tao-hsin 道信 (580-651; J. Dôshin) was the earliest Zen master to describe something resembling the practice of the *nembutsu* in his writings.

¹⁸ For example, see Kôchi Eigaku, op.cit., p. 2.

¹⁹ Translation taken from Philip Yampolsky, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*, pp. 156-157.

He identified the mental state resulting from that practice with the state of no-thought attained through Zen meditation.²⁰ The fifth patriarch Hung-jen 弘忍 (601-674; J. Gunin) did not follow Tao-hsin's lead and develop a Zen practice based on this similarity, but later descendents in his line did. Two generations later, if one follows the line through Chih-hsien 智詵 (609-702; J. Chisen) and Ch'u-chi 處寂 (648-734; J. Shojaku) rather than the sixth patriarch, we come to a Korean master named Musang 無相 (684-762; J. Musô). Although a Zen master, Musang actually taught a form of *nembutsu* that used gradual modulations in the voice as a device to induce meditative states.²¹

Examples like this in the early tradition are sporadic and do not by any means represent the central thrust of the tradition at that time. Nor do these individual masters constitute anything like a movement. The closest thing to a movement advocating dual practice of Zen and Pure Land to be found in the classical period are two successive masters from the Ox-head school, Fa-chih 法持 (635-702; J. Hôji) and his disciple Chih-wei 智威 (646-722; J. Chii). Their line soon died out, and after that one finds little evidence of dual practice by Zen masters through the T'ang (618-907) and early Sung (960-1279) period. In any event, one may say that these early masters were not advocating Pure Land practice in the true sense, but rather that they made use of the *nembutsu* as a meditative tool.²²

A self-conscious movement advocating dual practice did not really emerge until

²⁰ See Kôchi, op.cit., p. 2 for an explanation of Tao-hsin's position.

²¹ Wusang's method is described by Kôchi, op.cit., p. 3, and Chun-fang Yu, op.cit., p. 51.

²² Hirano Sôjô expresses a very interesting theory suggesting that even the early Zen masters may have actually practiced *nembutsu* of a more traditional type, but that the evidence for this was removed by later generations of disciples. Hirano bases his theory on the third episode in the *Hekigan roku* in which a visitor asks the ailing Ma-tsu Tao-i 馬祖道一 (709-788; J. Baso Dôitsu) how he is feeling and receives the cryptic reply "Sun-faced Buddha, Moon-faced Buddha" (日面佛月面佛 *nichimen butsu gatsumen butsu*). Hirano notes that in the source for this quotation, the *Butsumyôkyô* 仏名經, the word *namu* 南無 was originally attached to each name. He thus theorizes that in a time of serious illness, Ma-tsu practiced recitation of Buddha names much as Pure Land believers would, but that later generations found this shameful and removed the word *namu* to mask it. "Rinzai zen to nembutsu", p. 84.

sometime after the tenth century when Yung-ming Yen-shou 永明延寿 (907-975; J. Yōmei Enju) provided a theoretical basis for it.²³ Yen-shou extended his syncretic efforts toward the harmonization of all schools of Buddhism, but made special efforts to demonstrate the compatibility of Zen and Pure Land. At that time, most masters who advocated either Zen or Pure Land practice were highly critical of one another. Zen masters regarded Pure Land believers as incapable of progressing along the steep Zen path; Pure Land advocates accused Zen practitioners of being selfishly intent on their own enlightenment and lacking in the Buddhist virtue of compassion.²⁴ Yung-ming Yen-shou transcended these divisions both in his practice and his thought. Indeed, he would later be recognized as both a Zen master and a Pure Land master.²⁵

Yen-shou used Hua-yen philosophical categories to harmonize the two schools of thought, basing his argument on the non-duality of dichotomies like the absolute (*li* 理) and the phenomenal (*shih* 事).²⁶ On a practical, soteriological level, Yen-shou taught that Zen and Pure Land were not only compatible but mutually beneficial for believers, thus advocating a truly dual form of practice.²⁷ He wrote, "If there were Zen but not Pure Land, then nine out

²³ For studies of Yung-ming Yen-shou, see Mochizuki, *Chûgoku jôdo kyôshi*, pp. 329-341, Heng-ching Shih, "Yung-ming's Syncretism of Pure Land and Ch'an" and "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism", and Chun-fang Yu, *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*, p. 52.

²⁴ See Chappell, *op.cit.*, for a discussion of the early disputes between the Pure Land and Ch'an schools in China.

²⁵ For example, Dumoulin and Ch'en both identify him as a Ch'an master; Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, India and China*, p. 285, and Ch'en, *op.cit.*, p. 404. Chun-fang Yu presents him as a Pure Land master, including him in her section of short biographies of Pure Land patriarchs, Chun-fang Yu, *op.cit.*, pp. 43-44.

²⁶ Heng-ching Shih, "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism", pp. 76-78.

²⁷ It is not completely clear from the secondary sources the relative value that Yen-shou placed on Pure Land and Zen practices. In Chun-fang Yu's presentation, Yen-shou's teachings gave Pure Land practice an equal or even superior position compared to Zen meditation, Chun-fang Yu, *op.cit.*, p. 52. However, as Heng-ching Shih explains it, Yen-shou used the familiar Zen interpretation of Pure Land belief, including the *nembutsu*, to overcome contradictions between the schools; this approach suggests that Yen-shou gave Zen the primary position, "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism", pp. 74-78.

of ten people would stumble along the way.... If there were no Zen and only Pure Land, then 10,000 out of 10,000 practitioners would see Amida, so they would not be concerned about their not attaining enlightenment. When there is both Zen and Pure Land, then like horned tigers, people become masters in this life and Buddhas in the next. If there were neither Zen nor Pure Land, then [caught] between the anvil and the post for 10,000 kalpas and one thousand lifetimes, there would be nothing on which to rely."²⁸

After Yen-shou's time, during the Yüan dynasty (1280-1368), dual practice grew increasingly common in Chinese Buddhism. This is one of the primary reasons that scholars refer to this period as a time of gradual decline for Zen Buddhism in spite of the fact that it grew in sheer numbers.²⁹ By the Ming period, dual practice had become the norm throughout the world of Chinese Buddhism. All of the prominent masters of the period, including the four restorers of Buddhism in the later years of the Ming dynasty, Yun-ch'i Chu-hung 雲棲株宏 (1535-1615), Tzu-po Chen-k'o 達觀真可 (1543-1603), Han-shan Te-ch'ing 憨山德清 (1546-1623), and Ou-i Chih-hsu 藕益智旭 (1599-1655) advocated some form of dual practice.³⁰ Nonetheless, harmonization still required some reinterpretation of the teachings, whether explicit or implicit. Among Zen masters, interpretation of the *nembutsu* as a meditative device remained the normative method. From a Pure Land perspective, the Zen masters co-opted terms like "Amida" and "Pure Land" and reduced the *nembutsu* to a meditation device like the *kôan*.³¹

Defining the "true" Pure Land understanding of the *nembutsu* is a complicated topic. The term itself means both meditation and invocation and can refer to a variety of practices

²⁸ Translated from a quotation from Yen-shou's *Sanzen nembutsu shiryô kenge* 參禪念佛四料揀偈 in Fujiyoshi's *Zen to Jôdokyô*, p. 104. The passage can also be found in Mochizuki Shinkô, *Chûgoku Jôdo kyôrishi*, p. 341. Original not located.

²⁹ Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, India and China*, pp. 284-287; Ch'en, *op.cit.*, pp. 445-446.

³⁰ Cheng, *op.cit.*, pp. 52-54, and 61-64; Nagai, *op.cit.*, p. 326.

³¹ Heng-ching Shih, "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism", pp. 78-83.

based on different sutras.³² Within the Hua-yen and T'ien-t'ai schools, the practice is one among the many kinds of meditation used, and it is not intended to be an exclusive practice. In the context of Esoteric Buddhism, the term *nembutsu* normally refers to a form of meditation in which the believer focuses on Amida Buddha, especially using techniques of mental visualization; the goal of this form of concentration is the resulting state of samadhi. This interpretation of *nembutsu* practice is based on the *Pratyutpannasamadhi sūtra* (般舟三昧教; J. Hanjū sammaikyō).³³ By contrast, the practice commonly identified with the Pure Land school proper is based on Shan-tao's 善導 (618-681; J. Zendō) interpretation of the three Pure Land Sutras.³⁴ This tradition stresses oral invocation of Amida Buddha's name rather than visualization. The goal of practitioners is rebirth in the Pure Land in the next life. For believers of this type, the *nembutsu* is an expression of faith and gratitude for Amida Buddha, and any achievement of samadhi is basically inconsequential. In China, the Pure Land tradition that developed based on Shan-tao's understanding pushed the balance between reliance on other-power (他力 *tariki*) and self-power (自力 *jiriki*) far to the side of reliance on other-power, but did not completely reject all elements of self-power. Of these two general tendencies in Pure Land thought found in China, the esoteric and Shan-tao's, the esoteric interpretation would clearly be more amenable to Zen masters and more fruitful for harmonization from the Zen perspective.³⁵

Whether using the term *nembutsu* in reference to meditation on the Buddha or to

³² The Buddhist master Tsung-mi 宗密 (779-841; J. Shūmitsu), regarded as both a Hua-yen master and a Zen master, categorized these practices into four types. Roughly speaking, these are 1) vocal invocation of the Buddha's name, 2) concentration on a physical representation of the Buddha, 3) mental visualization of the Buddha, and 4) identification of the self with Amida Buddha. Tsung-mi set out this categorization in his *Hua-yen ching hsing-yüan p'in shu-ch'ao* 華嚴經行願品疏鈔, ZZ 1/7/5, pp. 457-458.

³³ T. 13, no. 418.

³⁴ These sutras are *Muryōjūkyō* 無量壽經 (T. 12, no. 360), *Kanmuryōjūkyō* 觀無量壽經 (T. 12, no. 365), and *Amidakyō* 阿彌陀經 (T. 12, no. 366).

³⁵ Chun-fang Yu, op.cit., p. 38.

invocation of the name, masters have long recognized that the practice had calming effects on the mind and could lead to a state of samadhi in which the distinction between subject and object is transcended. For example, the great T'ien-t'ai master Chih-i 智顗 (538-597; J. Chigi) included meditation on the Buddha Amida among the methods for attaining samadhi.³⁶ The twelfth century Ch'an master Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse 長蘆宗頤 (n.d.) recommended the practice of *nembutsu* for purposes of calming the mind to both beginners and those facing death.³⁷ As noted above, Wusang and his disciples used vocal invocation for the same purpose. Based on this kind of observation and the philosophical basis developed by Yen-shou, various Zen masters during the late Sung and early Yüan, including the dominant master of the age Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本 (1262-1323; J. Chûhō Myōhon), argued that Zen meditation and Pure Land practice lead to the same or similar results.³⁸ They were therefore willing to incorporate elements of Pure Land belief into their Zen practice.³⁹

In some cases, these Zen masters encouraged their students to use the *nembutsu* in much the same way that they would use a kōan or a mantra. They recommended chanting the name without advocating belief in Amida Buddha or rebirth in the Pure Land, since it was the resulting meditative state and not faith in Amida's vow that they believed had efficacy. In fact, they reinterpreted Amida and the Pure Land in Zen terms, speaking instead of the "Pure Land only in the mind" (唯心淨土 *yuishin jōdo*) and "the Amida within the self" (己心弥陀 *koshin no Mida*). In this way, faith that a Pure Land believer would direct outward toward an external power (*tariki*, other power) was directed inward toward the true self (*jiriki*, self power). Eventually, this kind of instruction was taken one step further and developed into what became

³⁶ Daniel B. Stevenson, "The Four Kinds of Samadhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism", pp. 59-60.

³⁷ Bielefeldt, "Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse's *Tso-ch'an I* and the "Secret" of Zen Meditation", p. 150.

³⁸ When the Pure Land master Chu-hung concurred with this observation found in the writings of Zen masters he studied, he took their ideas one step further. He concluded that *nembutsu* is actually superior to Zen meditation, since it is accessible to more people. Chun-fang Yu, op.cit., pp. 47 and 62.

³⁹ Dumoulin discusses this briefly in *Zen Buddhism: A History, Japan*, pp. 204-205.

known in the Ming period as the *nembutsu kôan* 念仏公案. During the Yüan and Ming periods we find that Zen monastic codes included recitation of Amida's name as a part of funeral services for monks and, more importantly, during times of serious illness.⁴⁰

The precise origin of the *nembutsu kôan* is unclear, but by the Ming period it had come into common usage. Unlike most other kôan, the *nembutsu kôan* has no roots in the classical Zen corpus, and it takes on any number of variations. However, its most basic form is the question, "Who is it who chants the *nembutsu*?" Generally speaking, a Zen master would give this kôan to a lay disciple, usually one who already practiced the *nembutsu*. The master would encourage the student to meditate on this question while going about his usual practice of chanting Amida's name. The basic purpose of the exercise was to turn the believer's focus away from a purely Pure Land recitation based on faith toward a more Zen understanding of it. The masters believed that the *nembutsu kôan* could engender in a Pure Land believer the same feeling of doubt that the kôan did in Zen practitioners and thus lead to an enlightenment experience.⁴¹

Zen masters used this exercise as a sort of bridge between the steep path of Zen and the easy path of Pure Land. By doing this, they hoped to reach out to people of average and below average abilities who might find Zen meditation too difficult. This was consistent with the strong Ming emphasis on lay Buddhism. It does not seem that masters commonly used this exercise with their disciples inside the monastery. This is not to say that monks did not themselves practice the *nembutsu*, since we know of several examples of monks who did. However, the *nembutsu kôan* was primarily a way for Zen masters to serve the needs of lay believers and not a practice for those who had dedicated their lives to religious life.

⁴⁰ In its instructions for services during the illness of a monk found in section 7, the *Ch'ih-hsiu pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* suggests chanting the names of the ten Buddhas for ordinary situations. However, when the illness is serious, it calls for reciting "Namu Amida Butsu" one hundred times. This is repeated for the funeral service on the day of cremation. T. 48, p. 1147b and 1148c.

⁴¹ Chun-fang Yu reviews the writing of several Ming period Zen masters who used the *nembutsu kôan*, op.cit., pp. 53-57.

Dual Practice in Japan

Dual practice of Zen and Pure Land was first introduced in Japan during the Kamakura period in the late thirteenth century (late Sung/early Yüan dynasty in China) by Japanese monks who had studied at Zen monasteries in China and Chinese monks who fled the chaos in their native land during the change of dynasties and settled in Japan. The most prominent Chinese Zen master of the time, Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本 (1263-1323; J. Chûhō Myōhon), was himself a proponent of dual practice and most of the Pure Land influence on Japanese Rinzai at that time can be traced to him. This was the case because a great many of the Japanese monks who traveled to China sought him out, and some of his Chinese disciples later made their way to Japan.⁴² However, for a variety of reasons, these Pure land influences did not endure in Japanese Zen as they did in China.

First, the general tendency of Japanese Buddhism during the Kamakura period moved in exactly the opposite direction from the Chinese. While Chinese Buddhism grew increasingly syncretic and combined practices from different Buddhist schools of thought, including Hua-yen, T'ien-t'ai, Ch'an and Pure Land⁴³, the Japanese were continuing to divide into distinct sects and were moving toward single, exclusive practices. This trend can be seen in the all of the new Japanese schools of the period, the Pure Land sects (Jōdo-shū, Jōdo shinshū, and Ji-shū), the Nichiren sect, and the two Zen sects, Rinzai and Sōtō.⁴⁴ Buddhist practice introduced in the Heian period by Shingon and Tendai had been characterized by a high degree of ritual and complex thought requiring extensive training. The new Kamakura schools each sought in their own way to simplify Buddhist practice by focusing on a single form: the Pure Land sects relied on recitation of the *nembutsu*, the Nichiren sect on reciting the title of

⁴² See Hirada Hiromichi, *op.cit.*, pp. 61-65.

⁴³ Sung-peng Hsu, *A Buddhist Leader in Ming China*, p. 47.

⁴⁴ Matsunaga, *op.cit.*, vol. 2, p. 7.

the Lotus Sutra, and the Zen sects stressed meditation. Although it would be an oversimplification to say that even these schools completely abolished all other forms of practice for their adherents, they were all moving away from syncretism.

Not only was the intellectual and religious climate of the time not conducive to any form of multiple practice, specific developments within Japanese Pure Land and Zen had moved them further apart than they had ever been in China. The two dominant Pure Land schools, Jôdo-shû and Jôdo shinshû, under the guidance of their founders Hônen 法然 (1133-1212) and Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1262), had taken the Pure Land tradition of Shan-tao to its logical limit, denying any validity to practices other than *nembutsu*. They taught that in the final age of *Mappô* 末法 people could only attain salvation through the vow of the Buddha Amida and called for total reliance on Amida's power (*tariki*). This made all practices other than reciting Amida's name obsolete. In fact, any other kind of practice would actually cause the believer harm, since it implied trust in one's own efforts (*jiriki*) rather than absolute reliance on faith in Amida. For philosophical reasons, Pure Land believers in Japan could not argue as some of their Chinese counterparts would that Zen meditation and Pure Land practice had the same result. They denied any efficacy for any practice other than their own and were especially harsh in their criticism of Zen which is the epitome of reliance on self power.

For their part, Zen masters were highly critical of Pure Land practice in Japan. Not only did they regard reliance on an external Buddha as misguided, they found the monastic practices of Japanese Pure Land, particularly True Pure Land, completely unacceptable. Since salvation by faith alone implied that keeping the precepts was no longer a necessary part of Buddhist practice, True Pure Land monks were allowed and even encouraged to marry and eat meat. Chinese Pure Land masters had never taken reliance on the power of Amida to this extreme and they had never advocated rejection of the common Vinaya tradition shared by all the Buddhist clergy. Under these circumstances, Zen Buddhists in Japan came to regard Pure Land Buddhism as a perversion of the tradition.

Earlier examples of Chinese Ch'an masters promoting dual practice were forgotten during the centuries when contact with China was lost, and the gulf between the Zen and Pure Land schools remained intact until the arrival of Obaku masters. Japanese Zen masters came to see any Pure Land influence on their Zen practice as a form of contamination. There are a few examples of Japanese Zen masters like Suzuki Shōsan 鈴木正三 (1579-1655) and Ungo Kiyō 雲居希膺 (1583-1659) who advocated dual practice of Zen and Pure Land, though even they regarded it primarily as a means to reach the laity. Shōsan was an independent, one might even say marginal, figure in the Zen tradition; he did not function within the bounds of institutional Zen, and his ideas had little or no influence on other Buddhist masters of the day.⁴⁵ In this regard, Ungo is a different matter, since he was a prominent figure within the Zen hierarchy and at one time served as abbot at Myōshin-ji. He not only took unpopular stands at Myōshin-ji as a reformer in favor of strict monastic discipline, but he continued to promote the practice of *nembutsu* among lay believers. His ideas were rejected by the majority of the other monks at the temple, and he was in effect forced out. His teaching has been denigrated within the mainstream of the Rinzai tradition as "Nembutsu Zen" and has not been influential, so in a sense he is also a marginal figure.⁴⁶

When the Obaku masters came to Japan and displayed such obvious Pure Land influences as chanting the *nembutsu* and chanting Pure Land sutras at daily services, most Japanese monks could only associate this with the dominant Pure Land tradition familiar to them in Japan. Even Obaku supporters from Myōshin-ji like Ryōkei had trouble reconciling themselves to this aspect of Obaku practice.⁴⁷ The Japanese response to this characteristic

⁴⁵ Suzuki Shōsan has received extensive attention in Western literature. See for example, King, *Death Was His Kōan*, Tyler, *Selected Writings of Suzuki Shōsan*, Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 122-143.

⁴⁶ Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, pp. 71-84.

⁴⁷ It is said that when Yin-yüan was residing at Fumon-ji and acting as abbot, Ryōkei did not participate fully in the Obaku-style services that Yin-yüan held in the morning and evening. He refrained from actively participating in those elements of the services that showed direct Pure Land influence. For example, he would remain seated while the other monks entered and exited the hall,

will be treated in more detail in the next chapter.

Obaku Zen's Dual Practice of Zen and Pure Land

The teachings of the Obaku masters fell squarely within the Chinese syncretic tradition that they had inherited and would not have seemed in any sense extraordinary in a Ming Chinese context. They approached the dual practice of Zen and Pure Land from the Zen side, and it was clear where the balance lay between the two teachings. They were Zen masters who made some use of Pure Land practices within a Zen context, reinterpreting them in Zen terms. This dual practice falls into two basic categories: use of the *nembutsu kōan* with Pure Land lay believers and the ritual use of Pure Land sutras and the chanting Amida's name within the monastery. Most modern scholarship has focused its attention on the former category, perhaps because it is more easily reconciled with the Rinzai tradition.⁴⁸ However, it is much more likely that Japanese monks were responding to the latter when they reacted against Obaku Zen as an impure Zen style.

Based on the recorded sayings of Yin-yüan, Mu-an, Chi-fei, and other early Obaku masters, one can say that Obaku followed the Chinese pattern of using the *nembutsu* primarily with lay believers, and then reinterpreting it in Zen terms as a kōan.⁴⁹ Looking at Yin-yüan's extensive writings as the primary resource for understanding Obaku's Zen style, one finds only a handful of references to chanting the *nembutsu*. In each instance, Yin-yüan had been approached by a Pure Land believer who already used the *nembutsu* as his or her primary chanting the *nembutsu*.

⁴⁸ For example, in his discussion of Yin-yüan's Zen style, Dieter Schwaller explains the history of the *nembutsu kōan* and give examples from Yin-yüan's recorded sayings to illustrate its use in Obaku Zen, but offers no explanation for Obaku's use of Pure Land elements in its monastic ritual. *Der japanische Obaku-Mönch Tetsugen Dōkō*, pp. 43-45.

⁴⁹ This observation is based on a review of primary materials when available and secondary studies made by Obaku scholars. The modern edition of Yin-yüan's complete works makes his teachings readily available for research. Unfortunately, modern editions do not exist for most other Obaku masters, and the original woodblock editions are rare. For secondary material related to Mu-an, Chi-fei, and other Obaku masters' teachings related to the *nembutsu*, as well as quotations from their recorded sayings, see Hayashi Bunshō, "Obaku o kataru", pp. 12-14 and 27-29.

Buddhist practice. Yin-yüan encouraged each of them to reflect on some form of the question, "Who chants the *nembutsu*? 念仏者は誰"⁵⁰ Like other Zen monks before him, Yin-yüan sought to reach these people at their current level of Buddhist understanding and then to inspire them to move forward, toward a Zen approach to Buddhist practice. He did this by giving them a *kôan*-like problem to contemplate while they continued in their regular Pure Land practice. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Yin-yüan ever encouraged a strictly Pure Land approach to the *nembutsu*, stressing chanting the name in faith without the Zen reinterpretation of it. Nor is there reason to believe that he gave the *nembutsu kôan* to anyone other than a Pure Land practitioner; there are no instances recorded in his works of the master recommending the *nembutsu kôan* to any of his Zen followers, lay or monk.

In this regard, Yin-yüan's teaching style is not unlike that of the Rinzai master Hakuin. Despite his harsh criticism of dual practice within the Zen monastic setting, Hakuin took a much softer, more conciliatory tone with Pure Land believers. For example, in the *Orategama zokushu* 遠羅天釜, he wrote, "It must be understood that the *kôan* and the recitation of the Buddha's name are both contributing causes to the path that leads to the opening up of the wisdom of the Buddha."⁵¹ He did not believe that the two practices were equally beneficial by any means, but he recognized the benefits of Pure Land practice for lay people of lesser abilities. In much the same way, Yin-yüan adjusted his approach to suit his audience, but always maintained his basic Zen orientation. In an apology for Obaku's Zen style, one modern Obaku scholar has argued that in its openness to Pure Land beliefs, Obaku reunites gradual and sudden practices and so reaches people of high, middle and low capacities. He maintains that when Zen excludes all other teachings (meaning both Pure Land beliefs and sutra study) then it becomes one-sided and excludes the practice of compassion.⁵²

⁵⁰ Such examples can be found in the *Ingen zenshû*, Vol. 3, p. 1089; vol. 6, p. 2843; vol. 9, p. 4291; vol. 10, p. 5030.

⁵¹ Translation from Yampolsky, *The Zen Master Hakuin*, p. 130.

⁵² Akamatsu Shinmyô, "Obakushû kôyô", pp. 12-13. Akamatsu explains and defends the

One does find an obvious exception to this pattern of dual practice among the early Obaku masters, the fourth abbot of Mampuku-ji, Tu-chan Hsing-jung. Tu-chan seems to have been a strong believer in the Pure Land teachings and regularly practiced the *nembutsu* himself, especially later in his life. For this reason, he became known as "Nembutsu Dokutan", an epithet used not without scorn by those within the Obaku tradition. By the accounts of Obaku scholars themselves, Tu-chan crossed the line from dual practice in the traditional Chinese Zen sense to a pure Japanese style of Pure Land practice.⁵³ For this reason, Tu-chan is regarded within the tradition as a marginal figure, and his teachings are not considered representative of Obaku Zen.

The inclusion of Pure Land elements in the ritual practices at Obaku temples clearly sets Obaku Zen apart from Japanese Rinzai and Sôtô Zen.⁵⁴ As noted above, Obaku monks chant aloud Pure Land sutras along with a variety of other scriptures at daily services and they recite Amida's name as a form of walking meditation when they enter and leave the hall.⁵⁵ (There is also some Pure Land influence on other rituals such as the *Hôjô gishiki* 放生儀式, the ceremony for releasing living animals.)⁵⁶ It is important to bear in mind that this represents only a small portion of the daily services and is by no means the central feature of Obaku ritual.

nembutsu kôan at some length and highly recommends it to lay people as an appropriate form of zazen for them to practice, *ibid.*, pp. 23-32. He is the best example in the modern period of a scholar-monk promoting Obaku Zen as Nembutsu Zen. However, he never loses his Zen orientation and is quite explicit that there is no Buddha or Pure Land outside the self.

⁵³ See for example his biography in Otsuki, *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten*, pp. 278-279, and Akamatsu Shinmyô, "Obakushû kôzô", p. 21.

⁵⁴ Rinzai funeral services for lay believers even today include references to Amida. However, that portion of the service is read in the Chinese fashion similar to Obaku's, and most lay people would probably not recognize it for what it is. Hirano Sôjô, "Rinzai zen to nembutsu", p. 89-90.

⁵⁵ The exact order of services is found in section 6 of the *Obaku shingi*, T. 82, p. 771b-c. For the morning service, the monks chant the *Sûramgama dharani* (from the *Sûrmgama sutra*, T. 19, no. 945) and the *Heart Sutra*. For the evening service they chant the *Amida Sutra*, the *Heart Sutra*, the *Ôjôju* 往生咒 (T. 12, no. 368), and other dharani. The full name for the *Ôjôju* is *Batsu issaigosshô kompon tokushô jôdôjinshu* 拔一切業障根本得生淨土神呪; it is generally associated with funeral services, since it requests rebirth in Amida's Pure Land.

⁵⁶ Amida Buddha is among the Buddha's mentioned in this service. T. 82, p. 772a-b.

The order and contents of the daily services were prescribed in the sixth section of the *Obaku shingi* and have been preserved down to the present. However, I have found no explicit explanation of any sort for these ritual practices in the primary literature of the Tokugawa period. This suggests that they were actually practices so common in Ming China that the early Obaku masters felt no need to explain or justify their existence.⁵⁷

In popular and scholarly writings alike, the common perception of Obaku is that it represents a form of "Nembutsu Zen". Contemporary Obaku scholars are extremely sensitive to this charge, since the term is often used in a derogatory manner. It generally implies a perversion of the Zen approach to Buddhist practice that somehow combines two contradictory sets of beliefs. While Obaku scholars do not deny the Pure Land influence on their school, they reject the characterization of their Zen style as Nembutsu Zen. Unlike their Edo period forbearers, present day Obaku monks feel the need to explain explicitly the presence of Pure Land elements in their rituals. They take the position that Obaku's use of Pure Land belief is more like that found in the Tendai and Kegon traditions than that of the native Japanese Pure Land schools, Jōdo-shū and Jōdo shinshū. It has been suggested that the misperception of Obaku as Nembutsu Zen was actually encouraged by Obaku monks themselves in the Meiji period, in a misguided attempt to popularize the sect and broaden its economic base.⁵⁸ Whether or not that is in fact the case, the Pure Land influence on Obaku is clearly not as strong as is popularly believed, as will be discussed below.

⁵⁷ This is not the case for contemporary scholars. For example, Hayashi Bunshō explains somewhat defensively that Amida is not the only Buddha mentioned in the daily services, as one would expect to find in a Pure Land temple. He argues that whether one thousand or ten thousand Buddhas are mentioned, it does not matter because they are all names for the true self, "Obaku o kataru", p. 15. I have also had this matter explained to me by one of the scholar-monks at Mampuku-ji after observing one of the services. The monk explained that he had been taught that the Obaku style of *nembutsu* practice was a form of meditation and that it had nothing to do with a Buddha outside himself. He pointed to his solar plexus and indicated that during that exercise Obaku monks concentrate on the Amida within themselves and try to realize the Pure Land inside.

⁵⁸ See Hayashi Bunshō, "Obaku o kataru", p. 9.

Other Influences on Obaku Zen

Very little work has been done by Obaku scholars in tracing other influences found in Obaku Zen, derived from Esoteric Buddhism, Chinese folk religion and other Chinese religious and philosophical traditions such as Confucianism and Taoism. A thorough study would require careful consideration of the written sources, the *Obaku shingi* and the recorded sayings of the early masters, detailed examination of the non-Buddhist images found at Obaku temples, and a consideration of Chinese folk traditions. Detailed consideration is beyond the scope of the present study; the following comments are tentative in nature.

The most obvious example of influence from Esoteric Buddhism is the use of Esoteric sutras and *dharani* in the daily services of Obaku temples. Other services in the liturgical calendar, such as the *segaki*, feeding the hungry ghosts, were originally characteristic of the Esoteric tradition in China, but in the Ming period they had come into common use at Zen monasteries.⁵⁹ These practices are set out in the *Obaku shingi*, so they remain a part of Obaku practice today. However, some Esoteric practices known to have existed in the early years of the sect's history have since died out. In keeping with the usual practices of Ming Buddhism, the Chinese Obaku masters were trained to use *dharani* in extraordinary circumstances to bring relief from or ward off natural calamities and they taught their Japanese disciples to do the same. There are numerous examples of Chinese and Japanese masters chanting *dharani* to bring rain in times of drought, cure disease during epidemics, and expel demons or other spirits that possessed the living.

Evidence of Chinese folk religion is harder to trace, since it was never described in the written documents. Rather, folk practices would have occurred quite naturally when the Obaku masters were serving the needs of Chinese expatriates in Nagasaki, and some of these practices must have been retained as Obaku spread to other parts of the country. As

⁵⁹ The Pure Land master Chu-hung was also known for his use of the *segaki* service along with other Esoteric rituals. See Chun-fang Yu, op.cit., p. 19.

described earlier, the Obaku temples in Nagasaki (the three Chinese temples founded before Yin-yüan came to Japan and those originally founded as branch temples of Mampuku-ji) all had halls for the Chinese folk deity Ma-tsu, whose image was temporarily enshrined there while Chinese sea merchants were in port. Since Chinese traders were not allowed in any other Japanese cities, it is not surprising that Obaku temples in other localities do not have similar halls. However, there is other evidence to suggest that Chinese folk deities were once venerated at Obaku temples including Mampuku-ji. For example, an image of the folk deity Kuan-ti 關帝 is enshrined as the main image in the Garan-dô 伽藍堂.⁶⁰ It is not known what folk practices the Chinese monks observed in the Edo period, but during the celebration of Chinese Obon in September and October, it is now common for Chinese students to set up the traditional altars for the dead at Obaku temples, including Mampuku-ji.⁶¹

One expects to find evidence of Confucian and Taoist influence on any Ming period Buddhist group, and Obaku is no exception. The belief that the three teachings, Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism, were one and harmonious (*sankyô itchi* 三教一致) was widespread among Buddhists in China at the end of the Ming dynasty.⁶² This view was promoted by almost all of the prominent Buddhist masters of the day, though naturally from a Buddhist perspective.⁶³ Yin-yüan and the other Chinese masters would have been quite unusual had they not held similar views. In Japan as well, Buddhists living at the beginning of the Edo

⁶⁰ See p. 26, note 27 for more information on Kuan-ti.

⁶¹ Altars at Mampuku-ji were identified as examples of the Chinese folk tradition associated with Obon through consultations with Anna Seidel, a Taoist scholar with extensive knowledge of Chinese religious images.

⁶² In Japan, the same expression, *sankyô itchi* 三教一致, usually referred to Buddhism, Confucianism, and the native Shinto. Until the Meiji period, the harmony between Buddhism and Shinto was graphically illustrated by the incorporation of small Shinto shrines within the compounds of most Buddhist temples. Many of the older examples of these Shinto shrines were removed during the Meiji period when efforts were made to forcibly separate the two traditions. Obaku temples have some Shinto shrines dating back to the Tokugawa period.

⁶³ See, for example, Sung-peng Hsu, *op.cit.*, pp. 150-163, Chun-fang Yu, *op.cit.*, pp. 7, 64-66, Chang Sheng-yen, *Minmatsu Chûgoku bukkyô no kenkyû*, pp. 30-34.

period had, by necessity, to come to grips with Neo-Confucian thought since it permeated and dominated the intellectual discourse of the secular world. Nonetheless, very little is said about Confucian and Taoist influence in any secondary literature on Obaku Zen. Nor has any work been done to ascertain the attitude individual Obaku masters took toward those schools of thought. This alone suggests that the syncretic movement to harmonize the three teachings was not central to the thought of Yin-yüan and the others. However, there are several directions that research could take to evaluate their positions vis-a-vis Confucian and Taoist thought.

First, there is a certain amount of material in Yin-yüan's collected works related to Confucianism and Taoism.⁶⁴ For example, one finds among his poetry in praise of various Buddhist masters a few verses extolling the Taoist master Lao-tzu and one verse stating that Buddhism and Confucianism are compatible.⁶⁵ Yin-yüan also extolled the Confucian virtues in general, and filial piety was a special theme in much of his teachings and writings.⁶⁶ There may well be other, less obvious passages in Yin-yüan's collected works with Taoist or Confucian themes, especially in letters to lay believers. It is worth noting in this context that the biographies of Obaku masters, both Chinese and Japanese alike, tend to stress their strong filial devotion. For example, Yin-yüan's biography explains that he deferred entering the monastic life for many years until his mother died, in order to fulfill his deep sense of filial piety toward her. Evaluation of all this material would require a more lengthy study of Yin-yüan's recorded sayings and the biographies than is appropriate here, but would provide a good basis for a study on Confucian and Taoist influences on Obaku Zen.

Furthermore, it is important to remember that Yin-yüan did not forbid his disciples from

⁶⁴ Yin-yüan's writings are readily available in Hirakubo's modern edition of the *Ingen zenshû*. The works of other Obaku masters, with the exception of Tetsugen, have not been published in the modern era, so research into their writings is more difficult. Hirakubo is currently working on an edition of Mu-an's complete works and has plans to do similar work with other early Obaku writings which should greatly improve matters. See Hirakubo, "Mokuan zenshû no henshu ni tsuite", pp. 1-2.

⁶⁵ *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 5, pp. 2477-2479.

⁶⁶ Yin-yüan wrote several verses in praise of filial piety, see *Ingen zenshû* vol. 9, p. 4218 for one example.

reading extensively in non-Buddhist writings once they had advanced sufficiently in their practice. This attitude is reflected in the fifth section of the *Obaku shingi* devoted to a description of correct practice. After warning that no amount of book learning will avail if the monks do not persevere in keeping the precepts and in their practice of meditation and good works, permission is nonetheless granted for the master to allow disciples to read as extensively as they please. "So long as it does not interfere with their meditation, monks who have mastered the sutras and recorded sayings [of Zen masters] may read as widely as they like in any books."⁶⁷ Yin-yüan himself kept an extensive personal library which he brought with him from China. This library included a large number of non-Buddhist writings, among them Confucian and Taoist texts.⁶⁸ A thorough review of the titles would perhaps offer clues as to which aspects of non-Buddhist thought were especially appealing to Yin-yüan.

Although not directly relevant to the issue at hand, it is interesting to note that Japanese Confucian scholars were known to have cultivated friendships with Obaku masters and to have studied the Chinese language with them.⁶⁹ Scholars like Itô Jinsai 伊藤仁斎 (1627-1705) and Ogyû Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666-1728) preferred to read the Confucian classics in the original Chinese rather than by translating them into Japanese, using *kambun* markings. In order to do this properly, they tried to master Chinese language, both written and spoken. For these scholars and others like them, Obaku masters were a living resource of Chinese language and

⁶⁷ T. 82, p. 769b

⁶⁸ A catalogue of Yin-yüan's private library was compiled a few months after his death. The list is divided into three sections, Buddhist scriptures, Buddhist texts, including those produced by Obaku masters, and secular writings. The third section is the smallest, but includes 61 items. Many are poetry collections, but there are a number of Taoist writings, such as the Inner Chapters of Chuang-tzu, and Confucian texts, such as the collected writings of Wang Yang-ming. A copy of this catalogue was published under the title "Ingen zenji no yuisho mokuroku", pp. 21-25.

⁶⁹ Yoshikawa Kôjirô comments on Sorai's friendship with Yüeh-fêng Tao-chuang 悅峰道章 (1655-1734; J. Eppô Dôshô) in his biography of Sorai in *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga*, pp. 121-122, 126-7, 201 and 206. Yüeh-fêng was a native of Chekiang who came to Japan in 1868 at the invitation of Kôfuku-ji, where he served as abbot and did much restoration work. Tu-chan Hsing-jung made him a Dharma heir in 1691. He became the eighth abbot of Mampuku-ji in 1707, and was honored with a purple robe in the same year.

culture that was otherwise unavailable to them, living as they were under the conditions of national isolation.

The *Sandan kaie*

The *Sandan kaie* 三壇戒会 (Triple Ordination Platform Ceremony), described in section five of the *Obaku shingi*, combines the final ordination of Obaku monks with a service for conferring the precepts on lay believers.⁷⁰ The ordination portion of the ceremony follows a general pattern common within the Mahayana tradition. Monks are ordained first by accepting the full set of precepts from the Vinaya tradition of Theravada Buddhism; eventually they received their final ordination with their acceptance of the Bodhisattva precepts, a specifically Mahayana development. As for conferring the precepts on lay people, there is a long history in both Theravada and Mahayana Buddhism of spreading the Dharma through bestowal of a smaller set of precepts on lay believers. In the ancient Buddhist traditions, lay people were encouraged not only to keep the most basic Buddhist precepts against killing, stealing, lying, sexual misconduct and drinking liquor, but to take on more stringent practices similar to those of monks for limited periods of time several times each month. In the Mahayana traditions of China and Japan, it became common for Buddhist masters to confer the precepts on large numbers of people at public lectures and similar gatherings. In Japan, the practice was generally associated with movements seeking to restore discipline within the Buddhist sangha as well as to strengthen the faith of lay Buddhists, such as the Vinaya movement in the Shingon sect,

⁷⁰ Yin-yüan wrote a more detailed description of the *Sandan Kaie*, the *Gukai hōgi*, published in a woodblock edition by Tetsugen Dōkō in 1658. Yin-yüan based his work on the *Hung-chieh-fa-i* 弘戒法儀 (J. *Gukai hōgi*), a text written by San-feng Fa-ts'ang 三峰法藏 in 1623. Fa-tsang had himself drawn upon earlier work by Yun-ch'i Chu-hung. Yin-yüan's *Gukai hōgi* can be found in the *Zengaku taikēi*, vol. 7 (the *kaiho* 戒法 section), pp. 1-68. Yin-yüan's edition of Fa-ts'ang's text appears in the ZZ 2.11.5. A Ch'ing dynasty edition of Fa-ts'ang's text, called the *Ch'uan-shou san-tan hung-chieh fa-i* 伝授三壇弘戒法儀 (J. Denju sandan gukai hōgi), appeared in 1688. That edition is also found in the ZZ, 2.12.1 For more information, see Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 147.

known as Shingon Ritsu.⁷¹ The Obaku *Sandan kaie* can be seen as a related tradition, and as such is not unique to Japan. While Obaku was not a *ritsu* movement in the literal sense, it shared with them the basic approach to reviving Buddhism and preserving the Dharma through strict observance of the precepts. However, the Obaku practice is more closely related to a tradition from Chinese Zen temples of the T'ang and Sung periods than to other Ritsu movements seen in Japan. Rather than the informal, almost impromptu bestowal of the precepts on lay people gathered for sermons or festival celebrations that one sees in *ritsu* movements, the Obaku ceremony is a highly structured ritual performed according to detailed instructions.⁷²

Obaku masters were the only Buddhists in Japan to perform the *Sandan kaie* ceremony, and for this reason it has been regarded as a unique characteristic of the sect. However, the ceremony does not seem to have been unique to their line in China, nor was it originally developed by them. The community at Wan-fu-ssu held the ceremony regularly, and Yin-yüan led it some sixteen times while serving there as abbot. It is not known who first introduced the ceremony there; since it was a late Ming development, it was probably introduced by Yin-yüan or one of his immediate predecessors. When Yin-yüan realized that the Japanese had never seen or heard of the ritual, he thought it would be a shame for them not to experience this beautiful ceremony. He therefore composed and had published a text, the *Gukai hōgi* 弘戒法儀, describing it in some detail. He also made the existing Chinese source that he had

⁷¹ Ritsu movements have occurred in several different sects in Japan, and are not limited to the Ritsu school transmitted to Japan in the Nara period. The primary example of these movements was the Shingon Ritsu sect that was very strong during the Kamakura period and revived in the Tokugawa period. Other Ritsu movements include Tendai's Anrakuritsu, Nichiren's Hokkeritsu, and Pure Land's Jōdoritsu, all active in the early Tokugawa period. See Watt, "Jiun Sonja (1718-1804): A Response to Confucianism within the Context of Buddhist Reform", p. 213. In a sense, Obaku represents a Ritsu movement within Rinzaï Zen, although it never used that term to describe itself.

⁷² We know from anecdotal evidence that Obaku masters also held more impromptu ceremonies as they traveled through the countryside, to bestow the precepts on the common people. For example, the *Zenrin shūhei shū* includes a story about Chōon Dōkai holding these popular ceremonies, pp. 17b-18a. In this case, the story is told to discredit Chōon, since it claims that he performed the ceremony for money.

used as the basis for his own work available in Japan.⁷³ The instructions from the *Gukai hōgi*, in an abbreviated form, were then incorporated into Ōbaku's monastic code as a permanent part of Ōbaku practice.

For whatever reason, the Ōbaku sect has not continued to hold this ceremony as Yin-yüan intended.⁷⁴ Therefore, the exact procedure for the *Sandan kaie* is no longer completely understood. Directions given in the *Ōbaku shingi* would normally have been augmented by an oral tradition preserving practical details not provided in the written text. Without that oral tradition, Ōbaku scholars cannot even be certain about the proper interpretation of the written instructions; thus their descriptions of the ceremony are usually quite vague. The following description, based on the day by day instructions found in the *Gukai no nittan* 弘戒日單 portion of section 6 in the *Ōbaku shingi*, must be regarded as tentative.⁷⁵ The ceremony took place over the course of eight days. The first two days were dedicated to bestowing the precepts on the broader Buddhist community; both lay people and monks took refuge in the Three Treasures, the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha, and then received the Five Precepts, the Eight Precepts and the ten precepts for novices.⁷⁶ On the third and fourth days, the community formally accepted novices who would have previously been accepted by individual masters. During these two days, novices received their robes

⁷³ See note 70 above.

⁷⁴ Unfortunately, the *Sandan kaie* ceremony has not survived to the present day. Historians at Mampuku-ji could not account for this. Nor did they know when the ceremony had last been held.

⁷⁵ T. 82, p. 769c-770a.

⁷⁶ Although they are listed separately, these sets of precepts are all related. The ten precepts for novices (沙弥十戒 *shami jikkai*) are to refrain from: 1) killing living things, 2) stealing, 3) sexual misconduct, 4) lying, 5) drinking liquor, 6) eating after noon, 7) going to see dancing, singing and shows, 8) adorning the body with perfumes, jewelry and other finery, 9) sleeping in a high bed, and 10) receiving money. The Five Precepts (五戒 *gokai*) are the first five of these, which lay people are expected to observe on a daily basis. There are some practical differences, of course, since the ban on sexual misconduct implies refraining from fornication and adultery on the part of lay people, rather than all sexual activity as it does for monks and nuns. The Eight Precepts (八戒 *hakkai*) usually refer to the first nine of the novices' precepts, with 8) and 9) combined. Lay people were expected to observe these stricter conditions on specific days of the month.

and bowls, took the ten precepts for novices and were lectured on them. All of the events of the first four days took place on the first platform. The next two days were dedicated to the Vinaya portion of full ordination which took place on the second platform. On the fifth day, the leader lectured on the four kinds of refuge for sentient beings (四依 *shie*).⁷⁷ On the sixth day, the participating monks received the 250 precepts of a fully ordained monk.⁷⁸ On the seventh and eighth days of the ceremony, the Bodhisattva precepts 菩薩戒 (*bosatsukai*) were explained and then the monks mounted the third platform and received them.⁷⁹

Yin-yüan may have conferred precepts on his Japanese disciples on earlier occasions, but he held the first *Sandan kaie* in Japan at Mampuku-ji during the winter retreat of 1663. He held the ceremony twice more after his retirement, in the second month of 1665 and again in the second month of 1670. After that time, Mu-an and successive abbots of Mampuku-ji continued the tradition for some time. It was normally expected that novices would have already received the ten precepts from their master when they first joined the order. Full ordination was then granted only at the *Sandan kaie*, which was to be held every three to four years at the discretion of the abbot. Initially, the ceremony was limited to the main temple Mampuku-ji, and monks would have had to travel there for ordination. However, after 1675 when Mu-an held the service at Zuishô-ji, the Obaku headquarters in Edo, both sites were

⁷⁷ *Shie* can mean a variety of things, including the four kinds of practices appropriate for monks. In this case, it refers to the four kinds of things that all sentient being can rely upon, the Buddha, the Dharma, the Sangha and the Precepts (仏法僧戒).

⁷⁸ The *Obaku shingi* describes only the ordination of monks. The precepts for full ordination are somewhat different for monks and nuns. While monks take a total of 250 precepts, nuns take an additional set, bringing their total to 348. It seems likely that the many nuns who joined the Obaku order received only the precepts for novices from their respective masters.

⁷⁹ The Bodhisattva precepts are generally divided into ten heavy and forty-eight light precepts 十重戒四十八輕戒 (*jûjûkai shijûhachikyôkai*). While the precepts for novices and the 250 precepts for fully ordained monks come from the Theravada tradition, the Bodhisattva precepts are specifically Mahayana in origin. See Groner, *Saichô: The Establishment of the Japanese tendai School*, especially pp. 49-50, and 213-246. Chinese Zen masters conferred these on both clergy and lay people alike as symbols of their connection to the Zen school. For an historical account of their use in Zen monasteries in China, see Foulk, *op.cit.*, pp. 78-87.

used.⁸⁰

The *Sandan kaie* was not only designed for ordaining Obaku monks, but as a means to spread the Dharma among the common people. Obaku abbots used the ceremony to popularize Obaku Zen and create or strengthen its ties with lay believers. Dating back to the T'ang and Sung periods, Zen monasteries in China regularly used ceremonies conferring the Bodhisattva precepts on lay people in much the same way⁸¹, as had the Zen schools in Japan.⁸² Obaku's success in promoting itself through this ritual is hard to judge, since no records were kept of the ceremony and no exact figures are available. We have only the anecdotal evidence from biographies and recorded sayings to provide information. According to references made in Yin-yüan's biography, five hundred people participated each of the first two times he led the service, and over a thousand the third time.⁸³ When Mu-an held the ceremony in 1677, 1200 people were said to have participated, and when Kao-ch'üan led it in 1695, another 1,100 people came.⁸⁴ These figures are approximate at best. Nonetheless, they do indicate significant interest in the ceremony among lay people in Kyoto and Edo. Not only could lay believers renew their ties with the Buddhist sangha and gain merit from taking the precepts, but it was also a novel opportunity for ordinary Japanese to watch an elaborate Chinese ritual first-hand.

Maintenance of Chinese Cultural Identity

Life at Mampuku-ji and other Obaku temples differed from that found in any other

⁸⁰ According to Washio Junkei, this caused antagonism between the monks at Mampuku-ji and those at Zuishō-ji, *Nihon zenshūshi no kenkyū*, p. 102.

⁸¹ Foulk, op.cit., pp. 85-87.

⁸² For a description of the Sôtō schools use of mass ordinations as a means to strengthen the sect on the popular level, see Bodiford, *The Growth of the Sôtō Zen Tradition in Medieval Japan* pp. 397-424.

⁸³ Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 160.

⁸⁴ Takenuki Genshō, *Nihon zenshūshi*, p. 227.

Japanese temple because the distinctive patterns of Ming monastic life were maintained, in such areas as ritual language, religious instruments, implements, food, clothing, personal appearance, and temple architecture. These created a special atmosphere at Obaku temples and made for the appearance of a distinctive Chinese style of Zen. In actuality, these were external differences, more closely related to cultural and ethnic identity than to differences in Buddhist teaching. However, Zen monastic practice encompasses all aspects of daily life and Zen codes prescribe appropriate behavior even on seemingly trivial levels. For this reason, the preservation of cultural differences did take on a religious quality for the Chinese Obaku masters. Conversely, these differences prompted Japanese Rinzai masters to criticize Obaku Zen as ritually incorrect.

During the early years when the majority of the Obaku community were Chinese, it was perfectly natural that they would continue to use their own language in daily and ritual life. From the start, this created special problems for relations between the Chinese masters and their Japanese disciples. Fortunately, they shared the written language of classical Chinese to bridge the gap, and there were interpreters to help in formal situations. Apparently, Yin-yüan never felt comfortable speaking Japanese when he received important guests, but he and the other Chinese monks did learn to communicate in Japanese for everyday purposes. Some Japanese disciples also made an effort to learn to speak Chinese in the Fukien dialect of their masters. All of them were expected to learn to chant the sutras and other prayers of the daily services in that dialect. Although Japanese naturally became the dominant language over the years, the custom of chanting in Fukien dialect Chinese has been preserved down to the present day. Large portions of the *Obaku shingi* include Japanese markings in the phonetic syllabary (振り仮名 *furigana*) indicating a Japanese approximation of Fukien pronunciation. Obaku monks still chant everything according to this style, known in Japanese as *Obaku bonbai* 黄檗梵唄 or *Obaku shōmyō* 黄檗声明, and learning to do so is among the first priorities for novices.

Obaku masters brought with them the instruments and other religious implements they had used in China. These are depicted in an appendix to the *Obaku shingi* and thus knowledge of them has been preserved down to the present, and they remain in use throughout all Obaku temples. Some of these instruments which have subsequently become commonplace in Japanese temples of all sects were unknown in Japan before the establishment of Obaku temples. For example, the drum known as *mokugyo* 木魚 is said to be a Ming instrument first imported to Japan by Obaku masters.⁸⁵ The Ming style of services, including the specific uses for the various instruments, are also preserved in the ritual directions in the main body of the monastic code. The original musical quality of the services has also been maintained by an unbroken chain of oral tradition within the sect. The combination of drums, bells, and hand chimes, along with the rhythms of the chanting, create an overall effect more closely resembling esoteric services than those of other Japanese Zen sects. We know from Tokugawa period comments that the music sounded exotic to the Japanese who heard it, and in some cases distinctly unpleasant.⁸⁶

Obaku temples also have preserved certain culinary customs from Ming China. For example, monks at Mampuku-ji still eat together in the dining hall and share a common serving pot in the Chinese manner. It was Yin-yüan's wish that the monks not divide up into smaller cliques at mealtimes, and he specifically called for monks living in their own subtemples on the temple precincts to gather for meals with the whole assembly.⁸⁷ Even today, Obaku is known for its original Chinese vegetarian cuisine, called *fucha ryôri* 布茶料理, and visitors to Mampuku-ji can partake of a meal served in the traditional fashion. This was originally festival food and has never been daily fare for the monks. Nonetheless, Obaku monks were criticized by Japanese

⁸⁵ Hayashi Bunshô, "Obaku o kataru", p. 23.

⁸⁶ Kyorei commented that the music was interesting, but inappropriate in Japan and grating on his ears day after day. See p. 98, below.

⁸⁷ See the seventh item in Yin-yüan's final instructions, the *Yoshiyokugo*, in the *Obaku shingi*, T. 82, p. 781a.

monks in the Tokugawa period for being fat and for eating throughout the day, in violation of the basic Buddhist code. While this criticism may well have had some basis in fact, the *Obaku shingi* clearly follows the usual standards, calling for two meals a day to be eaten before noon.

Another cluster of Obaku customs relate to the dress and personal appearance of the monks. First, Chinese monastic robes were somewhat different from Japanese robes. We know from the *Obaku geki* that the Japanese tailors had trouble producing these robes and that one tailor in Kyoto came to specialize in the making them.⁸⁸ The Chinese also wore shoes rather than the straw sandals customary in Japan and wore a different sort of cap. We know from criticism in the *Zenrin shûheishû* that Chinese etiquette related to the cap differed from the Japanese and this caused a certain misunderstanding.⁸⁹ In additions, Chinese monks shaved their heads according to a different schedule than the Japanese, so it was not uncommon for them to have up to two inches of hair. This gave them a somewhat worldly appearance in the eyes of their Japanese critics. We know from portraits that Chinese monks also grew their nails quite long, extending, sometimes, for several inches, as was the Chinese custom. Although it was natural for the Chinese Obaku monks to maintain these Chinese styles, their Japanese disciples adopted the same customs as a part of their monastic discipline. Even previously ordained monks from other sects were expected to change from Japanese to Chinese robes when they came to practice Zen for extended periods of time. Portraits of the early Japanese masters clearly show their full adoption of Chinese dress and personal appearance. It was this latter development that particularly caused resentment for many Japanese who felt that it indicated a lack of respect for Japanese customs. None of these

⁸⁸ *Obaku geki*, p. 4b.

⁸⁹ The topic of the sixth section of the first fascicle of the *Zenrin shûheishû* concerns wearing the cap incorrectly. It mentions that Ming monks ignored the proper etiquette for caps prescribed by the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*, and that Chinese monks wore their caps out of season, as if they served some symbolic function other than the practical purpose of keeping the head warm in winter. It specifically mentions that the founder of the Obaku line wore his cap to conceal his worldly appearance, a reference to Chinese monastic hair styles, which allowed for longer growth between shavings.

customs were specifically prescribed in Obaku's monastic code, and gradually all were replaced by Japanese monastic styles.

Other Characteristics

While not unique to Obaku Zen, there are three other characteristics that do help define the Obaku style of Zen: its attitude toward the sutras and teachings, its stress on strict observance of the monastic code, and its strong tradition of work among the common people. Each of these has a basis in the *Obaku shingi* and represents a tendency within Yin-yüan's teachings. One may also observe similar tendencies in other Ming period masters such as Chu-hung and in some Tokugawa period Japanese masters. These are the characteristics that probably struck the deepest chords in the Japanese monks who joined Obaku in the early years of its development in Japan.

In some cases, Zen masters have taken a radical position towards the sutras (and the Buddhist teachings they represent) and called for their destruction. One may well argue that statements of this sort, like the instruction to kill the Buddha, are intended symbolically, and are not meant to be literally fulfilled. Nonetheless, they do represent a strong emphasis within Zen Buddhism to substitute personal experience for scholastic pursuit. Zen masters speak of the direct transmission of the Dharma from mind to mind, not the transmission of a written tradition. There is a strong bias in the teachings of many Zen masters against a bookish understanding of Buddhism. However, other Zen masters take a more positive attitude toward the sutras and teachings, arguing that the teachings and meditation are one (禪教一致 *zenkyô itchi*). They recognize that the truth one encounters in the sutras is ultimately the same as what one experiences through meditation. Obaku Zen basically takes this latter, positive attitude.

In his early years of practicing Zen, when he first began learning the sutras, Yin-yüan observed to a friend that grasping the essential meaning of the sutras is like being shown the

road to follow, but that one must still follow the road for oneself in order to reach the goal.⁹⁰ Nonetheless, he continued to read and study the sutras throughout his life and encouraged his disciples to do the same.⁹¹ Obaku Zen does not regard sutra study as sufficient in and of itself, but does consider it an essential part of monastic life. Naturally, Obaku Zen favors the writings of the Zen patriarchs and certain sutras that have traditionally been associated with Zen, just as other sects give priority to some sutras over others. However, the Obaku sects' positive attitude toward the sutras as a whole is manifested in their production of the Obaku edition of the Tripitaka. Although Tetsugen rightly deserves the bulk of the credit for completing this project, Yin-yüan and the entire community contributed their skills and resources to support him. In a very real sense, Obaku made the Tripitaka readily available to any temple in Japan for the first time in the history of Japanese Buddhism.

Even before Yin-yüan came to Japan, he was known to the Japanese for his strict attitude toward observance of the precepts. Yin-yüan believed that the renewal of Rinzai Zen could only be achieved through a return to monastic discipline. The Japanese disciples that gathered around him shared in this conviction. Men like Ryôkei and Tetsugen left their previous affiliation to join Obaku largely because of their deep commitment to strict observance. With its emphasis on meditation and the sudden achievement of enlightenment, Zen has sometimes been interpreted as bypassing or transcending monastic discipline. Obaku Zen takes much the opposite approach. The attitude that monastic discipline is a necessary basis for Zen practice permeates the *Obaku shingi*. For example, in the fifth section on pure practice, the text reads, "Students of the way must first of all keep all of the precepts, the ten precepts of

⁹⁰ *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, p. 5115.

⁹¹ In fact, Yin-yüan inherited a tradition of deep respect for the sutras common to the abbots at Wan-fu-ssu. According to his biography, while serving as abbot there, he read the entire Tripitaka, which earlier abbots had taken pains to acquire. In the entry for Yin-yüan's forty-seventh year, the biography says that he spent 1,000 days reading the Tripitaka to commemorate the eighty-second anniversary of the first petition made by Cheng-yüan Chung-t'ien, then abbot, to government authorities in order to obtain a copy. The entry briefly explains the history of the three abbots of Wan-fu-ssu who dedicating their lives to obtaining this edition. *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, p. 5147-5149. See also p. 21, above.

the novice, the two hundred fifty precepts of the monk, and the ten heavy and forty-eight light precepts of the Bodhisattva.... If you do not keep the precepts, then you cannot meditate. If you cannot meditate, then you cannot attain wisdom."⁹² Obaku Zen thus portrays itself as using the traditional divisions of the Buddhist path, discipline, meditation and wisdom. As in traditional formulations, disciples of Obaku Zen begin with discipline, and building on it, progress through meditation to wisdom.

Among the features of Obaku practice that can be considered under the rubric of strict monastic discipline is their attitude toward the summer and winter retreats 安居 (J. *ango*). The custom of keeping a retreat dates back to Buddhist practice in India when monks were expected to remain at a monastery and not travel during the rainy season, a period of three months during the summer. In Zen temples in China, this custom developed into two yearly retreats, the summer retreat, from the fifteenth day of the fourth month through the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and the winter retreat, from the fifteenth day of the eleventh month through the fifteenth day of the first month of the new year. These periods of retreat became intense sessions of study for disciples under a master's guidance. Yin-yüan and the other Obaku masters kept these retreats strictly. We know from Kyorei's letter, for example, that Yin-yüan held his first retreat in Japan in the winter of 1654-1655, and Kyorei specifically mentioned that the assembly kept the rule strictly. Yin-yüan saw to it that the practice of keeping the summer and winter retreats would be preserved at Obaku monasteries by having them clearly regulated by the *Obaku shingi*.⁹³ All disciples were expected to participate in the sessions, and special permission had to be granted by the master to excuse an individual.

⁹² T. 82, p. 769a-b.

⁹³ The dates are listed in section 7 of the *Obaku geki* under the month by month calendar of events: Under the fourth month, on the fifteenth day, we find *ketsuge jōdō* 結夏上堂, the opening lecture for the summer retreat; the fifteenth day of the seventh month lists the *gege jōdō* 解夏上堂, the closing lecture. Similarly, for the winter retreat, we find *kessai* 結制, the opening ceremony for the winter retreat under the fifteenth day of the tenth month, and *kaisei* 解制, the closing ceremony on the fifteenth day of the first month. T. 82, p. 772c-773b.

Disciples had more freedom of movement during the months between sessions, and it was during the off months that they were expected to carry out their other projects.⁹⁴ At this time, Japanese Rinzai monasteries occasionally held retreats at the discretion of the master who served as abbot, but it was not a regular feature of their practice. The holding of scheduled retreats was among the features of Ōbaku practice that attracted Japanese Zen monks in the early years of its development in Japan. This practice no longer distinguishes Ōbaku, since Rinzai monasteries also regularly keep the retreats as a result of reforms implemented in the eighteenth century by Hakuin.⁹⁵

The summer and winter retreats served an important purpose; these were periods when students made great progress in their practice because they could meditate intensely and meet with their master on a regular basis. There were also opportunities for individual monks to experience the leadership of another master. As with the other sects of Zen, Ōbaku monks habitually traveled to study under different masters, usually with their own master's consent. For example, Tetsugen spent a summer session with Chi-fei, with the permission of his master Mu-an. Monks from other Rinzai lines and from the Sôtô school often joined an Ōbaku assembly for one of these sessions, and it was in this way that firsthand knowledge of Ōbaku practice spread throughout the Zen world in Japan. This free exchange between monasteries had been the pattern of Zen practice in China for generations. Before Myôshin-ji posted new regulations in 1665 that banned this type of exchange, monks from the Myôshin-ji line had also participated.

A final attitude that characterizes Ōbaku Zen is its dedication to work among the common people. Buddhist monks have always served as religious teachers for lay believers, and Ōbaku masters also fulfilled this role. Examples of this kind of service are innumerable. Ōbaku monks

⁹⁴ We know this from Tetsugen's example. Mu-an made a special exception in allowing Tetsugen to carry on with his Tripitaka project throughout the year when Tetsugen had yet to receive his *inka*, which he received in 1676.

⁹⁵ Hakuin reinstituted the practice of keeping the yearly retreats in the mid-eighteenth century; Miura, *op.cit.*, p. 27.

wrote letters, composed lessons on Buddhism (法語 *hōgo*), sometimes in the vernacular (假名法語 *kana hōgo*), and preached sermons for the sake of lay believers. Yin-yüan tried to set an example of Buddhist compassion to lay people by regularly holding the ceremony for setting living creatures free.⁹⁶ However, Obaku masters sometimes went beyond the role of teacher to provide for the physical needs of the common people. Normally these activities would be the domain of lay believers, but lay people did not always have the expertise or the resources to meet immediate physical needs, especially in times of crisis. For example, Tetsugyū worked among the common people in the countryside and became well-known for building bridges and reclaiming swamp land for farming; Tetsugen spent most of his time working with the merchant classes in the urban centers and was known for distributing food and monetary aid during periods of severe famine. These two Japanese Obaku masters stand out in their dedication to relieving physical distress, but they are only the most prominent examples within the sect of this kind of public service.

⁹⁶ One of the ponds at Mampuku-ji was built specifically for this purpose and is called Hōjōchi 放生池.

Chapter Four

Obaku in the World of Japanese Zen Buddhism

Most scholars who write about Obaku Zen within the context of Tokugawa Buddhism remark that it deeply influenced early modern Buddhism, especially Zen Buddhism. Yet scholars have rarely commented in concrete terms on the nature of that influence, nor even given detailed information on the Obaku sect's relations with other schools of Zen in Japan. This chapter will explore these subjects in an effort to portray Obaku's position in the world of Japanese Zen during its first century in Japan, beginning with the initial rush of interest at the arrival of the founder, Yin-yüan, through the period of reform within Rinzai Zen under the Master Hakuin and in Sôtô Zen under Menzan. These are crucial years for the formation of Zen as it is known today in Japan, and Obaku did indeed play a role as a catalyst for reform. Obaku's influence on reform was in some respects direct and positive in nature, contributing specific elements and tendencies in its Zen style to the Japanese world of Zen. Examples of this positive influence are Obaku's contributions to the movement for monastic discipline as a means of reform and renewed interest in reading and studying the original Zen records of the masters, such as the *Rinzairoku*, rather than compilations like the *Hekiganroku*. However, Obaku also influenced Japanese Zen in an indirect manner. In response to a style of Zen quite foreign to that known in Japan, Japanese Rinzai masters, and to a lesser extent Sôtô masters, were stimulated to redefine and sharpen their own sense of what Zen practice ought to be.

Initial Responses to Obaku Zen

As discussed in the historical sketch of Obaku in chapter two, Yin-yüan's arrival in

Japan was anticipated by elements within the world of Japanese Zen, especially among the monks at Myōshin-ji who were already familiar with his writings. After his arrival, numerous monks and lay believers made the journey to Nagasaki to meet the master and pay their respects. In many cases Rinzai and Sōtō monks joined his assembly and practiced under his direction for a summer or winter retreat before returning to their home temples. This early stage in Ōbaku's history in Japan has been called "the Ingen boom", because of the magnitude of the Japanese excitement at the arrival of a prominent Chinese master. None of the earlier Ming arrivals had engendered such a response, but neither had they attained the stature in China that Yin-yüan enjoyed as the abbot of Wan-fu-ssu. There was at this time no reason to believe that Yin-yüan would be staying on permanently in Japan, and this no doubt contributed to the flood of visiting monks interested in observing at firsthand a Chinese style of Zen.

The visiting Japanese monks did not anticipate the changes in the overall Chinese Zen style that had occurred since regular contact with Chinese Zen masters had ceased some two or three centuries previously. They were therefore generally shocked by what they observed in the daily practice of the Chinese assembly, especially by the incorporation of Pure Land practices into the daily Zen rituals. None of them had actually traveled in China themselves as Japanese masters from earlier centuries had often done, so they were equally unprepared for the culture shock inherent in entering a foreign environment. That, in effect, was what they were doing when they joined Yin-yüan's assembly. Yin-yüan and his company maintained their usual patterns of life and kept to the monastic rules they had followed in China. Japanese monks encountered any number of new and unfamiliar practices and customs; they would have found themselves strangers in their own country, since it was they who were expected to adapt to Chinese ways in order to practice under Yin-yüan.

Evidence for this kind of response to the cultural and religious differences of Ōbaku practice are found in the letters of visiting monks, among which the finest and most detailed is Kyorei's letter reporting his impressions of Yin-yüan and his assembly at Kōfuku-ji during

the winter retreat of 1654-55. The following is a translation of most of the letter, excluding a portion related to the crisis in the temple's finances and the names of visitors that Yin-yüan received:

I arrived in Nagasaki at the beginning of the eighth month [of 1654] and met with Master [Yin-yüan]. When I was about to ask [permission] to return home, Yin-yüan detained me. Since the shogunate's administrator of [Nagasaki] and the assembly also asked me to remain, I have stayed on at Nan-king Temple [Kôfuku-ji]. The year is almost at an end, so I plan to return to Hiroshima in the middle of the first month next year.

Master Yin-yüan is in good health.

There are now about seventy Japanese monks and more than thirty Chinese monks. Yin-yüan opened the winter retreat on the fifteenth day of the tenth month, and the monks will meditate until the fifteenth day of the first month. The rule is being strictly observed. Japanese and Chinese monks are mingled together, but they cannot communicate. Moreover, both the Japanese and the Chinese monks are highly conceited, and there are occasional incidents. I am troubled as you can imagine. However, things are generally tranquil now. With my present detachment, I understand that it is not so unusual. I am very relieved. This is Master Yin-yüan's first retreat in Japan, and he is quite nervous. He entrusted the Japanese assembly to me, and concerns himself with the harmony of the whole assembly.

I have given Yin-yüan Tokuô's [message] and had it translated. He also received Master Ryôkei's [message] and was pleased.

It is reasonable to expect me to come down next Spring, but there are various difficulties at the temple, so it would be better if I didn't go far away. There is an unusual need for money....

As for inviting Yin-yüan to Myôshin-ji, I heard from the *shuso* Shin¹ 首座信 that Tokuô and Master Ryôkei and others have each taken steps. I would truly like to do the same, but I don't think that the assembly [at Myôshin-ji] is in accord. If the whole monastery were in agreement, then he could be invited with official government permission. Master Yin-yüan would very much like to meet Master Ryôkei. If the process of the invitation proceeds, then Yin-yüan should be able to go to Kyoto....

Shin has already told you about the monastic code, but I will comment briefly. It is very different from the one followed in Japan.

* Meals are three times a day. Early in the morning and at noon time there is rice gruel as usual. Again in the late afternoon there is rice gruel, and then in the evening there are tea and cakes. This is the daily routine. Between times, there are tea and cakes at odd hours. Some days they even eat six times! The monks have fat bellies. This is very different from Japan.

* After the morning service, the assembly proceeds to the abbot's quarters and bows three times. This is not done in Japan and is truly a splendid

¹ *Shuso* 首座 is a title used for the head monk who ranks just below the abbot. It may also refer to the monk who serves as supervisor of the summer or winter retreat. The identity of the monk Shin 信 is unknown.

custom.

* Entering the hall is quite inferior to the [manner followed] at Myôshin-ji.

* At the end of the morning service, the assembly chants *Namu Amida Butsu* while entering and exiting [the hall] (*gyôdô* 行道). The bells, drums and *mokugyo* have an interesting rhythm, but it is an inappropriate ritual for Japan. Every day it grates on one's ears. There are various other customs that I cannot remember, and so cannot recount them.

The manner of doing zazen seems very commendable. In general, if one looks closely, the outer form looks like Jôdo-shû, but the inner looks like Zen-shû. This is probably the pattern for monastic life [in China].

Among Yin-yüan's attendants, there is no one outstanding. The *Seidô* Dokuô (Ch. Tu-ying)² 西堂独応 is said to be clever. Next, the scribe (*shoki* 書記) named Dokuchi (Ch. Tu-ch'ih)³ 独知 is said to be well liked in China. Other than that, there is the attendant (*jisha* 侍者) Ryôen (Ch. Ken-yen)⁴ 良演 who behaves well. The one named Dokutan⁵ 独湛 works at his kôan single-mindedly, and even Yin-yüan is impressed by him. The others are of little talent, but they are concealed in a way unknown among Japanese. They have no sense and are unpleasant people.

Next year, one or two of Yin-yüan's Dharma heirs will be coming to Japan. It is rumored that twenty or thirty men will accompany them. Perhaps you could come down to Nagasaki once and see conditions for yourself.⁶

Kyorei intimates that the tensions which arose between Chinese and Japanese monks in these early days of enthusiasm for Obaku were the result of cultural differences. As he explained it, not only could the two groups not communicate with one another, but both sides were prideful. More than just spoken language divided them; the customs, manners, and assumptions that make up the unspoken language of the two cultures were in conflict. The theme of cultural tension underlies much of the interaction between Obaku and Japanese Rinzai Zen, and cultural differences may well have been as crucial as those in Zen style and

² *Seidô* 西堂 is the title given to a monk who has previously served as head monk at another temple. I have rendered the names in Japanese as Kyorei would have read them, since he does not seem to have been certain of the exact characters used by the Chinese monks. The identity of Dokuô is uncertain. He is probably the monk Tu-wang Hsing-yu 独往性幽 (n.d.; J. Dokuô Shôyû) who became Yin-yüan's disciple in 1651 and accompanied him to Nagasaki in 1654.

³ Identity uncertain. Probably the monk also known as Tu-chi 独痴 (n.d.; J. Dokuchi) who accompanied Yin-yüan to Nagasaki in 1654 and returned to China the following year.

⁴ Identity unknown.

⁵ Tu-chan Hsing-jung (1628-1706; J. Dokutan Shôkei) who would later become the fourth abbot at Mampuku-ji. See pp. 49-50 for more information.

⁶ Tsuji, op.cit., pp. 322-325.

teaching for determining Obaku's place in Japanese Buddhism.

Kyorei expresses concern about four basic topics, concerns that recur again and again in later Rinzai discussions of Obaku practice. Kyorei was a close friend of Tokuô and was regarded as an ally of the faction at Myôshin-ji that favored a strict adherence to the monastic code. He was therefore probably predisposed to appreciate Yin-yüan's Dharma style, and he tempers his negative remarks with several positive comments about his experience. This lends a balance to his observations not found in later Rinzai texts, which are one-sidedly negative in tone. The primary problem that Kyorei mentions is the difference between monastic codes followed by the Ming Chinese and the Japanese forms of Rinzai. Kyorei specifically refers to the Chinese practice of taking three meals each day, including one after the noon hour, a breach of the basic Buddhist precepts taken by all monks, including novices. The Japanese regarded such eating habits as detrimental to meditation, since a full stomach tends to make one sleepy.⁷ Second, Kyorei observes that the monks practice a form of *nembutsu* as a regular part of their morning service, and accurately theorizes that this combination of an external Pure Land veneer over a solid Zen core is the Chinese pattern of Zen. This incorporation of *nembutsu* into monastic practice, rather than the use of the so-called *nembutsu kôan* with lay people, would later draw the most caustic criticism against the Obaku style from Rinzai masters. Kyorei raises a third concern about the qualities in Obaku music and chanting, which he regards as inappropriate in a Japanese Zen context. The fourth issue is the generally low level of ability that Kyorei observed among Yin-yüan's Chinese disciples. Kyorei mentions that a few of Yin-yüan's Dharma heirs were expected at a later time, suggesting that more talented disciples than those included in the first group existed. The early arrivals were not an especially advanced group, and none had received Yin-yüan's *inka* before they left China. Other disciples, particularly Mu-an and Chi-fei, who had become Yin-yüan's Dharma heirs before he left China, emigrated later and did, in fact, prove to be more impressive. Nonetheless,

⁷ See *Zenrin shûhei shû*, vol. 1, p. 5b.

a theme runs subtly through most later Rinzai comments related to Ōbaku to the effect that the Chinese masters of the Ming period never quite measured up to Japanese expectations. The general opinion seems to have been that by this time, Japanese Zen masters had surpassed their Chinese counterparts.

As Kyorei's letter indicates, only a few months after Yin-yüan's arrival in Japan, the assembly at Myōshin-ji was already divided over what attitude the temple should take toward Yin-yüan and his Zen style. Histories of Myōshin-ji and biographies of the anti-Ōbaku participants, notably those of the master Gudō, agree that this issue split the assembly at Myōshin-ji into two factions.⁸ Ryōkei Shōsen 龍溪性潛, Tokuō Myōkō 禿翁妙宏 (1611-1681), and Jikuin Somon 竺印祖門 (1610-1677) were the core of the pro-Ōbaku party that supported inviting Yin-yüan to become abbot at Myōshin-ji. Gudō Tōshoku 愚堂東寔 (1577-1661) and Daigu Sōchiku 大愚宗築 (1584-1669) led the other faction which vehemently opposed such an action. The latter faction succeeded in blocking the invitation and thereupon became the dominant party at Myōshin-ji. These pro- and anti-Ōbaku factions of the late 1650's reflect the preexisting division within the temple concerning the appropriate interpretation of the monastic code within the Rinzai school. Both factions sought the same end, the restoration and revitalization of Rinzai, but disagreed as to the best method for attaining their goals. One may regard this division as a variation of the recurrent tension between Zen freedom and the limitations of maintaining the precepts that arises throughout Zen history and indeed throughout Buddhist history.⁹

The pro-Ōbaku faction included those monks who preferred a strict interpretation of the monastic code and regarded monastic discipline as the best means to reform Rinzai, a position referred to derisively as *Jikai Zen* 持戒禪, maintain the precepts Zen, by its opponents.

⁸ See Kawakami, *Myōshinjiishi*, p. 453-454; Tamamura Takeji, *Rinzaishūshi*, p. 251; Itō Kokan, *Gudō*, pp. 120-121; Ogisu Jundō, *Myōshinji*, p. 96.

⁹ A more detailed discussion of the tensions within the Zen teachings regarding the proper understanding of the precepts will follow in Chapter 8, pp. 277-278.

This approach had been championed by such Myōshin-ji masters as Ungo Kiyō and Isshi Monju, though neither was involved in the later Ōbaku dispute. Isshi had died in 1646, some eight years before Yin-yüan's arrival; at least one of Isshi's former disciples, Dokushō Shōen 独照性円 (1617-1694), who shared Isshi's views on strict monastic discipline, participated in the pro-Ōbaku faction. Ungo had served as abbot of Myōshin-ji for a brief time in 1645, but then left the temple under unfortunate circumstances. Ungo had actively advocated the use of the *nembutsu* as a device appropriate for lay practice. Although his position was not Pure Land in the strict sense, it scandalized members of the Myōshin-ji community to such an extent that there was a movement among them to defrock him for bringing shame on Rinzai Zen with his Pure Land contamination.¹⁰ Opposition to Ungo was lead by Gudō and Daigu, central figures in both the anti-Ōbaku party and the faction opposed to strict interpretation of the precepts. Long before Yin-yüan and Ōbaku Zen came on the Japanese scene, Myōshin-ji had begun its struggle over strict monastic discipline and inclusion of Pure Land elements in Rinzai teachings.

Gudō Tōshuku served as abbot at Myōshin-ji three times, and it was from his line that the great eighteenth century reformer Hakuin would descend. Gudō and his supporters regarded strict interpretations of the precepts as a formalism inappropriate to the Zen context. They took a position described as "preserving the precepts from a position without precepts" (戒無き所に戒を保持すべし) or "formless precepts of the mind" (無相心地戒 *musō shinchī kai*).¹¹ It was their contention that adherence to the precepts was a natural result of enlightenment but that preservation of the Patriarch's Zen style required a transcendence

¹⁰ Ogisu Jundō discusses this in his biography of Ungo in *Myōshinji*, pp. 71-84. Even Ungo's own disciples were scandalized by their master's popular teaching style and sought his help in understanding his position. It eventually became clear that Ungo was advocating a form of *koshin mida* 己心弥陀 (Amida within the self) and *yuishin jōdo* 唯心淨土 (Pure Land only in the mind), closer to the Ōbaku understanding than a strict Pure Land interpretation. See also Hirano Sōjō, *Ungo oshō nempū*, especially pp. 18 and 23.

¹¹ Kawakami, op.cit., pp. 453-454.

beyond formalistic adherence.¹²

In a practical sense, the lines regarding Obaku had already been drawn long before Yin-yüan left China, because both sides were aware of his position on this issue through their reading of his recorded sayings three years prior to his emigration. Yin-yüan and his predecessors at Wan-fu-ssu advocated a strict interpretation of monastic discipline which made him the natural ally of the one faction and an adversary to the other. Ryôkei and his group hoped to strengthen their position at Myôshin-ji by inviting the prominent Chinese master to be abbot. Gudô and his party recognized this for the threat that it was and opposed all of Ryôkei's plans as they emerged. Gudô developed a purist position regarding Myôshin-ji, claiming that the temple was reserved exclusively for direct descendents of its founder Kanzan Egen 關山慧玄. Gudô argued that Myôshin-ji monks could not serve as abbots at temples affiliated with other Dharma lines, nor could Dharma heirs from other Rinzai lines serve as abbot at Myôshin-ji line temples.¹³

Even after plans to invite Yin-yüan to serve as abbot were abandoned and he was invited instead to Fumon-ji in Settsu, Gudô remained inflexible in his opposition to Yin-yüan. Despite Yin-yüan's high status, Gudô never made the trip to Settsu to greet him. According to a passage in the *Obaku geki*, he felt that it was Yin-yüan's place, as a visiting foreign monk, to approach him, the highest ranking Rinzai monk in Japan.¹⁴ Gudô knew quite well that Yin-yüan was being held at Fumon-ji under house arrest and could not make the short trip to Kyoto. However, a few years later when Yin-yüan was finally granted some freedom of movement and made a tour of the temples in Kyoto in 1659, he did stop at Myôshin-ji. On

¹² For a description of Gudô's position on the precepts, see Itô Kokan, *op.cit.*, pp. 228-231.

¹³ Gudô based this argument on the *Shûmon shôtôroku* 宗門正燈祿 by Tôyô Eichô 東陽英朝 (1429-1504), the founder of the Tôyô line of the Myôshin-ji lineage from which Gudô descended. See Ogisu Jundô, *Myôshinji*, p. 96 and Itô Kokan, *op.cit.*, p. 121 for quotations from Gudô's original argument.

¹⁴ *Obaku geki*, p. 12b.

that occasion, Gudô, who was then abbot, refused to greet him formally. The two men apparently exchanged unpleasanties indirectly through intermediaries. According to Myôshin-ji accounts, their exchange lead to Yin-yüan's abrupt departure.¹⁵ During the visit, Yin-yüan did pay his respects to Kanzan at the founder's pagoda, but otherwise stayed at Jikuin's subtemple, Ryôge-in, for three days in all.

Gudô's rejection of Yin-yüan's Zen style extended beyond the issue of monastic discipline. As with Ungo, Gudô objected to the inclusion of Pure Land elements in his Zen practice. According to Gudô's *nempû*, when Jikuin came to him seeking permission for Yin-yüan's above-mentioned visit, Gudô asked whether it was true or not that Yin-yüan practiced the *nembutsu*. According to the text, Jikuin hesitated when he saw Gudô's stern expression and so denied it. Gudô replied, "Ungo chanted the *nembutsu*, and now Yin-yüan does so as well. Even were I to fall to the lowest of the 80,000 hells, deep down I would still adhere to Patriarch Zen. We do not yet know whether Yin-yüan's Zen will prove to be a help or a detriment to our sect in the future. It is difficult to argue the point, so I will just leave it up to the assembly."¹⁶

Relations with Myôshin-ji after the Founding of Mampuku-ji

When Yin-yüan was granted permission by the Tokugawa bakufu to build a new temple and then received both the land and the funding to do so, the direct threat of Obaku having undue influence on Myôshin-ji seemed to have been averted. Obaku would become an independent line in Japan without direct links to Myôshin-ji line temples. Yet tensions between the two groups did not ease, but rather escalated. The existence of Obaku-san Mampuku-ji posed a new and different kind of threat to Myôshin-ji, and it responded in even sharper

¹⁵ See, for instance, Kawakami, *op.cit.*, pp. 462-463, and Itô's version, *op.cit.*, p. 121.

¹⁶ The passage in the original Chinese can be found in Itô Kokan's article "Gudô kokushi no zen", p. 13. For a Japanese translation, see Itô, *Gudô*, p. 123.

terms.

To understand the nature of Obaku's threat, several facts must be born in mind. First, Obaku received strong backing from the government on both national and local levels. That is to say, Obaku monks and temples enjoyed the patronage of the bakufu in Edo as well as from various local *daimyō* who governed the provinces. The retired emperor Gomizunoo also seemed to favor Yin-yüan's line, probably because of his established relationship with Master Ryōkei. The newly founded Obaku line was thus in a strong position politically. As will be seen later, Myōshin-ji monks criticized Obaku for its political connections, perhaps because these connections made its growth possible. Furthermore, the new line almost immediately gained a small but growing number of branch temples. These included the three existing Chinese temples in Nagasaki as well as some former Myōshin-ji temples, such as Ryōkei's own Fumon-ji in Settsu.¹⁷ Supporters of the new sect, many of them former members of the Myōshin-ji line like Ryōkei, Chōon, and Tetsugyū, set out to spread the Obaku line by establishing new temples.¹⁸ Since bakufu regulations prohibited building new ones, this often took the form of changing the affiliation of an existing temple from its previous main temple to Mampuku-ji. Studies of Edo period temple listings would have to be done on a case by case basis to determine the exact numbers, but many of these temples were originally branch temples of Myōshin-ji. This was only natural, since the former Myōshin-ji line monks who joined Obaku had strong connections with them. Obaku therefore represented a significant drain on Myōshin-ji's material and human resources.

Myōshin-ji took steps to stem the tide of defections to Obaku. For example, two or three monks from Ryōan-ji, a branch temple where Ryōkei had previously served as abbot,

¹⁷ According to the *Zengaku daijiten* (Tokyo: Komazawa University, 1985, rev. ed., p. 1099), Fumon-ji reverted to its former status as a Myōshin-ji line temple after Ryōkei's death. Nonetheless, Obaku sources continued to include it in their official listings of branch temples as late as the Meiji period. See Takenuku, *Kinsei Obakushu matsuji chōshūsei*, p. 301.

¹⁸ According to the listings of Obaku temples in Takenuki, *Kinsei Obakushu matsuji chōshūsei*, Chōon founded twenty-three temples and Tetsugyū founded twenty.

were placed under house arrest for one hundred days and not allowed any contact with the outside world during that time as a punishment for their association with Ōbaku.¹⁹ Gudō intended to expel anyone who did not return immediately to Myōshin-ji, targeting Ryōkei in particular. Ryōkei was the most prominent member of the Myōshin-ji community to support Yin-yüan and consequently came under the fiercest attack. It is not clear if Gudō's threat to expel them actually contributed to the eventual return of several pro-Ōbaku monks, including Jikuin and Tokuō, but the timing of their return suggests that it may have influenced their decision. Jikuin broke with Ryōkei first and had returned to Myōshin-ji before Yin-yüan's trip to Edo in 1658. If one follows the account in the *Ōbaku geki*, Tokuō would have left Yin-yüan's assembly the following year in order to participate in the three hundredth anniversary celebration of the founding of Myōshin-ji by Kanzan.²⁰ According to Kawakami's history of Myōshin-ji, Tokuō did not return until 1662, a year after Gudō's death when the more sympathetic Tangetsu (1607-1672) 湛月 was serving as abbot.²¹

Gudō's intention to expel monks who were associated with Ōbaku took on concrete form after his death when the assembly at Myōshin-ji took two actions in 1665. In that year, the temple rewrote its posted regulations (壁書 *hekisho*) to prohibit explicitly its monks from practicing at other temples. The assembly formally decided to expel Ryōkei, defrocking him as a Myōshin-ji line monk.²² Ryōkei had become Yin-yüan's Dharma heir in the first month of

¹⁹ Cited in Tsuji Zennosuke, *op.cit.*, p. 359. Hirakubo also relates a similar account in *op.cit.*, pp. 225-226, indicating that his source was Kawakami Kozan's *Myōshinjishi*. He does not give a full citation and I have been unable to locate the passage.

²⁰ *Ōbaku geki*, p. 9b.

²¹ Kawakami, *op.cit.*, p. 463. Although Kawakami gives Tangetsu's *hōki* 法諱 as Hōzan 法山, the *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten* lists his name as Tangetsu Shōen 湛月紹円. Based on the contents of the biography, it is clearly the same person. Tangetsu had been in correspondence with Yin-yüan since his early days in Nagasaki, and had greeted the Chinese master with great pleasure. Although Tangetsu remained a Myōshin-ji line monk, he stayed on cordial terms with the Ōbaku masters. See Otsuki, *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten*, pp. 221-222.

²² According to Tamamura, fourteen or fifteen other monks were also expelled at the same time, *Rinzaishūshi*, pp. 251-252. I have found no other reference to these numbers. It is possible that

1664 and had changed his Dharma name from Sōsen 宗潜 to Shōsen 性潜.²³ Given the timing and wording of the new regulations, Ryōkei's defection seems to have been the final straw that precipitated the formal action taken at Myōshin-ji.

The revised regulations were posted at Myōshin-ji on 1665/7/11. They read:

- It is an old temple rule that monks in our founder Kanzan's lineage do not hang their staffs [i.e. enter to practice] at other temples. Recently, there have been several people who have gone to other temples to practice, have changed their robes, altered their appearance, or changed their Dharma names. These monks have forgotten their debt of gratitude to their [original] master and lost their sense of gratitude toward their home temple. Since this is not appropriate behavior for a monk, they will not be permitted to return to their home temple.
- In recent years, [monks] at various branch temples of [Myōshin-ji] have wrongly performed the rituals of other temples, rituals of a kind that have never been heard in the three hundred years [of Myōshin-ji's existence]. Those who have forgotten their home temple's old ceremonies and have turned their backs on the strict procedures of our tradition are sinners against our sect. Henceforth they must promptly desist.
- The above matter should be regarded as a firm rule to protect the home temple. Hereafter, anyone who violates it will suffer the calamity of expulsion.²⁴

Although the regulation does not explicitly mention Ōbaku temples or specific monks, it was obviously designed to punish monks like Ryōkei who had gone to Ōbaku temples to practice under Yin-yüan and the other Ōbaku masters. The first clause seems to describe Ryōkei in particular, since it mentions changing the Dharma name. The mention of changing robes and appearances would have been a more general reference, since all Japanese monks who entered Ōbaku assemblies were expected to change to Chinese robes and to follow such Chinese practices as shaving their heads less frequently and letting their nails grow long.

Ryōkei and another Myōshin-ji monk, Teijū Ezen 提宗慧全 (1592-1668), met and most of these monks are not mentioned elsewhere because they were of low rank.

²³ Ryōkei had originally received *inka* under Master Hakubu Eryō 伯蒲慧稜 (often written 慧陵) and became his Dharma heir. Hakubu died in 1629, and Ryōkei succeeded him as abbot at Ryōan-ji. Little else is known about Hakubu except that he was one of the monks who took a moderate position toward the bakufu in the Purple Robe Affair. See the discussion of the Purple Robe Affair, pp. 146-148.

²⁴ Translation is based on the full text found in Minamoto Ryōen, op.cit., pp. 88-89. Tsuji provides a portion of the text, op.cit., p. 359.

designed a response to the revised regulations, which they issued in 1667. Teijû was among those punished by the assembly at Myôshin-ji, in his case for implementing the Ōbaku monastic code along with the Ōbaku style of ritual and practice at his temple, Ryûhō-ji 龍峰寺, in Tottori. The second clause of the Posted Regulations was probably written to address his case. Teijû composed the response and sent it anonymously to four officials at Myôshin-ji. The text begins by praising Yin-yüan and extolling his arrival in Japan as a special opportunity for Japanese Zen. It then answers the points made in the Posted Regulations one by one. The heart of the argument is that the new regulations would prevent Japanese Rinzai from reaping the benefits of contact with Yin-yüan's Zen style. Teijû points out that Kanzan himself changed teachers and Dharma names during his own search for enlightenment, and that to limit individual monks and branch temples from enjoying the benefits of contact with other teachers defies the original purpose of Rinzai Zen.²⁵

Myôshin-ji answered this anonymous letter with the *Takkyakumon* 答客問, a counter response written by the monk Mumon Genshin 無門原真 (1627-1686).²⁶ Mumon calls those who object to the old rules of Myôshin-ji and/or its Zen style traitors. He argues that in Japan there is a Japanese Buddhist Dharma, and that Chinese robes, music and the like are disruptive of it. Therefore, it would be a terrible error for Myôshin-ji monks to regard Yin-yüan as a model to be imitated. When in Japan, Chinese monks should conform to Japanese norms. Although Mumon claims that Myôshin-ji's relations with Yin-yüan were friendly and that the temple only wanted to prevent its members and subtemples from committing the error of assimilation to a foreign Zen style, that was not the case. Relations between the two temples remained tense for many years, and monks from Myôshin-ji continued to compose texts critical of Ōbaku and

²⁵ Minamoto provides a lengthy summary of the original text, op.cit., pp. 90-94. Tsuji gives a much shorter summary, op.cit., p. 360.

²⁶ I have been unable to locate the original document. Minamoto and Tsuji provide only very brief descriptions of it, so it is difficult to evaluate the nature of the argument. See Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 94-95 and Tsuji, op.cit., pp. 360-361.

its monks.

The *Zenrin shûhei shû*

In 1700, one such critical text, the *Zenrin shûhei shû* 禪林執弊集, was published for the stated purpose of exposing the persistent evil habits which had grown within the Zen sect.²⁷ The preface indicates that the author is "an anonymous descendent of Hanazono" (花園末葉無名子 *Hanazono no matsuyô mummyôshi*), but it is generally accepted that Keirin Sûshin 桂林崇 (1652-1728), the 313th abbot of Myôshin-ji, actually authored the piece. The text comprises two fascicles which include a total of thirty-seven sections. Each section evaluates one evil practice or a text that the author finds harmful in some way to the Zen sect. Although the central focus of the subjects covered relates to Rinzai Zen, with the Obaku line clearing falling under that rubric, the author makes use of Sôtô resources whenever deemed applicable or useful. Indeed, the preface indicates the author took an all-encompassing view of Zen, beginning with the comment, "There are some twenty lines of Zen [in Japan], from those of the forerunners Dôgen and Eisai down to the rear guards Yin-yüan and [Hsin-yueh] Hsing-ch'ou."²⁸ Under the guise of a series of exchanges between a student and his master, each section follows the format of question and answer.

Although not its sole object of criticism, a large proportion of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* relates to Obaku Zen either directly or indirectly. In some sections, the author mentions individual Obaku monks by name, or, more commonly, makes general references to "Ming monks" who have come to Japan. There are also a few specific cases where the subject

²⁷ *Zenrin shûhei shû*, woodblock edition, two fascicles, Kyoto, 1700. The second fascicle bears the title *Zoku zenrin shûhei shû* 續禪林執弊集, and is believed to be by the same author. Scholars generally refer to the two volumes as a single work.

²⁸ Hsin-yueh Hsing-ch'ou 興儔心越 (1639-1696; J. Kôchû Shin'etsu) was a Chinese monk of the Sôtô sect who came to Japan in 1677. Although he received *inka* from a Sôtô master in China long before he came to Japan, he visited and practiced under a number of Obaku and Rinzai masters while traveling through Japan.

matter strongly suggests criticism of individual Obaku monks or Obaku practices, but the author makes no direct reference to them as such. In all, seventeen sections are critical of Obaku Zen, eleven out of the twenty-two sections in the first fascicle, and six out of the fifteen in the second. For the sake of analysis, I have divided the criticisms against Obaku into four categories: 1) criticism leveled indirectly; 2) criticisms based on differences in Zen style; 3) defensive responses to Obaku criticisms of Japanese Rinzai; and 4) criticisms against specific individuals.

The first two sections of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* make no direct mention of Obaku Zen, neither referring to Obaku monks by name, nor using the more generic reference to "Ming monks", but the nature of the evil practices discussed suggests that Obaku is among the intended targets.²⁹ Section one discusses the proper use of offertory incense (嗣法香 *shihôkô* or 法香 *hokô*) which a master offers to express gratitude to his Dharma master. The text argues against the practice of dividing up the offertory incense to recognize one's debt of gratitude toward various other masters, not just the Dharma master from whom one has inherited the Dharma. According to the writer, this practice is disrespectful, because it indicates that the monk has forgotten his *on* 恩, the debt of gratitude owed to his Dharma master. This section may well be aimed at Ryôkei and others like him who figuratively if not literally divided their loyalties when they accepted the Dharma from Obaku masters. The second section criticizes slighting one's own Dharma lineage by inappropriately taking up residence at the temple of another lineage. In this case, the author specifically refers to the Sôtô practice of changing lineage whenever becoming abbot at a temple related to a different line (因院易嗣 *in'inekishi*). At the very time of the *Zenrin shûhei shû*'s publication, the Sôtô reformer Manzan was leading a movement against this practice, which had become the norm in Sôtô Zen

²⁹ Tsuji includes these two sections in his listing of sections from the *Zenrin shûhei shû* related to Obaku, with the observation that they apply to Ryôkei in particular, Tsuji, *op.cit.*, pp. 362-363. Unfortunately, Tsuji provides no other analysis of the material. In most cases he merely lists the title of the section without further comment.

temples two hundred years previously.³⁰ The issue was thus a topic for debate within the Zen world at that time. Neither Rinzai nor Obaku accepted this practice within their own schools, but it did sometimes occur.³¹ The author may have intended the criticism to apply to monks who crossed over from one Rinzai line to another, specifically from Myōshin-ji to Obaku. He may well have had Ryōkei's acceptance of Yin-yüan's Dharma specifically in mind, although Ryōkei's case was somewhat different from the Sôtō practice, which was the institutional norm and could involve several changes during a monk's career.

The second set of criticisms relates to differences in Zen style that existed between Japanese Rinzai and the Ming style represented by Obaku. The author of the *Zenrin shūhei shū* regards these differences as evidence of deterioration in Zen practice in China where, he explains, abuses of the accepted monastic code had become the norm. In most cases, these criticisms reflect changes in monastic practice that occurred in China between the Sung dynasty when Zen was transmitted to Japan and the late Ming period when Obaku masters emigrated. For example, the seating order of the monks customary in Obaku temples is based on the so-called "uncle-nephew" (叔姪 *shukutetsu*) system commonly used in Ming China. Monks are ranked according to their lineage's relative position in the overall Obaku line. The *Zenrin shūhei shū* dismisses this practice as "a wicked habit of these latter days," because in the Japanese context it appeared to be an innovation. In Japan, Zen temples preferred an arrangement based on length of practice and personal advancement that had been used at the Japanese Gozan temples since the thirteenth or fourteenth

³⁰ According to William M. Bodiford, Keirin Sūshin, the probable author of the *Zenrin shūhei shū*, participated in the Sôtō dispute. He wrote a tract in 1704 which defended Manzan's position in the *Shūtō fukko* 宗統復古志 dispute and refuted the work of Manzan's detractor Jōzan, the *Shōbō Tekiden Shishi Ikkushū* 正法嫡伝獅子一吼集. See "Dharma Transmission in Sôtō Zen; Manzan Dohaku's Reform Movement", p. 443. It is quite possible that the movements of Myōshin-ji line monks over to Obaku motivated Keirin to take a stand against the Sôtō practice.

³¹ The Posted Rules at Myōshin-ji explicitly forbade crossovers of any sort. See pp. 106-107 above. The Obaku master Chōon is known to have fought against related abuses of Dharma lineage within the Obaku sect. See Bodiford, "Dharma Transmission in Sôtō Zen; Manzan Dōhaku's Reform Movement", p. 434.

century.³² In a similar manner, changes that had occurred in the use of celebratory incense and the introduction of prayer amulets between the early Sung and the late Ming are said to be the result of debasement in the Zen style in China. Had contact not been virtually severed between the Chinese and Japanese Zen communities for two to three centuries, these changes in Chinese practice would have appeared more gradually and would have seemed less abrupt and foreign to Japanese observers.

In several sections, the *Zenrin shûhei shû* echoes themes first introduced in Kyorei's report on Yin-yüan's assembly. First and foremost are changes in the monastic code observed at Obaku temples. In a number of sections, these changes are interpreted as Ming departures from some universal Zen monastic code preserved in Japan but corrupted or lost in China. For example, Obaku music and chanting, which clearly offended many Japanese Rinzai monks, is the result of Ming Zen having "forgotten the eternal rule of Pai-chang."³³ The differences held up for censure range in nature from relatively major changes in ritual observance to minor issues like alterations in the names of temple buildings and wording on temple sign boards. In a section dedicated to listing a number of smaller examples, the author suggests that the underlying reason for all these abuses of Zen etiquette and custom is that Ming monks were not sufficiently familiar with the standard Zen code. The text reads:

They have not memorized the rule, so they think that the style in [Japanese] Zen monasteries is not correct.... I heard that once Yin-yüan had come to Japan, he began to read the *Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei*. He said that in Ming China it had been lost for a long time, but fortunately in Japan he could read

³² Ranking based on personal advancement refers to the practice of seating retired superiors, monks who had served as abbots, either in their current temple of residence (東堂 *tôdô*) or another temple (西堂 *seidô*), ahead of the other monks. It is not clear that Gozan temples used only personal advancement and years since ordination as criteria for ranking their monks. In the *Rinsen kakun* 臨川家訓, a monastic code written for the *jisetsu* ranked temple Rinsen-ji, the Zen Master Musô Soseki 夢窓疎石 [1275-1351] argued for a combination of years since ordination and the age of the monks involved. See Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, p. 157-158.

³³ *Zenrin shûhei shû*, vol. 1, p. 5a.

it and emerge from the mists of ignorance. How true!³⁴

It is not at all clear to which version of the Pai-chang code the text is referring. Ming editions of the Chinese Tripitaka included the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* 敕修百丈清規 (J. *Chokushû Hyakujô shingi*), the Yüan dynasty text then believed to be a version of Pai-chang's original code. This had already been transmitted to Japan in the fourteenth century. Obaku masters certainly had access to this text, since Wan-fu-ssu possessed an edition of the Tripitaka and Yin-yüan had brought his own copy with him to Japan.³⁵ In any event, given Obaku's dedication to strict monastic discipline, the suggestion that Obaku masters did not fully understand this classical Zen code or had lost it altogether is especially severe. It undermines one of the basic characteristics of Obaku's Zen style. There is a strong sense here that the author of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* believed that the true practice of pure Chinese Zen was preserved only in Japanese Rinzai temples and not in the contemporary Chinese style of Obaku Zen.

The author of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* comes very close to saying precisely that in a section on proper etiquette for wearing the Zen monk's cap. Having quoted from the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* and listed appropriate times to remove the cap, he observes, "Fortunately, this kind of old rule still exists in the Zen monasteries of Japan today and can still be observed."³⁶ What follows is a rather strange discussion of Ming etiquette, with explicit references to the Obaku line, presumably designed to show that unlike the Japanese, the Chinese had corrupted the Zen code. Although he never explicitly explains what differences exist in the Chinese behavior, he offers a variety of possible explanations for them: they

³⁴ Ibid., vol. 1, 7 a-b.

³⁵ The text also appears as text number 1636, volumes 1 and 2 in box number 263 in the Obaku-ban, Tetsugen's edition of the Tripitaka which was based on the Ming edition from Yin-yüan's private library.

³⁶ *Zenrin shûhei shû*, vol. 1, p. 6a.

imitate popular secular custom; they wish to disguise their worldly appearance³⁷; or they mistakenly believe that monk's caps serve the same purpose as the headdress of government officials, etc. It seems likely that the underlying issue in this section is the offensiveness of the overtly Chinese appearance retained at Obaku temples where Chinese dress and grooming remained the norm.

In a related section, the author identifies running quickly during *kinhin* 經行, the walking meditation performed as a break during sessions of seated meditation, as a late development introduced to Japan by Ming monks. He decries it as a form of lunacy rather than a true Zen practice. It is interesting that in this case, the writer has actually given precedence to the Sôtô manner of meditation and, appropriately, selects a passage from a Japanese Sôtô text, the *Keizan shingi*, to defend the superiority of slower-paced *kinhin*.³⁸ Once again, the author provides an explanation for the Ming innovation.

I personally believe that the Zen style of contemporary Ming China has degenerated. They don't even keep the fast! Noon and night they eat whenever they feel like it. They are always sated. Therefore, when they sit in meditation, their minds sink into darkness and sleep can easily overtake them. Even if they raise their body and shift their legs, they still don't wake up. Therefore they are trying to focus their attention by walking fast and running around. Is this skill in samadhi? It is not. It is a crazy practice. It cannot rightly be called *kinhin*.³⁹

This time, he argues that a breach in the most basic rules for novices results in a decline in practice. The Chinese overeat, and so must resort to running to stay awake during meditation sessions. Here the *Zenrin shûhei shû* carries on a theme mentioned by Kyorei, but develops it much further and in more negative terms. While Kyorei praised the meditation

³⁷ The mention of worldly appearance refers to the Chinese monastic custom of allowing the hair to grow for a longer period of time before shaving. See pp. 89-90 above for a detailed discussion on this and other differences in Obaku monks' appearance.

³⁸ Dôgen taught that to maintain the concentration of seated meditation during the breaks for *kinhin*, monks should walk at a slow, measured pace. See Bielefeldt, *Dogen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*, p. 116n.

³⁹ *Zenrin shûhei shû*, vol. 1, pp. 5b-6a.

he observed at Kôfuku-ji, the *Zenrin shûhei shû* implies that Ōbaku's departure from the monastic code severely undermines the ability to meditate. As mentioned earlier, it is unclear what basis such critical comments have in fact, since textual evidence from the *Ōbaku shingi* suggests that Ōbaku temples maintained the general Buddhist prohibition against eating after the noon meal.

A third group of criticisms represent Japanese responses to explicit and implicit Ōbaku criticisms of the Rinzai style dominant in Japan. Ōbaku masters made extensive use of the recorded sayings (語録 *goroku*) of earlier Zen masters, especially the *Rinzairoku* 臨濟錄. These original texts were given preference over the major collections of kôan such as the *Hekiganroku* 碧巖錄 that were more influential in Japan than in Ming China.⁴⁰ Ōbaku masters encouraged the study of these Zen texts in a manner not commonly seen in Japanese Rinzai temples before Ōbaku influence. They sought not to use small portions of them as kôans, although that practice was not unknown in Ōbaku, but rather to read and understand the text as a whole. Yin-yüan and other Ōbaku masters based their own recorded sayings on these original texts, explaining them or applying them to the immediate context concerning their disciples. Ōbaku's alternative emphasis was seen as an implicit criticism of Japanese Rinzai for its reliance on kôan collections rather than the reading of recorded sayings in their entirety. Although the *Zenrin shûhei shû* section that discourages the use of Zen texts for study rather than practice contains no direct reference to Ōbaku, explication of recorded sayings was so closely associated with Ōbaku monks that it is regarded as a criticism of Ōbaku.⁴¹

The *Zenrin shûhei shû* becomes overtly defensive when it examines two Ōbaku texts that expressed criticism of the Japanese use of kôan collections, the *Bukai nanshin* (sometimes read *Mukai nanshin*) 霧海南針 of Chôn Dôkai 潮音道海 (1628-1695), and Ryôkei's

⁴⁰ According to Yanagida Seizan, Japanese Rinzai had used the *Hekigan roku* as its guiding text, and that it was Yin-yüan who inspired the movement toward direct study of the original Zen literature, especially the *Rinzai roku*, that began in the early Tokugawa period; *Rinzai nôto*, p. 203-204.

⁴¹ See Tsuji, *op.cit.*, p. 363.

Shûtôroku 宗統録.⁴² It should be noted that both of these texts were written by Japanese Obaku masters who had originally studied under Japanese teachers. They both had a first-hand familiarity with the approach to kôan practice then prevalent throughout the Japanese Rinzai world. As the *Zenrin shûhei shû* explains, this system was based on a series of three hundred kôan, with the one hundred cases from the *Hekiganroku* forming the heart of the process.⁴³ It is difficult to know exactly how kôan were used by the early Obaku masters, but they were probably not as dependent on the traditional kôan collections as were the Japanese. It is said that Obaku masters often invented kôan spontaneously for their students to suit the situation, in addition to assigning more traditional cases.⁴⁴ The master Chi-fei, under whom Chôn studied for a time, was said to be especially talented at inventing kôan to meet the specific needs of his students. Chôn's experience with Chi-fei may have contributed to his negative appraisal of the Japanese system on kôan study.

Chôn wrote the *Bukai nanshin* in 1666 as a *kana hôgo* for a lay woman who lived in Edo. The text maps out a form of Zen not based on kôan practice but rather on the four vows and the six perfections.⁴⁵ In the passage quoted from the *Bukai nanshin*, Chôn attacks the

⁴² The author has been unable to examine these texts, and is thus unable to verify the passages cited in the *Zenrin shûhei shû*.

⁴³ The relevant passage reads, "If Nanshin [Chôn] wants to know our three hundred kôan cases, first the one hundred cases in the *Hekigan roku* are known as the main practice. Then there are the hundred cases of prior practice known as the Pre-Hekigan and the later hundred cases known as the Post-Hekigan." Yampolsky provides some background information on this system in his introduction to *The Zen Master Hakuin*, p. 14.

⁴⁴ According to Furuta Shôkin, Chôn was attracted to Obaku because of its basic approach to Zen which did not focus exclusively on traditional kôan cases. Yin-yüan and his predecessors Fei-yin and Mi-yun revived the T'ang style of Zen which stressed an immediate form of interaction between master and disciple, rather than relying upon traditional kôan cases as became the norm from the Sung dynasty onwards. See "Chôn Dôkai no Rinzai/Sôtô hihan", pp. 420-422. It later became common practice for Japanese Rinzai masters to invent kôan for their disciples, particularly after Hakuin's restoration of Rinzai; this remains the case today.

⁴⁵ The four vows are: 1) to save all sentient beings; 2) to extinguish all the afflictions; 3) to study all Buddhist teachings; and 4) to attain the supreme Buddha way. The six perfections are charity, observance of the precepts, perseverance, energy, meditation, and wisdom. For a brief description of the contents of the *Bukai nanshin*, see Ogisu Jundô, "Chôn Dôkai ni tsuite", pp. 219-233.

fossilized practice of kōan that he had experienced as a Rinzai monk in his youth.

They just memorized the kōans of the ancient masters and reduced the practice of Zen to written language and conversational language. Or they would choose from the three hundred cases in the *Hekiganroku* and take that to be kōan practice. As the secular proverb says, they were keeping count. They kept careful count of their comings and goings and called that the Great Awakening of Enlightenment.⁴⁶

Chōon describes here a manner of kōan study then prevalent in Japan in which the Zen student mastered the literary content of the classical Chinese kōan without necessarily seeking to penetrate any one of them for an enlightenment experience. In this approach, the master need not be enlightened himself, but only to have gone through the same regimen of study.⁴⁷ Obaku masters like Chōon were not alone in criticizing the Japanese system. Japanese Rinzai masters also realized that there was a basic problem in the Rinzai practice of kōan in the early Tokugawa period, and one of the reforms attributed to the eighteenth century Rinzai master Hakuin was the revitalization of the kōan system.⁴⁸ Hakuin may well have taken a view much like Chōon's of the kōan practice that existed before his time, since he himself developed a more dynamic approach.

The passage in the *Zenrin shūhei shū*, taken from Ryōkei's *Shūtōroku*, is critical of relying on the second edition of the *Hekiganshū*, the only version of the text then extant, because of the corruptions in the text.⁴⁹ Ryōkei admits that with careful study, one may

⁴⁶ *Zenrin shūhei shū*, vol. 1, pp. 16b-17a.

⁴⁷ According to Furuta, Chōon not only objected to kōan practice as it was known in his time, but to kōan practice in general; he says that Chōon felt that all kōan practice leads almost inevitably to the danger of "counting Zen" in which the student tries to master the language of one kōan after another rather than seeking enlightenment. See "Chōon Dōkai no Rinzai/Sōtō hihan", pp. 418-420.

⁴⁸ For a description of some of Hakuin's reforms, including his kōan system, see Miura, *op.cit.*, pp. 25-30.

⁴⁹ Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163; J. Daie Sōkō) destroyed the original woodblocks for the text soon after its first publication in 1128. The text was later reconstructed and published again in 1300 by the lay believer Chang Ming-yūan 張明遠 (n.d.; J. Chō Myōen). See Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History*, volume 1, p. 248. It was the second edition, transmitted in the early fourteenth century, that was used in Japan. Dōgen brought a hand-written copy to Japan in 1228, which was

benefit from reading it, but wonders whether it deserves the high reputation it enjoys. "The text has words missing, and correct and incorrect [sections] are mixed together and muddled. If one works at it, one can distinguish the gist of our sect's teaching within it. Still, is it appropriate to call this kind of leftover food and soured rice The Blue Cliff of [Zen Master] Bukka [Enko]?"⁵⁰ In particular, Ryōkei seems to doubt the value of investing as much energy in writing commentaries on the text as Chinese and Japanese continued to do. Without a study of the full text of the *Shūtōroku*, it is hard to know how he intended these remarks. Like Chōon, Ryōkei may have been objecting to the literary and academic exercises based on the *Hekiganroku* that passed for kōan practice at the time. The *Zenrin shūhei shū*'s response is not enlightening, since it is primarily *ad hominem* in nature.

Although Chinese and Japanese monks shared the written language of classical Chinese, the language barrier created many difficulties in the early encounters between Obaku masters and Japanese monks. In some respects, even the common written language seems to have been a source of tension. One of the implicit criticisms that the *Zenrin shūhei shū* addresses is the Chinese contention that the Japanese did not generally have a firm mastery of Chinese. It may be difficult to pinpoint examples in which Obaku masters denigrated Japanese abilities in the written language, but it is obvious that Japanese monks felt that this had occurred. Japanese and Chinese styles of written Chinese do differ, with the Japanese tending to use more particles, which make it easier to render the text into Japanese according to *kambun* markings. The Obaku masters used Ming colloquial expressions unknown to the Japanese, that differed from the older style of written language with which the Japanese were familiar.

During centuries leading up to the Tokugawa period, when exchange with China was limited, Zen monks served as advisors to various Japanese rulers because of their education preserved as a secret document at Daijō-ji, and only made commonly available in the modern period. See Miura, *op.cit.*, pp. 357-358.

⁵⁰ *Zenrin shūhei shū*, vol. 1, p. 2a.

and literary ability in written Chinese, the language of official discourse until the modern period. This remained the case in the early Tokugawa period until Confucian scholars began to fill those roles. Zen temples had been the guardians of culture for generations and were among the only sources of education available in Japan until the rise of Neo-Confucian schools during the Tokugawa period.⁵¹ Language ability in written Chinese was a source of pride for many Japanese monks, and it would only be natural for them to perceive native speakers as a kind of threat to their status in the intellectual world. This was no doubt intensified by the fact that many people came to view the Chinese Obaku masters as a resource for recovering the spoken language and improving their written skills as well.

In the section on Chinese and Japanese pronunciation in the *Zenrin shûhei shû*, the disciple who raises the question takes just that tone of appreciation for the reintroduction of spoken Chinese by the Obaku masters. The author's response shows the resultant defensive attitude.

When the Dharma descendents [of Chinese masters] brought the teachings of all the sects [to Japan], they brought all the sutras and dharani, but the Chinese pronunciation was lost. Recently, Ming monks have come to Japan and once again we can hear the Chinese pronunciation. Isn't that fortunate?

Reply: That is extremely foolish! Not only do you (*nanji* 汝) not know Chinese pronunciation, you don't know Japanese pronunciation either!⁵²

The answer continues with an extended explanation of *on* 音 and *kun* 訓 readings, identifying the former as true Chinese pronunciation and the latter as Japanese. It concludes with a denial that the language spoken by the Ming monks is actually Chinese.

As you know, in their country ever since the Yüan and Ming dynasties, the Mongols have ruled the country, so the [Chinese] tatoo their bodies and cut their hair [like the Mongols]. Their language and literature have also been greatly altered by these northern barbarians. Therefore, what the

⁵¹ A variety of schools arose during the Tokugawa period, not all related to Buddhist temples and Neo-Confucian academies. See Dore, *Education in Tokugawa Japan*.

⁵² *Zenrin shûhei shû*, vol. 1, p. 13a.

Ming monks say is Chinese isn't really Chinese. It's Ming and therefore Mongol.⁵³

There is one other defensive response in the *Zenrin shûhei shû* found in the final section that deals specifically with Obaku Zen. This topic probably represents the deepest reaction against Obaku in Japanese Rinzai. The idea that Yin-yüan's Zen style could revitalize Japanese Rinzai circulated among some Rinzai monks even before Yin-yüan had left China. The Japanese monks who joined Obaku assemblies were not alone in their belief that Japanese Rinzai needed to take steps to improve the level of its practice and discipline. However, other movements for reform that arose at Myôshin-ji in the seventeenth century and culminated in Hakuin's work in the eighteenth century strongly opposed the suggestion that Obaku held the answer for the restoration of Japanese Rinzai. The *Zenrin shûhei shû* responds to such a suggestion by first questioning the motives that brought Obaku masters to Japan. They did not come as "men who have forgotten themselves for the sake of the Dharma" as some believed, but rather out of a sense of despair. The passage briefly recounts the unsuccessful public debate of Yin-yüan's master and predecessor at Wan-fu-ssu, Master Fei-yin T'ung-jung. Fei-yin had challenged the validity of the lineages of certain of his contemporaries in his compilation of Zen biographies, entitled *Gotô gentô*, published in 1653. Fei-yin's charges had extended beyond the confines of Rinzai Zen, and called into question a number of Sôtô lineages. This caused considerable opposition from Sôtô adherents, leading eventually to a public debate before secular authorities between Fei-yin and the Sôtô master Yung-chüeh Yüan-hsien 永覺元賢 (1578-1657; J. Eigaku Genken) a few months after Yin-yüan had departed from China in 1654. Fei-yin lost the debate, and the original woodblocks for the *Gotô gentô* were ordered destroyed.⁵⁴ The *Zenrin shûhei shû* claims that his defeat caused

⁵³ Ibid., vol. 1, p. 14b.

⁵⁴ Detailed information on Fei-yin's claims and the resulting debates can be found in Torigoe Fumikuni, *Hiin zenji to sono cho- Gotô gentô*; and Nagai Masano, "Minmatsu ni ikita zenshatachi- Hiin Tsûyô ni yoru Gotô gentô no seiritsu", pp. 327-343.

the whole Ōbaku line to lose heart and thus accept invitations to come to Nagasaki. Somewhat ironically, the text goes on to criticize the Ōbaku line for arbitrarily limiting the abbots at the three Nagasaki temples to direct disciples of Yin-yüan's line.⁵⁵ If such limits existed, they would have matched similar limitations that applied to all Myōshin-ji line temples. The final passage indicates the offensive nature of the suggestion that Ōbaku could revitalize Rinzai. "For five to seven years they closed their gate and engage in pen and ink samadhi. And by doing that they plan to reform the Zen community!"⁵⁶

Several Ōbaku masters come under severe personal attack in the *Zenrin shūhei shū*, and these *ad hominem* criticisms form the fourth and final category to be considered here. As seen above, questioning the motives of the Chinese masters forms one type of personal attack. "I have heard that Yin-yüan, Mu-an, Chi-fei, and Kao-ch'üan were truly the foremost [monks] from contemporary Ming China. Be that as it may, it happens that, to a man they came to this country and are not at all [the type of] men who have forgotten themselves for the sake of the Dharma."⁵⁷ The depth of these masters' understanding is likewise questioned in another section:

When the founder of the Ōbaku [line] first arrived in Japan, people had not yet fathomed the shallowness of his enlightenment. There were a number of people such as Bankei [Yōtaku] 盤珪永琢, Kengan [Zen'etsu] 賢岩禪悅, and Ran'ō 懶翁 from the Myōshin-ji line and some Sōtō monks such as

⁵⁵ By the time of the *Zenrin shūhei shū*'s writing, the three Nagasaki temples were all Ōbaku branch temples under the head temple Mampuku-ji. These temples not only continued to serve the Chinese community in that city, but also provided fresh talent from China for Mampuku-ji and other major Ōbaku temples. Their abbots were generally Chinese monks from Wan-fu-ssu, but there is no clear documentary evidence to corroborate the claim that this was required. The passage may be an indirect reference to the episode involving Tao-che, who seems to have been removed from the post at Sōfuku-ji in favor of Yin-yüan. See p. 27, note 32.

⁵⁶ *Zenrin shūhei shū*, vol. 2, p. 15b. The reference to pen and ink samadhi 筆硯三昧 (*hikken sammai*) is not completely clear. It may refer to the practice of using written exchanges between Japanese disciples and Chinese masters, who shared only the written language. Alternately, it may be an attack on Ōbaku's Zen style, suggesting that it focuses on a literary understanding of Zen texts rather than on attaining enlightenment.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 15a.

[Unzan] Guhaku 雲山愚白 and [Dokuan] Genkō 独庵玄光 from Higo and Hizen who did not completely agree with him. When it came to the second abbot [of Mampuku-ji] Mu-an Hsing-t'ao, people half believed and half doubted him. By the time you reach the third and fourth generations, [the Obaku abbots] were already completely debased (七零八落 *shichiroi hachiraku*). Even if there were one or two of them capable of spreading their own position, none of them had so much as tasted the spittle of our secret practice of Zen. Although one cannot be sure about the founder, when one considers their [line] after it was completely debased, one wonders if perhaps the founder also failed to fathom his origin.⁵⁸

To devalue the understanding of the founder and his immediate successor quite naturally debases the entire line. However, the harshest words are reserved for those Japanese Rinzai monks who left the Myōshin-ji line in favor of Obaku.

Monks like Ryōkei and Chōon were perceived by many as traitors to their original Dharma line. However, Ryōkei was a special case even among the monks who converted to Obaku, because none of the others had approached his rank and stature within Japanese Rinzai before they changed affiliation. Most of the converts were young men like Chōon and Tetsugyū who had not yet received *inka*, let alone a purple robe or the position of abbot at Myōshin-ji. The *Zenrin shūhei shū* singles out Ryōkei as the worst offender against Rinzai Zen, using unusually strong language.

Ryōkei had long since received *inka* from Master Hakubu Eryō. He had accepted the imperial command and succeeded to [the position of abbot] at Myōshin-ji. Then later he traded his inheritance and changed his robes. Not only did he deceive himself and others, he betrayed his debt of gratitude [to his Dharma line] and scorned the imperial command. One can say that he is the greatest sinner among monks and lay people alike. His acts of flattery would cause a wise man shame.⁵⁹

Because Ryōkei had attained a high rank within the Myōshin-ji hierarchy, the *Zenrin shūhei shū* regards him as the lowest sinner. Ryōkei's unfortunate death in a flood tide in Osaka in 1670 is even represented as the karmic retribution for his sins against the Zen community.⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Ibid., vol. 1, pp. 19a-b.

⁵⁹ Ibid., vol. 2, p. 3b.

⁶⁰ Apparently some Rinzai texts went so far as to refer to the flood tide as "Kanzan's wave" 關

Chôn was only a young monk when he joined Ōbaku, so he did not incur the same wrath as Ryōkei. Nonetheless, he was a prolific writer and influential in spreading Ōbaku teachings, so he was an obvious target for criticism. The author of the *Zenrin shūhei shū* begins his assessment of the *Bukai nanshin* with a story designed to show the debased level of Chôn's character and thus discredit his writing. The author recounts his own chance meeting with the master when on pilgrimage some years earlier:

Quite unexpectedly, [Chôn] rented a cottage and set up an ordination platform. He played on an instrument and so summoned the foolish men and women from the neighboring houses. He made it into a place of practice (道場 *dōjō*) for repenting and receiving the precepts. He accepted a fee [for conferring] the precepts. Then he left and went to another inn and then another. Each day he took in some money in this manner and then would take a rest. Truly, he resembled a performer who dances mime or does tricks with a lion.⁶¹

The historical accuracy of this story is unknown. One would hardly expect to find any such story in Ōbaku literature, since accepting money for bestowing the precepts like a traveling minstrel is a clear breach of the monastic code. Chôn did travel throughout Japan, as is clear from the number of temples that he founded. He was among the most capable of the Japanese converts who set out to spread the new line by working among the people and founding temples. It is certainly possible that he used a ceremony to bestow the precepts as a regular part of his public teaching.

The *Ōbaku geki* of Mujaku Dōchū

The second Rinzaï text to be considered here is the *Ōbaku geki* 黄檗外記, written by one of Myōshin-ji's finest scholars of the early Tokugawa period, Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠 (1653-1744). The text is divided into two distinct sections. The first portion is a narrative 山湧, indicating that retribution was brought to bear against Ryōkei for his defection by the founder of Myōshin-ji, Kanzan Egen; Hirakubo, op.cit., p. 226.

⁶¹ *Zenrin shūhei shū*, vol. 1, pp. 17b-18a.

describing Yin-yüan's early years in Japan and the role played by Myōshin-ji monks in gaining official permission for him to remain. Mujaku wrote this section in Japanese, drawing on the recollections of his master Jikuin and other contemporaries, as well as some textual evidence. The second section of the text is actually a series of short vignettes written in classical Chinese. These passages vary greatly in style and content, and seem to come from a variety of sources. The vignettes stand as independent units that Mujaku could not easily have tied together into a narrative. However, they do share a common theme of presenting Ōbaku monks in a bad light. Throughout both portions of the text, Mujaku adds on his own reflections and conjectures, clearly marking these as such, and occasionally includes a quotation from classical Buddhist sources that he finds in some way illuminating to the issue at hand.

Like the majority of Mujaku's works, the *Ōbaku geki* was never published in a woodblock edition for general circulation. Until quite recently, only a few original hand written copies existed.⁶² It therefore seems likely that Mujaku intended the text for internal circulation within the Myōshin-ji community, and not for the wider Zen community. Given the negative portrait that Mujaku draws of individual Ōbaku monks and the line as a whole, he may have intended the *Ōbaku geki* as a warning to Myōshin-ji monks who still found the Ōbaku style of Zen appealing. He may also have hoped to clarify his master Jikuin's role in inviting Yin-yüan to Kyoto, in order to distance Jikuin from Ryōkei, who was already fully discredited in the eyes of Myōshin-ji monks, and from Yin-yüan.

There are a few problems with dating the text as a whole, and some scholars have also

⁶² According to the listing in Iida Rigyō's reliable history of Mujaku, three original copies of the *Ōbaku geki* exist, one at Shunkō-in 春光院 at Myōshin-ji, a second at Nagasaki's historical museum, and a third at Tokyo University; *Gakushō Mujaku Dōchū*, p. 298. All comments made here are based on the Shunkō-in copy written in Mujaku's own hand. References will be made to my own numbering of the leaves of the original manuscript. A full translation of the text follows in Appendix One. To my knowledge, the text has been published twice in recent years, but neither edition is readily available even in Japan. There is a printed copy in the Ōbaku journal, the *Ōbaku bunka*, no. 41-43 (Sept. 1978-Jan. 1979). The other edition is a modern handwritten copy prepared by the Sôtō scholar Kagamishima Genryū, which appeared along with Mujaku's *Shōbō genzō senpyō*, in a folio published by Komazawa University in 1960.

questioned the authorship of the Chinese sections. Mujaku signed his name, Dôchû of Ryûge-in 龍華道忠識, at the end of the Japanese narrative and dated it 1720.8.2.⁶³ For this reason, most scholars regard the whole text as dating from that year. In fact, there is no way of knowing when Mujaku composed or added the Chinese sections. They are arranged as separate units and could have been written before or after the narrative, or could even have been collected over a period of years.⁶⁴ Mujaku's signature makes the authorship of the Japanese portion obvious, but some scholars, particularly Minamoto Ryôen, have questioned the authenticity of the Chinese portion, which bears no such mark.⁶⁵

Minamoto conjectures that another monk either edited or composed the Chinese section, basing his findings on a number of observations. First, he notes that the interspersed comments identify the speaker alternatively as Dôchû or Hôu 葆雨. Based on his own impressions of the content and style of these comments, Minamoto believes the two names refer to different people. In point of fact, however, Hôu is one of Mujaku's pen names which he used in many other of his writings.⁶⁶ Minamoto also explains that the copy of the text that he used has a note written into the margin by a Chinese monk to the effect that Mujaku wrote in *kana* because he did not know Chinese.⁶⁷ Minamoto makes no attempt to evaluate this comment, but simply quotes from it. The remark has no basis in fact. Mujaku displayed an impressive grasp of classical Chinese in the many volumes of scholarship he composed in that language, especially in his lexicons of Zen terms drawn from the Chinese Zen corpus,

⁶³ *Obaku geki*, p. 11b.

⁶⁴ An episode in the final Chinese vignette reportedly dates from Genbun 4 (1739), so at least that final episode was added on much later than 1720, *Obaku geki*, p. 20b.

⁶⁵ Minamoto's discussion of the *Obaku geki* can be found in op.cit., pp. 99-107. He deals with the issue of authorship on pp. 99-100.

⁶⁶ A careful study of the usage of the two names within the *Obaku geki* itself shows that Mujaku refers to himself consistently as Dôchû in Japanese and Hôu in Chinese. There is one occurrence of the name Hôu in the Japanese narrative, and that appears in a Chinese passage that Mujaku inserted into the Japanese narrative, *Obaku geki*, p. 7a.

⁶⁷ This remark does not appear in the Shunkô-in copy.

which are still highly regarded by scholars today.

Minamoto's doubts about the authorship of the Chinese segments may well have arisen because of the copy of the *Obaku geki* he consulted. Minamoto does not identify which of the three existing originals he used, but it could not have been the Myôshin-ji copy preserved at Shunkô-in. That copy has been positively identified by Yanagida Seizân, one of Japan's leading experts on Mujaku, as in Mujaku's own hand writing.⁶⁸ It does not contain any marginal notes of the type mentioned above. Furthermore, Minamoto refers to a vignette, apparently written in Chinese, which does not appear in the Shunkô-in copy.⁶⁹ It appears that Minamoto is correct in assuming that the copy he examined was edited by a later monk. However, this is not the case with the Shunkô-in copy; both the Chinese and the Japanese portions of that text were written by Mujaku himself.

Because the material in the *Obaku geki* is primarily anecdotal in nature, its criticism of Obaku Zen is centered on its stories about individual Obaku monks. Most of the material focuses on Yin-yüan and Ryôkei, but there are a few sections on anonymous Obaku monks of later generations. We will first examine the portraits drawn of these monks before moving on to evaluate the general criticisms of Obaku implicit in the text.

Mujaku overtly represents Yin-yüan as a degenerate monk who seeks his own fame and fortune rather than serving the cause of the Dharma. In fact, the Yin-yüan of the *Obaku geki* uses spreading the Dharma as a means to his own ends.

I knew from his first words that he was that kind of monk. When Yin-yüan first turned to my teacher Jikuin, he said, "Since you know many of the

⁶⁸ Yanagida examined the entire text at my request and aided me with some of the more difficult passages. Yanagida's work related to Mujaku includes editing the photo reproduction of Mujaku's original copy of the *Zenrin shokisen*, (first published by Baiyô shoin in 1909, reissued by Seishin shôbô in 1963, and by Chubun shuppansha in 1979) and his earlier article, "Mujaku Dôchû no gakumon", describing Mujaku's scholarly methods.

⁶⁹ Minamoto describes an episode involving a misunderstanding that occurred while Yin-yüan was building the Monks' hall (僧堂 *Sôdô*) at Fumon-ji, op.cit., p. 101. There is no corresponding passage in the Shunkô-in copy.

daimyô, if you were to act as intermediary in building me a two-mat grass hut, I could set up my Dharma banner." When he said that, I knew for certain that he was a monk [seeking] fame and fortune. In ancient times, truly worthy teachers would never have said such a thing even by mistake, because it wouldn't have entered their minds in the first place. As you might expect, his followers are fools taken in by his deceiving spirit. They fan the fire of decadence all the more. The nation is full of lawless and debauched men who add and subtract from the teachings and do not preserve the precepts at all. Although people say that he will rekindle Japanese Zen, one would better say that he will corrupt it."⁷⁰

Mujaku further illustrates this point by mentioning two other inappropriate actions taken by or for Yin-yüan. First, there is the episode with the purple robe which lead to Jikuin withdrawing from Yin-yüan's cause.⁷¹ Jikuin happened to come across a purple robe made up in the Chinese fashion, and learned that it was intended for Yin-yüan. Jikuin rushed to Fumon-ji to confront Ryôkei about the methods by which the robe had been obtained. Actively seeking the honor of a purple robe was offensive enough to Jikuin in purely religious terms, but to do so without following proper procedure could have brought grave political consequences on the sect.⁷² Yin-yüan's second serious breach of Buddhist conduct was to actively seek an audience with the Shogun Ietsuna. Mujaku quotes Jikuin as having said, "The illustrious monks of antiquity were sometimes summoned by the king or a minister, but they would not go. Still less would they themselves have desired an audience. It is entirely wrong for this bearded Chinese to act as if he wants an audience. Yin-yüan has lost his morals."⁷³ Once again Jikuin took action, this time informing the bakufu of his official resignation as Yin-yüan's representative. Mujaku obviously concurred with his master's assessment of Yin-yüan's behavior. By presenting Obaku's founder in this light, Mujaku hoped to defend Japanese.

⁷⁰ *Obaku geki*, p. 6b.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 4b-5b.

⁷² Myôshin-ji was one of the two temples involved in the Purple Robe Affair. Members of the temple had been stripped of imperial honors, including purple robes, when the bakufu took action against the emperor's involvement in Buddhist affairs. Myôshin-ji monks were therefore somewhat sensitive about the issue. See Chapter 5 for a discussion of the Purple Robe Affair.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, p. 5b.

Rinzai from any contaminating Ōbaku influences which others misguidedly took for reform.

Ryōkei participated actively in the above two episodes, using his considerable influence as a former abbot of Myōshin-ji to gain advantage for Yin-yüan with both the bakufu and the court. However, Mujaku paints an ambiguous portrait of Ryōkei, one that is basically free of the baser motivation seen in Yin-yüan's words and deeds. In marked contrast to the *Zenrin shūhei shū*, there is only one example of direct criticism of Ryōkei in the *Ōbaku geki*. That criticism is part of a comment Gudō makes in one of the Chinese vignettes regarding Ryōkei's close association with Yin-yüan: "And as for that Ryōkei, he's bald and wrinkled. He's old enough to know better. But when he encounters something new he gets himself turned upside down and loses his head. He really should be pitied."⁷⁴ This remark does seem to capture Mujaku's implicit opinion of Ryōkei who appears as an eager and somewhat naive supporter of Yin-yüan. Ryōkei seems more of a dupe who falls under the spell of the manipulative Chinese monks than a villain himself. Even in the case of the Zen master's whisk that Ryōkei presented to Emperor Gomizunoo, it is Kao-ch'üan who comes across as the truly guilty party who tried to usurp the imperial name exclusively for Ōbaku.⁷⁵

From the viewpoint of the *Ōbaku geki*, the early Japanese supporters of Ōbaku, represented by Ryōkei, Jikuin and Tokuō, seem to have made the mistake of trusting the Chinese master Yin-yüan before they really knew him. They were attracted by the unknown, a trait shared by many Japanese living in the closed world of Tokugawa Japan. In at least two scenes, Mujaku mentions that crowds of ordinary Japanese gathered to catch a glimpse of Yin-yüan, drawn by the novelty of seeing a Chinese. In much the same way, Ryōkei was foolishly intrigued by the exotic Chinese Zen style, but he did not truly understand Yin-yüan's character. Those who were able to see through to the truth either broke with Yin-yüan or never supported him in the first place. In one episode, which Mujaku tells but then dismisses

⁷⁴ Ibid. pp. 12b-13a.

⁷⁵ This episode will be examined in more detail in the following chapter.

as false, a government official wisely refused to support Yin-yüan sight unseen, saying that even after a number of years one may not really know what is in another's heart.⁷⁶ In Mujaku's account, the other government officials who made the decisions enabling Yin-yüan to remain in Japan and to found a large monastery based their judgments upon the reliability and character of the Japanese monks in Yin-yüan's service, and not on their direct knowledge of Yin-yüan himself. Mujaku glosses over the changes that occurred in the bakufu's attitude after the shôgun and councilors had met Yin-yüan for themselves.

The *Obaku geki* probably served as a warning to the innocent monks at Myôshin-ji who could be swept up in the excitement and novelty of the new style of Zen. However, as Mujaku pointed out, not only the innocent may be attracted to Obaku. Monks with similarly debased characters would naturally be attracted to Yin-yüan as well. Mujaku provides a specific example of this by recounting a later event involving Egoku Dômyô 慧極道明 (1632-1721), another former Myôshin-ji line monk.⁷⁷ Egoku apparently requested an audience with the daimyô of Kaga province in order to preach the Dharma. Being well versed in the Zen tradition, the daimyô embarrassed Egoku publicly and caused him to withdraw by observing, "Illustrious monks of the ancient past refused to go even when they had been invited by officials. Egoku seeking an audience now, without my even inviting him, is at odds with the illustrious monks of the past." Mujaku concludes that Egoku shared Yin-yüan's degenerate desire for fame and fortune. Like his master, Egoku put himself forward in a manner unbefitting a Zen monk. Mujaku ends the *Obaku geki* with two further examples of unnamed, wicked Obaku monks who between them committed murder, theft, and broke the precept against sexual relations.⁷⁸ All of these later examples stand as Mujaku's evidence that Yin-yüan's degeneracy bred

⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 9a-9b.

⁷⁷ Ibid., p. 7b. This episode immediately follows the account of Yin-yüan requesting an audience with the shogun. Mujaku inserted it into the narrative as a part of his own commentary. For a biography of Egoku, see Rinoie, *Egoku Dômyô zenshi den*.

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 20b-21a.

further degeneracy in his line. The wickedness within the Obaku line clearly descends directly from its founder. As Mujaku put it, the later examples are "also evidence of the lingering style of Yin-yüan."⁷⁹

Mujaku has surprisingly little to say directly about Obaku's Zen style or the ritual distinctions that dominated both Kyorei's letter and the *Zenrin shûhei shû*. He makes no mention at all of its inclusion of Pure Land elements, nor does he comment on Obaku departing from the traditional Zen monastic code in any other respect. This is mildly surprising, since Mujaku was himself one of the leading experts of his day on Zen codes (*shingi* 清規), and is known to have composed several of them for individual temples.⁸⁰ Mujaku provides only a few anecdotal references to Obaku's Zen style, leaving the weight of his argument to rest on the characters of the Chinese masters.

In the opening scene of the narrative, Mujaku recounts a story about Yin-yüan's practice of releasing living creatures. Apparently, during his time in Nagasaki, Yin-yüan accepted a donation from the local *daimyô* and used the money to buy live fish which he then released into a pond. To everyone's dismay, all the fish died and came floating to the top of the pond. Mujaku himself refrains from commenting on the event, but he quotes Yin-yüan's interpreter as saying, "The Japanese will never believe in you if you do this sort of thing. Isn't there some other way to spread the Dharma?"⁸¹

A second example comes up in the Chinese portion of the text in an event from Yin-yüan's tenure at Fumon-ji in Settsu.

Master Daishun Gentei 大春元貞 [said] that some days when Master Yin-yüan

⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 7b.

⁸⁰ Mujaku authored a twenty fascicle commentary on the *Ch'ih-hsiu Pai-chang ch'ing-kuei* titled *Chokushu Hyakujo shingi sae*. A modern facsimile edition in two volumes was edited by Yanagida Seizan and published by Chubun shuppansha, 1977. Iida lists the titles of a number of *shingi* Mujaku composed for individual temples among his other writings, *Gakusei Mujaku Dôchû*, pp. 297-331.

⁸¹ Ibid., p. 1b.

was at Fumon-ji in Tonda, he hung up his staff and mingled with the monks. At lunch time one day, Gentei was serving the others. He lost his grip and dropped the rice bucket. The rice scattered all over the floor. Yin-yüan saw this from a distance, laughed and said, "Did the bottom drop out of the bucket? Did the bottom drop out of the bucket?"⁸²

Yin-yüan refers here to a line from Hsüeh-feng I-ts'un's 雪峰義存 (822-908; J. Seppô Gison) recorded sayings in which the experience of enlightenment is compared to the bottom falling out of a bucket.⁸³ In sympathetic hands, this story might easily be used to illustrate Yin-yüan's wit and familiarity with the classical Zen sources. One might even argue that it demonstrates his ability to apply the sayings of the masters to daily life in an attempt to push a disciple toward enlightenment. However, Mujaku comes to a far different conclusion, "I say that frivolity of this sort shows the vacuity of Yin-yüan's Zen style."⁸⁴ Mujaku sets a tone here that Japanese took fairly often regarding the Ming Chinese masters; they were accused of behaving in a frivolous manner because they employed a great deal of humor in their daily life, unfamiliar in the more restrained atmosphere of a Japanese Zen monastery.

There is one rather cryptic passage in the Chinese section that may have been intended as a criticism of Obaku's main method for spreading the sect throughout the country. Mujaku mentions that there are Obaku monks who claim to transmit the Dharma but who have no home temple of their own. He says that they "are all over the city, in front of shops and behind them."⁸⁵ This may refer to the large number of Obaku monks who did not initially possess temples. The number of Obaku monks grew so rapidly that it quickly surpassed the number of Obaku temples available to them. In addition, the early generations of Japanese Obaku monks regularly traveled and gave lectures to spread their teaching in different cities

⁸² Ibid., p. 13b.

⁸³ Hsueh-feng I-ts'un *ch'an-shih yu-lu* 雪峰義存禪師語錄 (J. Seppo Gison *Zenji goroku*), in ZZ, 2.25.5, p. 473a.

⁸⁴ *Obaku geki*, p. 13b.

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 17b.

and towns where there were no Obaku temples. Obaku monks did not initially enjoy an existing network of temples throughout the country. Many times they stayed at Sôtô temples where they were more warmly received than in Rinzai monasteries. There are numerous examples of communities that were impressed by these traveling monks, who restored dilapidated temples and then were invited to serve as resident monk.

Implicit throughout the *Obaku geki* is the perception that Obaku monks were overly proud and not respectful enough of their Japanese hosts. We cannot be certain whether or not the Chinese monks were intentionally haughty with their Japanese peers or in what ways they manifested such behavior. They may have behaved in a superior fashion as the Japanese report. Alternatively, it is possible that they were conforming to the code of monastic etiquette as they knew it, and that cultural differences led to a perception of rudeness. Certainly pride on the part of the Japanese contributed to the problem, as Kyorei had observed. In any event, we have ample evidence that, intentionally or otherwise, offense was taken by many Japanese. For example, in the section in the *Obaku geki* related to Gudô's complaint against Yin-yüan, Gudô expressed his displeasure at Yin-yüan's behavior which he found presumptuous for a foreign guest in Japan.

To begin with, Yin-yüan does not understand courtesy. I am the highest ranking monk in the Zen monasteries of Japan. If he wants to spread his Dharma in Japan, then he should first come and consult with me. After that, it would be time enough to save sentient beings according to their capacity. If I went to Ch'ing China, then I would do as much.⁸⁶

Gudô knew that Yin-yüan was under house arrest at the time and not free to make such a courtesy call. Still, he expected some recognition of his status as the abbot of Myôshin-ji, the main temple under which Fumon-ji officially fell.

In Mujaku's accounts of Yin-yüan's behavior, there are several times when the Chinese monk took actions that would have been highly rude and offensive to the Japanese present.

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 12b.

For example, when preparing for his audience with the shogun, Yin-yüan refused to bow three times as Japanese custom dictated and the counselors requested. Mujaku explains that this caused considerable distress for Ryôkei and Tokuô, who had to negotiate a compromise between Yin-yüan and the counselors. When Yin-yüan entered the shogun's hall, he sat immediately in front of the young shogun and even started to walk directly toward him. Ryôkei was forced to restrain him to prevent any further misunderstanding.⁸⁷ Mujaku complains later in the text that although Yin-yüan spoke Japanese at least passably well with his own attendants, he refused to do so with honored guests. Mujaku interprets this as Yin-yüan's way of belittling his Japanese guests. He mentions in this context Yin-yüan's dying instructions that Mampuku-ji must always invite Chinese monks to serve as its abbot. In Mujaku's opinion, this perpetuated the pattern of disrespect through the entire Obaku line.⁸⁸

For both the author of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* and Mujaku Dôchû, their ultimate conclusion concerning Obaku Zen was that it posed a danger for Japanese Rinzai. For practical reasons, they hoped to stem the flow of human and material resources that drained Rinzai of talented men, valued temples, and external monetary support. However, their concerns ran much deeper than these practical concerns and related to issues of proper Rinzai practice. Both feared that in spite of expectations to the contrary in some quarters, Obaku would have a corrupting influence on their own sect's teachings and practice. The arrival of Obaku masters and the establishment of the Obaku Mampuku-ji line in Japan set off a reexamination on the part of Japanese Rinzai masters of what exactly they believed should constitute Rinzai belief and practice. Some Obaku tendencies did find their way into Japanese Rinzai temples; the most obvious examples of this are the renewed interest in reading and studying the original texts in the Zen corpus and a restored dedication to keeping the winter and summer retreats as communal events. These tendencies were in harmony with movements

⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 10a-11a.

⁸⁸ Ibid., pp. 13b-14a.

arising within Japanese Buddhism and the wider intellectual world of Tokugawa thought. However, other Obaku tendencies were flatly rejected as inappropriate or impure. Foremost in this category is the combined practice of Zen meditation and *nembutsu*, which ran counter to the Japanese tendency toward pure, that is exclusive, practices.

Hakuin and Obaku Zen

The mid-Tokugawa era master Hakuin (1686-1769) is known as the restorer of Japanese Rinzai, and his teaching and Zen style form the basis of modern day Rinzai Zen in Japan. His influence is so far-reaching, that it is not at all uncommon to refer to modern Rinzai Zen as Hakuin Zen. Hakuin sought to revitalize Rinzai practice in his day by returning to the Zen style of the Sung dynasty when Zen was at its zenith in China and was first transmitted to Japan. For this reason, he focused on kôan study as the central feature in Zen practice and advocated the continuation of kôan study throughout one's life and not just during the training years before one's enlightenment experience had been acknowledged. Concomitant with his work to restore the Sung style of Zen were his efforts to purify Zen of all contaminating influences that had accumulated over the years of decline following the Sung period. In this regard, he singled out two types of Zen practice for special censure, silent-illumination Zen and the combined practice of Zen and Pure Land. Hakuin never mentioned Obaku Zen directly. However, since Obaku Zen advocated a form of dual practice, one can discern something of his attitude toward Obaku by looking at his attitude toward this combined practice.

First, Hakuin did not object to Pure Land practice in and of itself. He recognized it as an appropriate practice for believers of medium- or low-level abilities. In several places in his writings he indicates respect for Pure Land as an alternative path leading toward enlightenment. "It must be understood that the kôan and the recitation of the Buddha's name are both contributing causes to the path that leads to the opening up of the wisdom of the Buddha."⁸⁹

⁸⁹ This passage appears in Hakuin's letter comparing kôan practice with the practice of

Such positive evaluations generally appear in letters addressed to lay believers, especially those who have already expressed their devotion to Pure Land practice. Hakuin supported the whole-hearted practice of the *nembutsu* for those lay people and monks who truly lacked the ability to undertake the "steep" path of Zen. However, he became incensed by attempts to incorporate Pure Land practice into Zen, especially within the confines of the Zen monastery.

Hakuin explains that before Zen began to decline in China, starting with the Indian and Chinese Patriarchs and continuing down to the Yüan dynasty masters, Zen masters had never chanted the name nor expressed a desire for rebirth in the Pure Land. They retained the pure practice of the "steep way". Combined practice arose in the period of decline during the late Ming dynasty among men like Yun-ch'i Chu-hung who were unable to progress in Zen.⁹⁰ In Hakuin's judgment, these later masters turned to Pure Land out of despair for their future lives in the face of death.

This is not meant to belittle the basic teachings of the Pure Land nor to make light of the practice of the calling of the Buddha's name. But not to practice Zen meditation while within the Zen Sect, to becloud the eye to see into one's own nature because of laziness in the study of Zen under a teacher and idleness in one's aspirations, only weakens the power to study Zen. People such as these end up by spending their whole lives in vain.... People of this sort, while within Zen, slander the Zen teachings. They are like those wood-eating maggots that are produced in beams and pillars and then in turn destroy those very beams and pillars.⁹¹

nembutsu, the *Orategamia zokushu* 遠羅天釜統集. English translation taken from Philip Yampolsky, *The Zen Master Hakuin*, p. 130. Although Hakuin stresses here that the practice of the *nembutsu* and the *kôan* are both expedient means that share a common goal, he by no means suggests that the two practices were equally effective. According to Hakuin, in comparison to the countless numbers who have attained enlightenment through *kôan* study, only a few have benefited from practice of the *nembutsu*; *ibid.*, p. 145. Moreover, using an appropriate beginner's *kôan* like the *Mu* 無 *kôan* of Chao-chou 趙州 (the first *kôan* in the *Mumonkan*) can lead to relatively quick results, while reliance on Pure Land practices may well take a life time and lead nowhere; *ibid.*, p. 146.

⁹⁰ Hakuin criticized Chu-hung throughout his writings, including the *Orategama zokushû*. From that text and others, it appears that Hakuin regarded Chu-hung as the first cause, as it were, of the combined practice of Zen and Pure Land becoming acceptable in Zen monasteries. See Yampolsky, *The Zen Master Hakuin*, pp. 147-148. He appears to have been unaware that earlier Zen masters, notably the late Sung/early Yüan dynasty Rinzaï master Chung-feng Ming-pen 中峰明本 (1263-1323; J Chûhō Myōhon), had advocated forms of combined practice.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

Hakuin thus traces the movement toward combined practice to personal weakness in the late Ming Zen masters. But once this contamination of dual practice had entered the Zen monasteries, it spread like a disease. "From that time on the monasteries all fell into line and marched along behind this teaching; herein lies the basis for the deterioration of the style of Zen."⁹² In order to prevent the whole Zen community from being similarly infected, the root cause had to be exposed and removed. For this reason, Hakuin attacked combined practice in the harshest terms.

Hakuin did not directly identify Obaku Zen nor the Obaku line in his attacks on combined practice as he did the Ming master Chu-hung. However, as the primary conduit of the debased Ming style of Zen, Hakuin certainly intended Obaku Zen as one of the primary targets of his tirades against combined practice. In a few passages, the identification of Obaku masters lurks just beneath the surface. For example, in the *Yabukôji* 薮柑子 where Hakuin allows his anger to emerge almost unchecked, he alludes to Obaku's transmission to Japan.

A hundred years ago the true style changed and Zen followers adopted an obnoxious teaching. Those who would combine Pure Land and Zen are [as common] as hemp and millet. In olden times the outward appearance was the *śrāvaka* practice, the internal mystery was the bodhisattva Way. Nowadays outward appearance is the Zen teaching and the inner mystery is the Pure Land practice.⁹³

As Yampolsky points out in his related note, the time reference mentioned in this passage coincides with the arrival of Yin-yüan in 1654. Moreover, Hakuin has neatly inverted here the observation first made by Kyorei that Obaku Zen is outwardly Pure Land and inwardly Zen.

The image that he draws of these masters seems to describe the proud figures we find in Obaku portraits of the Chinese masters. They sit sternly and with dignity, wearing their silk caps and holding their whisks. "After all they look like true living Patriarchs of direct descent in the lineage, people whom even a Buddha or a demon would not dare approach."

⁹² Ibid., p. 149.

⁹³ Ibid., p. 171.

In even more subtle terms than those of Mujaku, Hakuin describes the dangers posed by the allure of the Chinese Zen masters. Looking the part of patriarchs, they are assumed by many Japanese to be superior in ability, but on close inspection "they do not have the slightest capacity to see into their own natures."⁹⁴ In Hakuin's view, these masters take on the outward trappings of Zen while concealing their true dedication to Pure Land. Thus, their outward appearances pose a threat, since they may deceive the unwary and so spread the contamination throughout Japanese Zen just as it spread in Ming China. Hakuin makes the direst of predictions if this trend is allowed to continue. "The deterioration of Buddhism in Japan must not continue for long.... If Zen is combined with Pure Land, Zen cannot last for long and will surely be destroyed."⁹⁵

Obaku and Soto Zen

The arrival of the Obaku masters from China and the establishment of the Obaku school in Japan had the greater impact on Rinzai Zen, but it also affected the Sôtô school to a lesser extent. A thorough evaluation of Obaku Zen's influence on Sôtô Zen is beyond the scope of this dissertation. What follows here is a brief sketch of the relations between the two schools based on secondary literature written primarily by Sôtô scholars.

Sôtô monks were as interested as their Rinzai counterparts at seeing Chinese masters for themselves, and many made their way to Nagasaki to meet with Yin-yüan and his more prominent disciples, Mu-an and Chi-fei. A partial list of the prominent Sôtô masters who studied under the Obaku masters includes Unzan Guhaku 雲山愚白 (1619-1702), Yuie Dôjô 惟慧道定 (1634-1713)⁹⁶, Tokuô Ryôkô 徳翁良高 (1649-1709), Mutoku Ryôgo 無得良悟

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 171.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 176.

⁹⁶ Yuie Dojo was commonly called Tokugan Yuie 得巖惟慧 after the Tokugan-ji temple where he was abbot.

(1651-1742), Gesshû Sôko and Manzan Dôhaku. While relations with Rinzai were strained from the start, relations between Sôtô and Obaku were generally friendly during the first years of Obaku's development. Relations remained cordial even after the founding of Obaku-san Mampuku-ji. This is not surprising, since as a completely distinct lineage of Rinzai, Obaku could not and did not pose the same threat to Sôtô as it did to Japanese Rinzai. There are numerous examples of Sôtô monks practicing under Obaku masters for periods of time, but few of these men stayed on to become Obaku Dharma heirs. The majority returned to their Sôtô temples, and in some prominent cases, even adapted elements of Obaku ritual and regulations into their Sôtô framework. Without the pressures of institutional constraints such as the Posted Regulations at Myôshin-ji, Sôtô monks were free to learn from Obaku practice and to establish on-going relationships with Obaku monks; many friendships developed between Sôtô and Obaku monks, especially with the first generation of Japanese disciples like Tetsugen, Tetsugyû and Chôn. While Obaku motivated Rinzai masters to re-evaluate their teachings predominantly for negative reasons, Sôtô masters were positively influenced. In a very real sense, contact with Obaku masters inspired Sôtô monks to undertake a reform of their own sect.

The Sôtô scholar Kagamishima Genryû has pointed out that the response to Obaku within Sôtô followed a very different pattern than that seen in Rinzai. In Rinzai, the progressive party, represented by Gudô, resisted Obaku influences and therefore took issue with attempts by the restoration party to welcome Obaku monks and adopt their customs. The two movements were at odds over Obaku from the first. By contrast, in the Sôtô case, the progressive monks who welcomed Obaku influences were the very men who initiated the great Sôtô reform movement of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It was only later that problems began to emerge between progressive and reform tendencies, and concomitantly between Sôtô and Obaku. Kagamishima illustrates this, using two of the great Sôtô reformers of the mid-Tokugawa period, Manzan Dôhaku (1636-1715) and Menzan Zuihō

(1683-1769).⁹⁷

Manzan concentrated his reform efforts in two directions. First, he strove to restore Dharma transmission through individual, personal contact between masters and disciples (一師印證 *isshi inshō*), which he argued was Dōgen's original intention. Sôtō had developed an alternative form of transmission dependent on the temple of residence (伽藍法 *garanbō*) which necessitated changing one's lineage according to one's position as abbot (因院易嗣 *in'in ekishi*). Manzan received encouragement and support for this effort from his long-time friend, the Obaku master Chōon Dōkai. Chōon led a similar reform movement within the Obaku sect and was highly critical of the existing Sôtō practice.⁹⁸ However, Manzan did not draw directly on Obaku texts as the basis for his argument on Dharma transmission, but made creative use of Dōgen's works.⁹⁹ On the other hand, there is textual evidence of direct Obaku influence on Manzan's second sphere of action, the reform of monastic discipline.

Manzan undertook monastic reform by studying and publishing earlier Sôtō rules that had been almost lost over the centuries. Manzan did not initiate this avenue of reform. His master Gesshū Sōko began research on the historical monastic codes for Japanese Sôtō, the *Eihei shingi* 永平清規 and the *Keizan shingi* 瑩山清規 and had written a monastic code for his own temple, Daijō-ji, called the *Undō jōki* 雲堂常規.¹⁰⁰ Gesshū had studied under both Tao-che and Yin-yüan, and had been impressed by the Obaku monastic code. He published his own code in 1674, just two years after the *Obaku shingi* had appeared, and was inspired by it to some extent. Although he indicated that the *Undō jōki* drew on the two

⁹⁷ Kagamishima makes this point in various books and articles. See, for example, his volume in the Zen no goroku series, *Manzan/Menzan*, p. 47.

⁹⁸ Bodiford, "Dharma Transmission in Sôtō Zen; Manzan Dōhaku's Reform Movement", p. 434.

⁹⁹ Bodiford explains that the historical and textual material is highly ambiguous on these issues and that Manzan interpreted them to suit his purpose. He provides some historical examples to illustrate this point; *ibid.*, pp. 425-431. He also notes that the key passages which Manzan attributes to Dōgen cannot be found in Dōgen's known writings; *ibid.*, pp. 438-439.

¹⁰⁰ See note 14 on p. ___ for information on the *Eihei shingi*, *Keizan shingi* and *Undō jōki*.

Sôtô codes, Sôtô scholars have noted the obvious reliance on the *Obaku shingi* as well. Gesshû encouraged Manzan to continue this research into Sôtô's historical monastic codes. It said that Manzan fulfilled his master's dying request by writing the *Shôjurin shingi* 栴樹林清規, his own extensive study of existing Zen codes. Like Gesshû, Manzan not only extended his research back to traditional Sôtô sources, but also took into account the *Obaku shingi* and through it older Rinzai codes.

Over the course of four centuries before Manzan's time, the traditional Sôtô codes had nearly been lost, just as much of Dôgen's writings had been hidden and almost forgotten. Therefore, Gesshû and Manzan's efforts were important examples of sectarian scholarship that made the older texts accessible for the first time in generations. Although intended as codes for Daijô-ji, the *Undô jôki* and to a greater extent the *Shôjurin shingi*, became influential throughout the Sôtô world and were widely adopted by Sôtô temples. Like Gesshû, Manzan not only drew on the traditional Sôtô codes, but made use of some elements of Obaku customs. For example, unlike the *Eihei shingi* which mandates the *Sôdô* 僧堂 (Monk's hall) as the locus for both meditation and meals, the *Shôjurin shingi* uses Obaku terms and refers to the place for meditating as the *Zendô* 禪堂 (Meditation hall) and the place for meals as the *Saidô* 齋堂 (Dining hall). In Obaku temples there were indeed separate halls for sleeping, meditating, and eating, and Manzan's adaptation of this terminology created the impression that his own Sôtô temple likewise had separate halls. In fact, at Daijô-ji, the terms *Zendô* and *Sôdô* referred to the same building, but because of the terminology, it became popular at other Sôtô temples to use three separate halls in the Obaku fashion. A second example of Obaku influence is the alteration of the time of chanting at mealtimes. In the *Keizan shingi*, the chanting is performed after the meal, while Manzan changed it to before the meal. This particular change was first enacted by Gesshû in the *Undô jôki*, and Manzan followed suit.¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ There are no modern editions of the *Shôjurin shingi*. Information on the contents and Obaku influences is based on the explanatory notes (解説 *kaisetsu*) from the *Sôtôshû zensho*, *Kaidai sakuin*,

The reform movement begun by seventeenth century Sôtô scholars like Gesshû and Manzan continued to bear fruit in the eighteenth century, particularly with the work of the most prominent sectarian Sôtô scholar Menzan. However, as the reform movement progressed, the restoration of Dôgen's Zen style came to dominate the agenda. Sôtô scholars became increasingly intolerant of any accretions from other sources. As a result, the later Sôtô scholars came to criticize their predecessors for adopting Obaku customs into Sôtô practice. Menzan was able to build upon the earlier generations' rediscovery of Dôgen's original writings and to produce his own extensive research in Dôgen studies, including his eleven volume encyclopedia on Dôgen's terms, the *Shôbô genzô shôtenroku* 正法眼藏涉典録. Menzan agreed with Manzan's basic reform work as regards to both Dharma transmission and monastic discipline, both of which were based upon rediscovering and reinstituting Dôgen's style of Zen. However, Menzan took issue with Manzan's reliance on the *Obaku shingi* in the *Shôjurin shingi* and the resulting alterations that occurred in Sôtô practice throughout Japan. In his works on Sôtô monastic discipline, the *Sôdô shingi gyôhôshô* 僧堂清規行法鈔 (published in 1753 in five fascicles) and the *Sôdô shingi kôtei betsureku* 僧堂清規考訂別録 (published in 1755 in eight fascicles), Menzan criticized these foreign elements as inappropriate for Sôtô Zen and sought to expunge all traces of Obaku influence from Sôtô practice.

Obaku Zen entered Japan at a time when Buddhist masters were painfully aware of the problems facing their individual sects and the whole of the Buddhist world. They were already searching for answers to their problems and methods to restore their practice to the high level they believed had once existed. In Zen Buddhism, the nascent reform movements of the mid-seventeenth century were laying ground work that would support the more successful movements of the following century. During that century of preparation, Obaku

vol. 6, pp. 152-154.

Zen did serve as a catalyst for change in both Rinzai and Sôtô Zen, in large part because the Japanese looked to it as such. As a form of Chinese Zen, the Ōbaku style naturally attracted attention and commanded a certain respect from the Japanese. Once the differences in its Zen style became apparent, Ōbaku offered Japanese Zen a range of new possibilities that could be introduced and access to older Chinese resources and patterns of practice that had not been fully utilized in Japan for generations. Ōbaku's unique characteristics also triggered negative responses that contributed indirectly to a process of redefinition of Zen practice in Japanese terms.

No small part of the division between Ōbaku and Japanese Rinzai were cultural differences that exaggerated the real distinctions between the Chinese and Japanese approaches to Zen. Ōbaku's Chinese character and its dedication to maintaining that character made it difficult for the school to be assimilated immediately into Japanese Rinzai. It developed instead into a small but stable lineage, independent from other Rinzai lines. Ultimately, its independence and differences were strong enough for it to constitute a third school of Zen in Japan, despite its identity as a Rinzai lineage. However, its ties with Japanese Rinzai have remained strong throughout its history. Not only did Ōbaku influence Japanese Rinzai in its early years, but Japanese Zen styles and movements had a strong impact on the Ōbaku sect over the years. In particular, the style of Zen developed by Hakuin influenced later Ōbaku masters. Hakuin's strong reform program, revitalizing Japanese Rinzai, corresponded with the decline in the flow of qualified Chinese abbots from China to Mampuku-ji in the mid- to late eighteenth century. Ōbaku's internal vitality was diminishing by then, and the sect was ready for an influx of new ideas. By the end of the Tokugawa period, Ōbaku had become less distinctly Chinese, and had adopted many Japanese customs and practices not expressly contrary to the Ōbaku monastic code. If the Chinese Ōbaku masters once helped to reintroduce such basic Zen texts as the *Rinzairoku* into the Japanese scene, by the modern era Ōbaku students came to study that text under the tutelage of Rinzai scholars.

Chapter Five

Obaku and the Secular Authorities

After a uneasy beginning, Obaku Zen's extensive dealings with various secular authorities during the Tokugawa period were largely positive in nature. Obaku received support from elements within the ruling military government in Edo, local provincial *daimyô*, and members of the imperial family, all of which served to strengthen the new sect and encourage its spread. In the modern period, scholars reflecting on Obaku's support from secular powers, have tended to stress either Obaku's dealings with the Edo bakufu or with the imperial family but not both. As a result, they often portray the Obaku Sect one-sidedly as either a special favorite of the imperial family or as the Tokugawa bakufu's chosen Zen line. Both arguments have some basis in historical fact, but ideological concerns arising in the modern period seem to have determined the presentation and interpretation of historical facts.

Not surprisingly, Obaku scholars earlier in this century presented the facts surrounding Obaku's transmission and spread with a special emphasis on imperial favor. For example, the historical sketches written in the 1930's by scholars such as Akamatsu Shinmyô convey the distinct impression that Mampuku-ji was founded under imperial direction.¹ While they do not deny bakufu involvement in the process of establishing Obaku, they largely ignore it, stressing instead the negative impact that bakufu regulations had on the emperor and Buddhism in general. Contemporary scholars, especially Takenuki Genshō, have done extensive work to establish the role played by the Edo bakufu in establishing and spreading Obaku Zen.² In

¹ See for example, Akamatsu, "Obakushū kōzō", pp. 7-9, and "Obaku no shinpū", pp. 76-78.

² Takenuki discusses Obaku's development and the Edo bakufu's role in its spread in very similar terms in two works, *Nihon zenshūshi*, pp. 210-240, and *Kinsei Obakushū matsuji chōshūsei*, pp. 17-42.

this reworked version, Obaku is, in a sense, the creation of the Tokugawa bakufu as it searched for a way to imitate the earlier Ashikaga pattern of bakufu-Zen relations. In all fairness, these later historical sketches are more deeply rooted in the historical sources and reflect more accurately the impact of secular influence at the time. However, perhaps because these accounts seek to balance the heavily imperial focus of earlier works, the imperial connections, which also played an important part in Obaku's development, are conspicuously absent from more recent histories.

By the time that Obaku masters first emigrated to Japan, the military government under the leadership of the Tokugawa family was reasonably secure in its authority and the emperor's powers had been clearly restricted in scope. In the most immediate terms, imperial favor would not have sufficed to insure Obaku's success in Japan. Without bakufu permission, Yin-yüan and his Chinese disciples would never have traveled beyond Nagasaki, let alone founded a new monastery of Mampuku-ji's size. However, the emperor was still a valuable ally in the cultural and religious spheres, where his influence remained strong. He continued to enjoy a significant level of authority among the Buddhist leaders in Kyoto, particularly at the dominant Rinzai Zen temples, Myōshin-ji and Daitoku-ji.³ Therefore, Obaku had much to gain from both of these two powers and managed rather successfully to balance its loyalties to each without becoming embroiled in the tension that existed between the two. The bakufu and the emperor, in turn, found their own reasons to sponsor Obaku in a manner appropriate to their respective powers. In general terms, the bakufu's interest was largely cultural rather than religious, and the emperor's more a matter of personal devotion to the practice of Zen. Both applauded Obaku's strict interpretation of monastic discipline and may have shared the

³ By the beginning of the Tokugawa period, the *gozan* 五山 Zen temples, which had been the dominant force in Rinzai Zen in earlier centuries, had declined in vitality and were eclipsed by the independent temples Daitoku-ji and Myōshin-ji. These temples had the reputation for promoting strict Zen practice, rather than the more artistic and literary pursuits favored at *gozan* temples. They enjoyed strong financial support from *sengoku daimyō* during the sixteenth century, and were the most influential Zen centers during the seventeenth century. Collcutt, *op.cit.*, pp. 123-129.

hope that Obaku could revitalize the Rinzaï school in Japan.

Tokugawa *Hatto* and the Purple Robe Affair

During the first fifty years of the seventeenth century, the Tokugawa bakufu enacted a series of laws (法度 *hatto*) to govern the various elements within Japanese society as a part of its overall plan to consolidate its authority. In particular, they designed *hatto* to control the three portions of society that had possessed power in the past and therefore posed the greatest potential threat to the Tokugawa's continued dominance, that is, the military houses, the imperial court, and Buddhist sects. Quite naturally, once Mampuku-ji had been founded, Obaku also fell under the general laws governing Buddhist temples; these laws regulated Obaku's relations with the Edo bakufu, but their impact extended beyond the immediate literal constraints they entailed. The temple laws, 寺院法度 *jiin hatto*, had determined the contours of the existing religious world into which Obaku had somehow to find its niche. These pre-existing conditions severely limited the avenues open to the fledgling school in its efforts to expand. In addition, incidents that had occurred earlier in the century as a consequence of the bakufu enforcing specific *hatto* against the emperor and the Buddhist community effected Obaku's relationship with the emperor.

One underlying principle operative in all the various *hattowas* to separate groups from their traditional sources of power; for example, the military houses were divested of direct ownership of land and separated from direct control over the peasants who worked the land. In a similar manner, the laws governing the imperial court and Buddhist groups divided these two potential allies in a variety of ways. Since the emperor had traditionally had a special relationship with certain temples, this relationship was brought under bakufu control. Buddhist monks were encouraged through a host of laws to limit themselves to scholarly and religious pursuits, thus reducing the access to political and military power that many sects had enjoyed

during the period of civil unrest in the centuries immediately preceding the Tokugawa period.⁴

Relations between the imperial court and Buddhist leaders had influenced the Japanese political scene since the introduction of Buddhism in the sixth century. Japanese emperors generally acted as sponsors of Buddhist monks and temples, which reciprocated by providing religious services of various kinds for the sake of the court and the nation. Although the military leaders of the medieval period are normally thought of as the sponsors for Rinzai Zen temples, the emperor had also enjoyed a special relationship with several of these temples, notably Myôshin-ji and Daitoku-ji. When the Tokugawa bakufu sought to assert its authority over both the imperial court and Buddhism, part of its plan was to create a barrier between the emperor and these Zen temples. They accomplished this with two related set of *hatto* enacted in 1613 and 1615, the first directed at eight specified temples, including Daitoku-ji and Myôshin-ji, and the second extending to the main temples of all sects.⁵ Before that time, the emperor had held the official authority to name the abbot of such temples as Myôshin-ji and Daitoku-ji and to bestow such honors as the purple robe and honorific titles on individual monks of any sect. In these *hatto*, the bakufu required that henceforth the emperor do so only with prior notification of the proper bakufu authorities, a process tantamount to the emperor requesting bakufu permission to fulfill his traditional role vis-a-vis the Buddhist community. Although the emperor retained the nominal authority to name abbots and bestow honors, his decisions were placed directly under bakufu scrutiny and subject to government approval. At the same time, the bakufu took steps to limit the pool of qualified candidates for the position of abbot at the more prominent Rinzai Zen temples. They did this by determining an official, not to say

⁴ During the period of the Warring States, Buddhist temples were among the strongest political and military powers, with land holdings and standing armies which, in some cases, rivaled the most powerful *daimyô*. Oda Nobunaga, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, and Tokugawa Ieyasu all took steps to control these temples and reduce their military and economic power as a crucial part of the process of unification. See McMullin, *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth-Century Japan*.

⁵ The "*Chokkyo shie no hatto*" specifically named Daitoku-ji, Myôshin-ji, Chion-in 智恩院, Jôke-in 浄花院, Sennyû-ji 泉涌寺, and Awaokômyô-ji 粟生光明寺; Funaoka, *Takuan*, p. 42.

artificial, set of qualifications: a Zen master was to have practiced for thirty years and to have studied at least 1,700 kōan⁶ from the traditional Zen sources in order to qualify for the post.⁷

Emperor Gomizunoo 御水尾天皇 (1612-1629), known for his deep personal affinity with Zen Buddhism, was reigning at the time these *hatto* came into effect. Gomizunoo had a strained relationship with the Edo bakufu throughout his reign and even later during his years of retirement.⁸ Like his father Goyōzei 御陽成 (1587-1611) before him, Gomizunoo lived under the indignity of being scrutinized by the shogunate's representative in Kyoto, the *Shoshidai* 所司代, whose responsibilities included overseeing the imperial court.⁹ In addition, Gomizunoo had been obliged to marry the second Tokugawa shogun Hidetada's daughter. It would seem that Gomizunoo was a man of considerable talent and he resented all of the bakufu's interference in court affairs and bridled under the new strictures being placed upon him. He ignored the bakufu's determined procedure for conferring imperial honors in a number of cases, and this eventually provoked a response. The bakufu took action in order to assert its power over the court by enforcing the *hatto* of 1613 and 1615. In 1627, they officially invalidated a number of imperial honors, including honorific titles and purple robes, that had been granted without their approval. The resulting incidents within the Buddhist community

⁶ There are said to be 1,701 biographies of Zen masters in the *Ching-té ch'uan-téng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (J. Keitoku dentōroku). This is probably the source for the prescribed number of kōan, which is an artificial creation. In fact, the *Ching-té ch'uan-téng lu* contains 960 biographies and merely lists the names of the other masters; Miura, op.cit., p. 352.

⁷ Both Daitoku-ji and Myōshin-ji received *hatto* specifying these qualifications in 1615. Funaoka provides the text of the "Daitokuji shohatto" 大徳寺諸法度, dated the seventh month of that year; Funaoka, op.cit., pp. 51-51.

⁸ The Purple Robe Affair (紫衣事件 *Shie jiken*) precipitated Gomizunoo's abdication, as will be seen, but that did not bring an end to his personal conflict with the Edo bakufu. The Shogun Iemitsu further insulted the Emperor in 1634 when he publically refused the honorific title of *Dajodaijin* 大政大臣 that Gomizunoo had privately proposed to confer upon him. See Ooms, *Tokugawa Ideology*, pp. 169-170.

⁹ Tokugawa Ieyasu had recreated this post in 1600 to keep an eye on the imperial court. The official holding this post reported to Edo every five years to make his report.

are known in Japan as the Purple Robe Affair (紫衣事件 *Shie jiken*).¹⁰

Both Myōshin-ji and Daitoku-ji had been immediately effected by the invalidations of 1627, and both temples responded in protest. Takuan Sōhō 澤庵宗彭 (1573-1645), a former abbot of Daitoku-ji, orchestrated the initial Zen response to the bakufu's action. Takuan returned to Daitoku-ji and wrote a highly critical appraisal of the original *hatto*, called the *Benmeiron* 辨明論, stating that the regulations were unreasonable in the light of practical considerations and concluded that they must have been drawn up by an unenlightened individual who did not properly understand Zen practice and training. It was his contention that the requirement that thirty years of training be mandatory would waste the finest years of a master's life when he should instead be busy guiding students. As for the requirement that the candidate for abbot have mastered 1,700 kōan, Takuan felt that this was excessive and missed the true intention of Zen practice. Enlightenment was not determined by the years of practice nor the number of kōan studied. Moreover, these requirements would make the continuation of Dharma transmission difficult or even impossible. In 1628, Takuan signed the document, as did two other monks, Gyokushitsu Sōhaku 玉室宗珀 (1572-1641), the current abbot at Daitoku-ji, and Kōgetsu Sōgan 江月宗玩 (1574-1643) another former abbot, and sent it to the Kyoto *Shoshidai* who forwarded it on to Edo.

The bakufu responded to the criticism from Daitoku-ji and Myōshin-ji by formally recognizing as valid those appointments of imperial honors bestowed according to proper form and to men above the age of fifty. However, they demanded written apologies from both Daitoku-ji and Myōshin-ji for their protests. This sent the assemblies at the two temples into confusion as to how to respond. Moderate factions at both temples called for compromise with the government, but Takuan and his group refused to budge. As a result, the bakufu

¹⁰ The most lucid account of the *hatto* effecting Zen temples and especially the Purple Robe Affair is found in Takenuki, *Nihon zenshūshi*, pp. 187-197. Funaoka gives a detailed account, including excerpts from many of the primary sources; Funaoka, *op.cit.* pp. 41-81. Murai Sanae provides a brief summary of the three primary Buddhist figures involved, Takuan, Gyokushitsu and Kōgetsu in "Shie jikengo no chōbaku kankei", pp. 1-11.

summoned the three monks who had signed the criticism to Edo. They punished Takuan and Gyokushitsu with banishment, but were lenient with Kôgetsu who had complied with their orders and apologized. Angry over the bakufu's heavy-handed tactics, Emperor Gomizunoo abdicated in favor of his young daughter, Empress Meishô 明正天皇 (1630-1643), in 1629. Lacking any real power in relation to bakufu affairs, abdication was his only available means to protest what he regarded as an overly severe punishment inflicted on one of his favorites, Takuan. The Purple Robe Affair was resolved a few years later when the banishments were lifted. Afterwards, all three monks returned to bakufu favor and were even summoned to Edo castle to instruct the third shogun Iemitsu.¹¹

Obaku Zen and the Emperor Gomizunoo

The Emperor Gomizunoo's relationship with Ryôkei, Yin-yüan and other Obaku masters forms an interesting chapter in Obaku's early history. Obaku Zen claims a very special relationship with Gomizunoo, whom they include on their genealogical charts as a full master in one of the sect's dominant Dharma lines.¹² Not surprisingly, this claim caused some controversy during the Tokugawa period among other Zen schools and even within Obaku itself when it was first revealed. It also served the sect well after the Imperial Restoration of 1868 when it was advantageous to have imperial connections. Many of the details surrounding the emperor's relations with Obaku remain obscure, and accounts vary greatly depending on the nature of the source (and the affiliation of its author). However, what follows is a review of events as they are known or claimed by the parties involved.

¹¹ Murai provides details about Takuan, Gyokushitsu, and Kôgetsu, and their later relations with the bakufu, including the favors received and services rendered in the anti-Christian movement, *ibid.*, p. 7.

¹² Gomizunoo appears as an Obaku master of the 34th generation (Yin-yüan is the 32nd and Ryôkei the 33rd) in the official record, the *Obakushû kanroku* 黄檗宗鑑録. According to genealogical charts, the emperor's Dharma line includes two abbots of Mampuku-ji and continues down to the present.

The Emperor Gomizunoo was born in 1596, the third child of Emperor Goyōzai.¹³ He ascended to the throne in 1611, reigning nineteen years until his abdication in 1629. At the time of his abdication, he was only thirty-four years of age and he lived a long life in retirement, dying in 1680 at the age of eighty-five. Even after his abdication, all sources indicate that Gomizunoo continued to fulfill the official duties of naming abbots and conferring purple robes and honorific titles. Tensions with the Edo bakufu did not ease completely even after the Purple Robe Affair was settled, although the situation was somewhat ameliorated by the common cause of repulsing Christianity, which allied Buddhist leaders, the imperial court, and government officials during the 1630's. However, there are several examples of continued tension with the bakufu related to the emperor's dealings with Buddhist leaders, some directly related to Obaku Zen.

During his reign, the emperor had contacts with various Buddhist monks as a natural consequence of his position, but his interest in Zen at that stage of his life may well have been largely cultural. Both the imperial family and many Buddhist masters, especially Zen masters, shared an abiding interest in such cultural pursuits as the tea ceremony, calligraphy and poetry. Gomizunoo may well have regarded Takuan as a tea master as much as a Zen master. However, after his mother's death in 1630, Gomizunoo seems to have become more serious in his interest in Zen. He was then relying primarily upon the Rinzai master Isshi Monju as his guide, but also summoned other Myōshin-ji masters to instruct him over the years, including Ungo Kiyō and Gudō Tōshuku. In fact, it was on the occasion of one of Gudō's sermon's at the palace that Gomizunoo first met Ryōkei who later became the emperor's link with Obaku Zen.¹⁴ As has been mentioned in other contexts, Isshi preferred a strict approach to monastic discipline.

¹³ There is a modern biography of Gomizunoo written by Kumakura Isao, called *Gomizunooin*. Although Kumakura provides information on various aspects of Gomizunoo's life, especially his dealings with the Tokugawa family and his artistic pursuits, he provides almost no information on the emperor's practice of Zen or his relationships with Zen masters.

¹⁴ Nakao Fumio, *Gomizunoo hō to Obakushū*, pp. 4-6.

One may infer that this either influenced the emperor's understanding of Zen and/or suited his own proclivities, since after Isshi's death in 1646, Gomizunoo continued to prefer advocates of strict precept adherence, including the Obaku masters.

Gomizunoo took the tonsure in 1651 and was given the religious name of Enjō Dōkaku Hōō 円淨道覚法皇. As with his abdication, this action was regarded at the time as a protest against the Tokugawa shogun's treatment of him. Iemitsu had specifically requested that the emperor neither resign nor take the tonsure. Gomizunoo had resigned years earlier, but had refrained from taking holy orders until after Iemitsu's death, which he used as an opportunity to fulfill this long-standing wish.¹⁵ His action was seen as an affront to the Tokugawa shogun, since he waited only a matter of days after Iemitsu's passing; Iemitsu died on 1651/4/20, and Gomizunoo was ordained on 5/6, approximately two weeks later. When Gomizunoo announced his ordination, the funeral services and mourning for Iemitsu were barely underway. However, even if Gomizunoo intentionally timed his ordination to indicate his on-going protest against Tokugawa interference in imperial affairs, his later actions suggest that he was genuinely motivated by religious intentions and practiced Zen as a serious student.

Gomizunoo's relationship with Ryōkei developed gradually over a number of years, culminating, according to Obaku accounts, in the emperor receiving *inka* and inheriting Ryōkei's Dharma. The two men first met in 1636 when Ryōkei came to the palace as one of Gudō's attendants, and the emperor took notice of the young master on that occasion. At about the time of his ordination, the emperor conferred several honors on Ryōkei, naming him abbot at Myōshin-ji, first in 1651 and then again in 1654, and granting him the purple robe in 1651. These honors do not in themselves indicate that a deep personal relationship existed between the two men; that seems to have developed a few years later. Ryōkei was summoned to the palace several times over the years to instruct the emperor in Zen teachings and practice;

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 6. See also Gomizunoo's biography in Otsuki, *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten*, pp. 127-129.

these visits became more frequent after 1655 when Ryōkei had begun his work for Yin-yüan in earnest. It seems likely that during the years 1655 through 1659 while Yin-yüan's case was still pending before the bakufu, Ryōkei approached the court to gain imperial support for Yin-yüan's cause. He may have recommended that Yin-yüan receive an imperial purple robe, which would perhaps have raised Yin-yüan's stature in the eyes of the shogun's counselors.¹⁶ In any event, Obaku sources regard 1657 as the point at which the emperor first became affiliated with Obaku Zen through his dealings with Ryōkei.¹⁷

Gomizunoo never met face to face with Yin-yüan or with any of the other Chinese masters. He always had contact with them through a Japanese intermediary and through letters.¹⁸ The emperor had heard a great deal about Yin-yüan from Ryōkei and through him knew about the founding of Mampuku-ji. Since Gomizunoo could not invite the Chinese master to court to instruct him in person, he made a special request through Ryōkei that Yin-yüan compose for him a lesson on Zen. Yin-yüan replied with a short lesson in Chinese (*hōgo* 法語) in 1663.¹⁹ This initiated an indirect relationship that lasted until Yin-yüan's death. Over the years, Gomizunoo was generous in his dealings with Yin-yüan and Mampuku-ji and demonstrated his respect for the master through his gifts and poetry. For example, in 1666,

¹⁶ There is evidence suggesting this in the *Obaku geki* in the episode concerning the purple robe. According to Mujaku, Ryōkei acquired the robe for Yin-yüan through irregular channels and this precipitated the final break between Ryōkei and Jikuin. If the account is factual, Jikuin was not only offended at the forwardness of the action in religious terms, but was concerned about following the proper procedure set out in the *hatto* of 1615, which would have required bakafu permission for a such an honor. Jikuin remonstrated with Ryōkei, saying, "One cannot be allowed to wear a purple robe without both the knowledge of the military government and permission from the imperial court." *Obaku geki*, p. 5a. The suggestion here is that bakufu permission had not been sought and that Ryōkei's actions were inviting problems from the government officials.

¹⁷ The essay "Gomizunoo Tenno to Obaku", published at Mampuku-ji to commemorate the 250th anniversary of Gomizunoo's death, indicates that Ryōkei first introduced the Obaku style of Zen to Gomizunoo in the summer of 1657. Furuichi, *Gomizunoo Tenno to Obaku*, p. 2.

¹⁸ Gomizunoo was fulfilling some sort of promise or taboo against meeting directly with non-Japanese. This did not prevent him having extensive correspondence with Obaku masters like Yin-yüan and Kao-ch'üan.

¹⁹ The text of the *hōgo* is quite short and can be found (repeated twice from different sources) in the *Ingen zenshū*, vol. 7, pp. 3233-3238.

Gomizunoo presented Yin-yüan with five Buddhist relics in a small jade pagoda and provided the funds to build the Shariden 舍利殿 (Relic's hall) on the grounds of Mampuku-ji where the relics were later enshrined. When he learned that Yin-yüan was on his deathbed in 1673, he sent a message conferring on him the honorific title *Daikô fushô kokushi* 大光普照国師. He is reported to have said at that time, "The master is a National Treasure. If he could live longer, I would gladly take his place [in death]."²⁰

The Imperial Dharma Heir

During the period from 1661 until his death in 1670, Ryôkei served as Gomizunoo's Zen master and their relationship developed fully. Before that time, Ryôkei had been working diligently on Yin-yüan's behalf and was traveling almost constantly. In 1661, when Mampuku-ji came under construction, Ryôkei had completed his service to establish Yin-yüan in Japan and returned to his home temple, Fumon-ji in Settsu. In 1664, Gomizunoo appointed Ryôkei abbot and restorer of Shômyô-ji 正明寺, a temple dear to the emperor.²¹ By that time, Ryôkei had received *inka* from Yin-yüan, and the temple officially became an Obaku branch temple. Over the ten year period from 1661 through 1670, Ryôkei often went to the palace to lecture to the emperor and his family and attendants on Zen. In 1665, he conferred the Bodhisattva precepts on one of Gomizunoo's daughters. In the autumn of 1667, Ryôkei gave the emperor the Oak Tree *kôan* (底前柏樹 *teizen hakuju*) as his device for meditation, and

²⁰ According to Nakao, although Kao-ch'üan read the emperor's letter granting Yin-yüan the honorific title *Daikô fushô kokushi*, the sect kept the title secret until some twenty-two years later when Kao-ch'üan revealed it publicly with bakufu permission. See Nakao, *Gomizunoo hōdō to Ōbakushū*, pp. 61-65. It seems likely that this secrecy was related to the *hatto* governing imperial titles; Gomizunoo probably conferred the title immediately when he heard that Yin-yüan was dying, without having sufficient time to obtain bakufu permission.

²¹ Shômyô-ji is in Hino in Shiga prefecture. It was originally built by Shôtoku Taishi 聖徳太子 and burned to the ground in the late sixteenth century. Gomizunoo had originally intended Isshi Monju to serve as founder/restorer, but Isshi died before the work had progressed significantly. Other monks served as abbot in the interim between Isshi's death in 1646 and Ryôkei's assuming that office in 1664. However, it is Ryôkei who was listed as founder/restorer. See Nakao, *op.cit.*, p. 13.

subsequently confirmed his enlightenment experience.²² During the following summer, Ryōkei conferred the full Bodhisattva precepts upon him. Obaku scholars interpret this to be a further indication of Ryōkei's Dharma transmission, since formal Obaku ordination at the *Sandan kaie* culminates with the Bodhisattva precepts.²³

Ryōkei died unexpectedly in a flood tide in Osaka in 1670 without having transmitted his Dharma to any of his disciples aside from the emperor, who could not function as a typical Dharma heir. The emperor mourned the passing of his teacher, not the least because Ryōkei's line had no other heir to carry on the Dharma and would therefore come to a premature end. Gomizunoo took those steps necessary to honor Ryōkei as his Dharma master: He had three memorial pagodas built for Ryōkei, one at Mampuku-ji, a second at Shōmyō-ji and the third at Keizui-ji 慶瑞寺 in Tonda; he saw to it that all the regular memorial services for Ryōkei were observed at Shōmyō-ji. Finally, when Gomizunoo was himself dying, he took steps to insure Ryōkei's lineage would continue after him. He wrote to Kao-ch'üan and entrusted to him a number of religious articles and poetry he had received from Yin-yüan and Ryōkei, in order that they could be appropriately preserved by the sect. He included with these articles a set of his dying instructions which he asked Kao-ch'üan to fulfill.²⁴

Kao-ch'üan had acted as Yin-yüan's assistant in his final years, writing several documents in Yin-yüan's stead. This first brought him into contact with the emperor when he wrote the thanksgiving record commemorating the construction of the Shariden. Following that occasion, there were numerous exchanges of gifts, poetry and letters between the emperor and Kao-

²² The Oak Tree kōan appears as the 37th case in the *Mumonkan*. Nakao provides the text of the emperor's letter of thanks to Ryōkei that followed this exchange, op.cit., pp. 36-37. The letter does indicate that the emperor had attained enlightenment under Ryōkei's guidance.

²³ Ibid., p. 39.

²⁴ If this letter has been preserved, I have found no evidence of it. Perhaps a copy of it will be found in Kao-ch'üan's complete works, if the project to publish them ever comes to fruition. I have never even seen any direct quotations from it. All information about it in the secondary literature seems to come from Kao-ch'üan's writings.

ch'üan before he received the emperor's final request which came soon after the emperor's death in 1680. Their long correspondence perhaps explains why the emperor chose to rely upon Kao-ch'üan rather than one of his superiors at Mampuku-ji. Given the date of the emperor's death, there would not yet have been an abbot at Mampuku-ji to replace Mu-an who died earlier the same year. Therefore, the emperor's choice was not as obvious as it might otherwise have been.

According to Kao-ch'üan's account, the emperor did not want to allow Ryôkei's Dharma line to end, so he requested that Kao-ch'üan take action and appoint an heir as his proxy. The emperor informed Kao-ch'üan that he had inherited Ryôkei's Dharma, providing both the master's whisk and a verse as evidence of this fact. As a retired emperor, Gomizunoo could not fulfill the normal duties of a Zen master, accepting and training students, and then in due time transmitting the Dharma to a worthy disciple. Nor did he personally know Ryôkei's other disciples so that he might make an informed choice from among them. Therefore, Gomizunoo requested that Kao-ch'üan choose the appropriate individual from among that group, present him with the whisk, and thus transmit Ryôkei's Dharma in the emperor's name.

Kao-ch'üan was faced with something of a dilemma as to how to proceed. The situation posed difficult problems whatever course of action he might choose. According to Obaku practice, Dharma transmission should occur only after face to face encounters between a master and a student. When a master died unexpectedly, his disciples would seek out other Obaku masters to guide their practice and confirm their enlightenment experience. They would then become the new master's Dharma heirs.²⁵ Under normal circumstances, Ryôkei's disciples might reasonably have turned to Gomizunoo and perhaps become his Dharma heirs directly. However, the emperor's exalted social position set him outside the normal monastic life and made normal procedures impractical. Moreover, his unique status lent his unusual

²⁵ That is precisely what happened when Tetsugen died at the early age of 53 without having named any of his disciples a Dharma heir. Many of them became Mu-an's disciples, including Hôshû, Tetsugen's leading disciple, who eventually received Mu-an's *inka* and is listed in his line.

request special weight. Kao-ch'üan consulted with his superiors at the head temple, including Tu-chan Hsing-jung who would soon become the fourth abbot at Mampuku-ji in 1682, and showed great discretion in keeping his decision quiet. For five years, Kao-ch'üan took no public action to fulfill Gomizunoo's instructions, although it is said that he used that time period to evaluate Ryôkei's leading disciples to determine their level of understanding. Then, in 1685, he conferred *inka* on Kaiô Hôkô 晦翁宝高 (1635-1712), officially naming him as Gomizunoo's successor. Kaiô received Ryôkei's whisk and the emperor's monastic robe and was appointed abbot at Shômyô-ji. Obaku masters including Kao-ch'üan, Tetsugyû, Nan-yüan Hsing-p'ai 南源性派 (1631-1692; J. Nangen Shôha), and Dokuhon Shôgen 独本性源 (1618-1689) marked the occasion by composing celebratory verses.

Kao-ch'üan's decision was not greeted with universal applause. Criticism arose within the sect and from other Buddhist leaders, eventually leading to government involvement to settle the dispute. External criticism took two forms. On the one hand, Kao-ch'üan was accused of delaying his decision for five years in order to accomplish his true purpose, namely to cut off Ryôkei's Dharma line. On the other hand, other Rinzaï masters took issue with Obaku staking exclusive claim on the emperor's devotion. Mujaku Dôchû of Myôshin-ji took this latter approach in the *Obaku geki*, in which he denied that the emperor had ever made such a request in the first place.

After Gudô had passed away, the emperor summoned Ryôkei. After a time, Ryôkei offered the retired emperor one of his whisks. This meant that he wanted to place the emperor's name exclusively on the list of his Dharma heirs. The emperor looked upon [the whisk] as a worldly implement. Later, Ryôkei drowned to death in a high flood tide in Naniwa. When the emperor himself was facing death, he sent the whisk along with a message to Akenomiya 明宮 (the emperor's daughter who later became a nun and resided at Rinkyû-ji 林丘寺). [The message] said, "This is something for a monk to use; it is useless at the palace. It was originally Ryôkei's religious implement. Please have Kao-ch'üan return it to one of Ryôkei's disciples."

After the emperor passed away, his daughter did exactly what he had requested. Kao-ch'üan accepted the whisk, but told a lie. He said that the emperor wanted to be Ryôkei's Dharma heir. (The emperor merely wanted to

return the whisk to Ryôkei's disciples.)²⁶

Mujaku is at pains here to deny that the emperor considered himself Ryôkei's Dharma heir despite the fact that he possessed Ryôkei's whisk. In a rare slip, Mujaku contradicts himself within these few lines, giving two conflicting explanations. First he claims that the emperor regarded the whisk as a secular implement, an unlikely explanation for a devout Zen practitioner like Gomizunoo. Then, he suggests that although the emperor recognized the whisk's religious meaning, he distanced himself from the obvious implication that he had become Ryôkei's heir. On a more subtle level, Mujaku argues against any exclusive claim to Gomizunoo's Zen affiliation by mentioning his deep connections with both Gudô and Isshi, both of Myôshin-ji.

The internal dispute resulting from Kao-ch'üan publicly naming Kaiô to be Gomizunoo's Dharma heir was more serious in nature. It split the sect into two factions, pitting Kao-ch'üan and his supporters against the abbot Tu-chan and other senior monks at the main temple. Tu-chan and the others stressed that Obaku should not recognize Dharma transmission except through direct, face to face encounters between master and student. According to the *Obaku geki*, Tu-chan based his argument against Kao-ch'üan's decision on an incident that had occurred at Wan-fu-ssu some time earlier, presumably when Master Fei-yin was abbot.²⁷ Fei-yin had apparently expelled a monk for accepting Dharma transmission by proxy. Tu-chan took this as a binding rule for the Obaku line and would not accept the transmission to Kaiô as valid. Kao-ch'üan defended his decision in light of the special circumstances related to the emperor's social status, stressing that his primary objective was to fulfill the emperor's final instructions.

²⁶ *Obaku geki*, p. 14b. This passage is one of the Chinese vignettes in the second portion of the *Obaku geki*. Mujaku includes all of the pertinent information concerning the various negative reactions, internal and external alike, as well as a less coherent explanation of the petition to the bakufu and the *Jisha bugyô*'s response. Of particular interest is Mujaku's description, albeit at third or fourth hand, of the contents of a letter K'ao-chuan supposedly wrote to Tu-chan in his own defense. Kao-ch'üan "quoted the emperor as saying, 'We take Yin-yüan to be Bodhidharma, Ryôkei to be the second Patriarch, and ourself to be the third Patriarch.'" Mujaku rejects this, saying that Kao-ch'üan said it to slander the emperor and mock the Japanese people.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 15a.

Arguments went on for a number of years, and all internal efforts to settle the dispute proved unsuccessful. Eventually, the case was decided by the bakufu when Tu-chan made an official petition requesting their determination of the matter.

Ultimately, Tu-chan was not successful in his efforts to invalidate Kaiô's reception of Gomizunoo's Dharma, and his petition brought about his own defeat. The bakufu decided that Kao-ch'üan had acted rightly, showing proper respect for the wishes of a Japanese emperor as befitted a visiting Chinese master. As a result of this decision, Tu-chan was forced to resign as abbot in 1691; he and his party left Mampuku-ji and retired to other temples. Following the accepted procedure, Tu-chan sent the bakufu a list of qualified candidates to succeed him as abbot at Mampuku-ji, naming Nan-yüan as his own first choice. The bakufu preferred Kao-ch'üan, who also qualified and appeared on the list. He became Mampuku-ji's fifth abbot in 1692, thus ending the so-called "indirect transmission incident" (代付事件 *daifu jiken* or 代付論争 *daifu ronsô*).

Obaku Relations with the Tokugawa Bakufu

The Tokugawa bakufu initially took a suspicious attitude toward Yin-yüan and his Chinese disciples when they received petitions requesting permission for them to travel and reside outside of Nagasaki in 1655. Although Yin-yüan was a well-known monk and the petitions were filed by prominent Japanese Rinzai masters, Yin-yüan's connections with the Ming loyalists caused Tokugawa government officials some concern. By 1659, the situation had been completely reversed. The bakufu had not only become full supporters of Yin-yüan, they would agree to sponsor the founding of the main temple Obaku-san Mampuku-ji, provide a yearly stipend to finance its upkeep, and even facilitate further emigration of Obaku monks from China to perpetuate the line. The change in attitude came about gradually over the four to five year petition process, but the most dramatic progress occurred in 1658 when Yin-yüan traveled to Edo for an audience at the castle. We can perhaps regard Yin-yüan's personal

encounters with the shogun and his counselors during that visit as the turning point after which all residual doubts about his motives were laid to rest. The positive impression that Yin-yüan made may explain the bakufu's willingness to grant him permanent status as a resident alien, but do not seem sufficient to explain the bakufu's active involvement in establishing a new Zen line. This is particularly the case since bakufu policies were otherwise geared toward constraining Buddhism's growth. Under the circumstances, one must ask what the bakufu sought to gain from its arrangement with Ōbaku Zen and why Ōbaku was singled out for special treatment.

Takenuki has pointed out a parallel between the Tokugawa bakufu's relationship with Ōbaku Zen and that of other military houses to Rinzai Zen since the Kamakura period.²⁸ Takenuki provides ample evidence of bakufu sponsorship of Ōbaku, giving details as to who donated what and when. A brief listing of the larger donations include the following: First, the bakufu provided the land and permission to build a new monastery in 1659. According to the red seal certificate that was first issued on 11/7/1665, the land granted to Mampuku-ji measured ninety thousand *tsubo* with an annual stipend of four hundred *koku* of rice.²⁹ It should be noted that in granting permission to found a new temple, the bakufu made an exception to its own order, enacted just the year before, in 1658, forbidding the construction of new temples. The senior counselor Sakai Tadakatsu, who became Yin-yüan's strongest supporter in the Edo government, left one thousand *ryō* of gold in his will for construction costs. In 1667, the Shogun Ietsuna personally donated twenty thousand *ryō* of gold, four hundred fifty teak trees, and assigned his own administrator of construction, Aoki Shigekane 青木重兼 (1606-

²⁸ See Takenuki, *Nihon zenshūshi*, p. 220.

²⁹ Red seal certificates were issued to Mampuku-ji by every shogun from the fourth Ietsuna through the fourteenth Iemochi (1646-1666). The grant and stipend remained unchanged throughout the period. The entire plot of land which the bakufu acquired from the Konoe family in 1659 was assessed at 1,400 *koku*. The bakufu retained the larger portion of the land, granting Ōbaku-san the smaller parcel.

1682)³⁰, the *daimyō* of Kai province, to direct the project and provided the services of the carpentry clan Akishino 秋篠. Having the shogun's support lent Obaku a high level of credibility among the other military houses, and many *daimyō* and *hatamoto* followed the shogun's lead in contributing to construction projects at Obaku-san or by sponsoring Obaku temples in their home districts.³¹

Having illustrated his contention that Mampuku-ji was founded and built under strong bakufu sponsorship, thus supporting his comparison to earlier historical examples, Takenuki does not explore the implications of the comparison. Specifically, he never addresses possible motives of the Tokugawa bakufu that a comparison might suggest. First let us consider other common elements that support the comparison and then move on to some contrasts to see what the historical patterns suggest. In both the Kamakura and Tokugawa cases, relatively new military governments supported new Zen lines by building large monasteries and appointing Chinese emigre masters as abbots. Zen held distinctive advantages from the perspective of military governments. As Collcutt put it, "The Zen stress on active meditation, man-to-man debate, physical self-discipline, and practical rather than bookish experience, appealed naturally to the warrior spirit.... Furthermore, as a predominantly monastic form of Buddhism, Zen was socially stable, politically non-volatile, and as amenable to secular supervision and control in Japan as it had been in China."³²

Certain characteristics in Obaku's Zen style would have commended it to the bakufu

³⁰ Aoki Shigekane was already a lay patron of Yin-yüan whom he had met at Fumon-ji when he had been serving in Settsu in the mid-1650's. It is said that he received Mu-an's Dharma in 1679 and was given the name Zuisan Shōshō 瑞山性正. This was not recorded in any official sectarian records, but an episode is recorded in Mu-an's *nempū*. For quotations of the passage from the *Mokuan zenji nempū* relevant to Aoki, see Nakamura Shusei, "Mokuan zenji to sono waso shihosha", p. 12 under the name Zuisan Dōshō 瑞山道正.

³¹ A listing of the smaller donations by the other military houses is too lengthy to include here. Takenuki details the names and contributions in a number of places, *Nihon zenshūshi*, pp. 218-220 and 235-236, and *Kinsei Ōbakushū matsuji chōshusei*, pp. 21-22.

³² Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, p. 61.

as a good basis for revitalizing or, perhaps more accurately, controlling Japanese Rinzai in a manner beneficial to the Tokugawa system. Obaku's stress on monastic discipline and its positive attitude toward the study of scripture made it an appealing form of Zen, suiting the bakufu's general goals to reduce Buddhism's political threat by reaffirming monastic discipline and scholarship. It seems unlikely that the bakufu was otherwise interested in the details of Obaku's practice as it compared to Japanese Rinzai. The Pure Land elements that offended Japanese monks and ultimately led to Obaku's independence as a third Zen sect were not an issue for the bakufu. Government officials were not concerned with the "purity" of the Zen practice or with any other philosophical debate, as long as it did not cause a public disturbance.

Like Rinzai in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Obaku represented a new style of Buddhism in Japan, not yet co-opted by any political power in Japanese society. Whereas the existing Rinzai monasteries had long-standing connections with the imperial court as discussed above, Obaku did not. The Zen community of Kyoto included many individuals from the nobility who were not favorably inclined in their attitudes toward the military government in Edo. The Purple Robe Affair and the poor treatment that the emperor received at the shogun's hands probably only exacerbated those feelings. The bakufu may have felt it advantageous to have close ties with at least one influential Zen monastery in Kyoto. Chinese Obaku masters were likely allies, since as foreigners they had no cultural biases against the military government.

Tokugawa Ietsuna and his successor Tsunayoshi followed the example of the Ashikaga shoguns in patronizing Zen monasteries, in this case making significant donations to Mampuku-ji. Following the Ashikaga pattern, they were far more interested in the cultural aspects of Zen than in actually practicing it for themselves. With a few notable exceptions such as Sakai Tadakatsu and Aoki Shigekane, Obaku Zen did not inspire great personal devotion among the bakufu and *han* officials who supported the new sect.³³ Even in Sakai's case, there is no

³³ There is no way to be certain how many military houses became patrons of Obaku in the

clear indication that he practiced Zen meditation under any master's guidance. Like most government officials, his religious concerns were centered on holding Buddhist memorial services for his deceased family members and earning personal merit through his monetary support of Buddhist monks and monasteries.

In additions to the parallels, there are contrasts between the Kamakura and Tokugawa situations that prove equally enlightening in understanding Ōbaku's role in Tokugawa society. Whereas the Ashikaga bakufu used Zen temples in the *gozan* 五山 system as a nation-wide, quasi-political institution,³⁴ the Tokugawa bakufu had already co-opted all existing Buddhist sects to serve the same purpose. Buddhist temples acted as quasi-government agencies in the *danka seido* 檀家制度, or parishioner system, requiring each family throughout the country to register membership at a local Buddhist temple to prove they were not Christians. The Tokugawa bakufu did not need Ōbaku in particular to serve any such purpose. Rather, Ōbaku lent the Tokugawa bakufu an opportunity to provide Japanese society with this one direct link with Chinese culture, especially the calligraphy, painting, poetry, and prose for which Ōbaku masters were known. This, of course, again suggests comparisons with the Kamakura examples, especially the Hōjō regents, who "drew on Zen not only as a source of spiritual enlightenment but also as a medium of intellectual and cultural improvement."³⁵

Ōbaku's Growth within the Tokugawa Temple System

Ōbaku entered the scene in Japan five or six decades after Tokugawa Ieyasu had attained ascendancy and had unified the country under his control. The bakufu already had a early years, because the records for military families, 武鑑 *bukan*, do not record religious affiliation until Keio 2 (1866). In the records for that year, Ōbaku is specifically listed as the primary affiliation for twelve individuals. In many other cases, the affiliation is noted simply as "Zenshū", and some of these individuals may have been Ōbaku believers. See Hashimoto Hiroshi, *Kaitei zōho Daibukan*, vol. 2, pp. 1054-1091.

³⁴ See Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, pp. 100-101.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 58.

coherent policy for regulating Buddhist sects and temples. For this reason it is useful to consider first the situation prevailing before Obaku's founding. In dealing with Buddhist organizations, the bakufu had issued new laws regulating Buddhist temples and schools (寺院法度 *jiin hatto*) several times over the years. In keeping with long-standing sectarian divisions within Japanese Buddhism, the *hatto* were issued predominantly along sectarian lines. They formalized existing patterns in which temples within a given school or sect might be related in a hierarchical manner as main temple and affiliated branch temple.³⁶ The new regulations mandated that every Buddhist temple and school should officially designate its affiliation and clearly specify the internal relationships between main and branch temples. This resulted in a formal system intended to incorporate every existing temple into a overarching hierarchical structure. Such a system was designed to facilitate governmental control over Buddhist temples, since officials would need to directly communicate with only a small set of main temples. The main temples were then responsible for enforcing any government directives from above to their affiliated branch temples. In order to fulfill this responsibility, main temples were from the outset granted significant control over their branch temples in the overall system.

Although some temples already had pre-existing lines of affiliation with a given sect or major temple, many did not. The process of registering main and branch temples required a certain amount of sorting out of the lines of association within sects, which inevitably precipitated some disputes among temples, as each one was forced to choose and formally state its affiliation. Any network intended to consolidate every temple within the entire country necessarily took time to materialize. Gradually, Buddhist groups took on a defined shape that approximated the sectarian pattern still familiar today.³⁷ Zen temples were clearly distinguished as either

³⁶ The system of relating temples hierarchically as main and branch temples (*honmatsu seido* 本末制度) had its roots in the Heian period, but had never been formalized to incorporate all temples. See McMullin, *op.cit.*, p. 21. For a detailed description of *honmatsu seido*, from its origins in the medieval period through its full development in the Tokugawa period, see Toyoda Takeshi, *Nihon shûkyô seido shi no kenkyû*, pp. 30-72.

³⁷ The first stages of the process are represented by the *Kan'ei no shoshû honjichô* 寛永の

Rinzai or Sôtô, based on the divergent history and practices of the two schools. Unlike Sôtô, Rinzai Zen was not united under a single structure, but divided up into several lines primarily associated with the larger temples including Myôshin-ji, Daitoku-ji, Nanzen-ji and so on.

A new Rinzai line such as Ōbaku faced significant obstacles to growth inherent in this system. It had no special status under the law despite its close relationship with the government. Like all existing networks within the hierarchy, Ōbaku was constrained by the regulations against building new temples and limiting the restoration of existing temples. Unlike the older schools, however, Ōbaku did not possess a large network of temples historically affiliated with the main temple Mampuku-ji. Initially, Ōbaku was limited to just those temples that government officials sponsored with bakufu permission. Ōbaku would have remained quite small had the regulations for temples not developed and changed in a manner that helped their cause.

In 1665, the bakufu issued a new set of *hatto* applicable to all Buddhist sects, which altered the balance of power between main and branch temples.³⁸ Main temples had previously held the upper hand, since they were given official power to regulate their branch temples. Having once established the hierarchical pattern, branch temples did not have the freedom to change their affiliation without the main temple granting permission, an unlikely event at best. Under the new laws, branch temples and their members were given the authority to determine their own affiliation; according to the new guidelines, the branch temples and their congregations gained control over the choice of abbot, which in turn determined the temple's affiliation. This left room for considerably more fluctuation, which benefitted Ōbaku directly. Temples like Fumon-ji in Settsu that had previously been listed officially as Myôshin-ji branch temples became Ōbaku branch temples by virtue of their abbot's affiliation. Other temples 諸宗本寺帳, a register of all main and branch temples compiled in 1632 and 1633. Registries of main and branch temples were done at irregular intervals throughout the period in order to update the existing records. Takenuki's *Kinsei Ōbakushu matsuji chōshūsei* provides detailed information about Ōbaku temples found in later registries.

³⁸ The date for these new *hatto*, 11/7/1665, coincides precisely with the date for the first red seal certificate granted to Mampuku-ji.

that had only weak connections with their main temples became prime targets for Obaku expansion. It is not known whether or not the bakufu designed these regulations with Obaku's interests in mind. The timing suggests the possibility of a direct correlation, but there is no concrete evidence on which to rely. Nonetheless, intentional or not, the new laws were among the more crucial steps taken by the Tokugawa bakufu that aided the development of Obaku Zen, since they created an opening in an otherwise closed landscape.

Obaku masters developed a variety of strategies for gaining new temples for the order, based on the new regulations. For example, existing family temples in Edo or the provinces often became Obaku branch temples when the local *daimyō* or another high-level official invited an Obaku monk to serve as abbot. Obaku monks traveling through different regions of the country to spread the new Zen style among the common people also founded numerous temples with popular support. Obaku monks did not enjoy the benefit of an existing network of Obaku temples in which to stay for short periods of time when traveling. They would therefore sometimes stop at a dilapidated temple or one that no longer had a resident monk and use it for temporary shelter. If the local community responded positively, the Obaku monk might be invited to restore the temple and serve as its head. The members would then switch the temple's official affiliation to Mampuku-ji or to another large Obaku temple. Using all of these methods, Obaku had expanded to include 1043 temples spread through 51 out of the 66 provinces in Japan by the time they put together their first comprehensive list of main and branch temples in 1745.³⁹

An important factor to bear in mind is that Obaku monks of the early generations faced a shortage of temples unknown in other sects. As the sect attracted Japanese converts, the number of Obaku monks far outweighed the number of Obaku temples that they could expect to inherit from their master. More and more Obaku monks found themselves without temples

³⁹ These numbers are based on the *Enkyō matsujiichō* 延享末寺帳 published in Enkyō 2 (1745). Takenuki provides a breakdown by province of the information from that and other sources. See *Kinsei Obakushu matsuji chōshūsei*, pp. 25-28.

that they could call their permanent homes. Tetsugen was in just this situation when he acquired his primary temple of residence, Zuiryû-ji 瑞龍寺 in Osaka, though he later founded other temples in much the same way. In the case of Zuiryû-ji, Tetsugen and his disciples had moved to Osaka to begin work on the Tripitaka. As there were no Obaku temples in the immediate vicinity, they lived temporarily with a family of Obaku lay believers. A community group in the Tamba district offered to restore a ruined temple and invited Tetsugen to become the resident monk. He renamed the temple Zuiryû-ji and is listed on the official records as its founder.

As the above example also illustrates, Obaku masters sometimes borrowed or even rented houses or land for temporary quarters. The bakufu actually granted the sect official permission to do so in 1673. The practice was obviously not standard at the time and attracted some scornful remarks from other Buddhists. I believe that this is the import of one short passage from the *Obaku geki*. "Today in the Obaku line there are some who claim to transmit the Dharma but have no temple in which to reside. They are all over the city, in front of shops and behind them. They are the so-called Senior Guardian [who protects] the heavens and the Minister of Works [who protects] all the earth."⁴⁰ Given the conditions facing a new Buddhist school at the time, few other options existed for those monks who had not yet made a name for themselves but had received an invitation to establish a temple from a prominent government official or a local group of believers.

Obaku's Change of Perspective

Buddhism has traditionally relied upon the secular authorities for a measure of support and in turn has had to accept varying degrees of secular control and limitation. Chinese

⁴⁰ *Obaku geki*, p. 17b. The final line is obscure. The author has been unable to identify the term *manten taiho manchi shikû* 満天満地司空, translated here as Senior Guardian [who protects] the heavens and the Minister of Works [who protects] the earth". The terms *taiho* and *shikû* refer to government posts during the Chou dynasty. The former was the senior guardian of the heir apparent and the latter the minister of works, responsible to oversee the land and the people.

Buddhism certainly fit this pattern in the late Ming period, and the Chinese monks would have taken it for granted that the same would hold true in Japan. Indeed, in Japan, both the imperial court and military governments have acted the part of benefactor to Buddhism and, depending on the period, exerted some control over its growth and internal affairs. There is nothing unusual, then, in Obaku Zen enjoying the degree of secular patronage described above. Although relations between the bakufu and the court were still strained in the mid-seventeenth century, this did not prevent them from sharing a common cause, such as the anti-Christian movement, nor from sponsoring the same Buddhist groups. For its part, Obaku benefited from both its relationship with the imperial family, especially Emperor Gomizunoo, and its relationship with bakufu and *han* officials. Needless to say, the benefits were different in accordance with the spheres of power proper to each. While the bakufu and *han* officials could provide financial support, permission to build new temples, assistance in sponsoring the emigration of Chinese monks, etc., close relations with the emperor brought Obaku prestige in the social realm.

The emperor's actual authority had been limited by the bakufu to cultural and artistic spheres. Even at a time when the emperor had little or no political or military power, imperial support still lent Obaku prestige in Japanese society. When the emperor conferred purple robes and honorific titles on various Obaku masters (with bakufu permission, of course), he gave them status in the hierarchical world of Japanese Buddhism. Likewise, the shogun's personal support for Obaku raised the new sect's standing with the military houses. However, since the bakufu held the monopoly on political power, Obaku had to abide by the bakufu's system of government and answer to its authority whenever disputes arose. On a very practical level, like all Buddhist groups at the time, Obaku fell under bakufu control for a wide variety of monastic concerns, including building and restoring temples, publishing texts, appointing a new abbot for the main monastery, etc. From time to time, the bakufu did exercise its authority to ban certain Buddhist practices and even outlawed entire Buddhist organizations, so the

level of potential coercive power to control Buddhist sects that it possessed should not be underestimated. There was no comparable type of imperial control operative over Buddhist sects until after the Meiji Restoration. Therefore, during the Tokugawa period, while imperial support was an asset for the new sect, bakufu support was a necessity for Obaku's very existence.

Following the Meiji Restoration, the situation changed significantly for Obaku Zen and the whole of the Buddhist world in Japan. Buddhism in general came on hard times. The Meiji government preferred the native Shinto as a state religion and put Buddhism, which had cooperated so thoroughly with the bakufu, in an inferior position. Existing tendencies that viewed Buddhism as a foreign religion, detrimental to Japanese ways of thinking, became dominant in intellectual and political circles. Buddhism had been on the defensive on the intellectual front during much of the Tokugawa period, but it had enjoyed government protection from any serious attacks on its personnel, property and economic base. Now, it came under fire from government policies as well as popular outcry. The Meiji government actively pursued a policy of separating Shinto from long-standing elements of Buddhist influence (神仏分離 *shinbutsu bunri*). This led to the closing of numerous temples, particularly those built within shrine grounds, and to the laicization of shrine priests (社僧 *shasō*) who had served at those temples as well as other monks. Buddhist temples on all levels of the Buddhist hierarchy lost the financial security they had enjoyed under the Tokugawa when temple lands granted by bakufu or han certificates were reclaimed in 1871 and the *danka seido* system was abolished in 1872. There was also a popular backlash against Buddhism calling for its eradication (廃仏毀釈 *haibutsu kishaku*), which led to the destruction of temples and looting of monastic treasure houses in some parts of the country.⁴¹

Obaku found itself in an especially precarious position during the Meiji era because of

⁴¹ For descriptions of the conditions facing Buddhism during the Meiji period, see Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*, and Colcutt, "Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication".

its previous ties to the bakufu. Consequently, Obaku leaders changed their perspective on the sect's history and teachings in an attempt to stabilize the situation. First, in the matter of monetary support, Mampuku-ji had lost sources of income other than those directly associated with the end of the *danka seido*. Obviously, once the bakufu fell, the yearly government stipend of 400 *koku* came to an end. Presumably, the government also repossessed the bulk of Mampuku-ji's land grant under the land reclamation act of 1871 which would have entailed another drop in revenues.⁴² Other, private sources of income also dried up during the financial crises that occurred toward the end of the Tokugawa period and continued into early Meiji. For example, Mampuku-ji had received a regular yearly donation throughout most of the Tokugawa period from a medical academy in Edo, established by one of its early Japanese monks, Ryôô Dôkaku 了翁道覚 (1630-1707). As the institute ceased to thrive toward the end of the period in the face of incoming Western medicine, the stipend gradually decreased and then stopped altogether.⁴³ Like other Buddhist organizations, Obaku desperately needed to cultivate other sources of income, especially on a popular level.

With the possible exception of the Sôtô school, Zen had never really enjoyed the broad levels of popularity among the common people that Pure Land and Nichiren groups had. This meant that in the Meiji era, Zen temples had smaller bases of lay believers to depend upon for donations. Obaku was no exception. Although early generations of Japanese Obaku monks had worked extensively with the common people, this work had gradually declined as the sect became more firmly established. After mandatory Buddhist affiliation was abolished

⁴² There is very little written on Obaku's history under the Meiji government, and I have found no direct references to loss of land at that time. However, the lands now held by Mampuku-ji include just those areas within the actual compound. This fits the pattern of land reclamation enacted in 1871.

⁴³ Ryôô founded the medical academy and its affiliated pharmacy, known respectively as Kintaien 錦袋園 and Kangakuya 勧学屋 in 1665. Ryôô set up a sort of trust in his will that served as a philanthropic agency. Surplus profits were donated on a yearly basis to various Buddhist groups including Tendai, Jôdo shinshû and Zen. Over the years 1701 through 1844, Obaku received approximately 7,800 *ryo* of gold and 1,500 *ryo* of silver for routine upkeep at Mampuku-ji. See Hirakubo Akira, "Edo jidai ni okeru Mampukuji no shûrishi ni tsuite".

by the Meiji authorities, Obaku once again made an effort to popularize its teachings in order to build up voluntary membership. This process included a renewed stress on the Pure Land elements that had always existed in their Zen style but had gradually faded under the influence of Hakuin's kōan Zen. Obaku now presented itself as the one Zen school with teachings designed to reach people of all ranges of ability; for those of high capacity they continued to stress meditation and kōan practice, and for those of medium and low capacity they renewed their stress on the practice of chanting the *nembutsu*.

At the same time that Obaku faced crises in its financial stability and popular acceptance, it also found itself in a new and uncomfortable position with the new political order. Because of its close ties with the bakufu, Obaku was discredited when the bakufu lost power. The close association which had originally been necessary for Obaku's establishment and growth now became a hindrance to its continuing existence. Therefore, Obaku reinterpreted its history to magnify the role of the emperor and attenuate its ties to the bakufu. As the emperor system gained dominance in the world of Meiji thought, Obaku became more and more an imperial sect in its own version of its history. The old story found in sectarian writings during the Tokugawa period that the shogun had invited Yin-yüan to Japan was dropped. New versions seem to have emerged sometime during Meiji suggesting that Yin-yüan came to Kyoto (or to Japan, depending on the source) at the emperor's invitation. Moreover, it was said that he chose land in Uji for Mampuku-ji in order to be near the retired emperor.⁴⁴ These efforts to recast Obaku history were so successful, that the new versions were widely accepted as factual and appeared in non-sectarian scholarly encyclopediae, historical surveys, etc. Remnants of this can still be found in many post-war writings, such as *Zen Dust*, which reports that, "Eventually the reigning emperor granted [Yin-yüan] land at Uji, near Kyoto, where... he

⁴⁴ Although somewhat later, works like Furuichi's *Gomizunoo tennō to Obaku* published in 1929 and many war time Obaku histories and articles, including those by Akamatsu Shinmyō and Washio Junkei, fit into this same pattern.

built an imposing monastery and temple in the late Ming style, which he named Mampuku-ji..."⁴⁵

The trend to reinterpret Ōbaku's history extended into early Shōwa and characterizes much of the scholarship written by Ōbaku scholars before and during the Second World War. These works tend to distort the facts, not by denying the bakufu's participation in the process of establishing Ōbaku Zen, but by a careful shift of emphasis away from the bakufu whenever possible. Much of the recent scholarship on Ōbaku history, especially the work of Takenuki, has tried to restore a more realistic portrait of Ōbaku's relations with the secular authorities by shifting the focus back on Ōbaku's reliance on bakufu patronage. This approach is more accurate for evaluating Ōbaku during the Tokugawa period itself when bakufu patronage was of preeminent importance. However, in light of the practical concerns that shaped Ōbaku's view of itself from the Meiji through the Shōwa periods, scholars should not underestimate the importance in the modern period of Ōbaku's deep ties with the emperor Gōmizunoo.

⁴⁵ Miura, *op.cit.*, p. 22.

Chapter Six

Introduction to Tetsugen Dôkô

As described in the first part of this dissertation, a small group of Chinese monks emigrated to Japan in the mid-seventeenth century and transmitted the Zen style that would there become the Obaku school. The Chinese masters established their own monasteries with distinctive monastic codes, thus preserving in Obaku the Ming style of Rinzai Zen. However, without the support and practical assistance of the Japanese monks who first secured welcome for the Chinese emigrés in the country and then facilitated the establishment of the first Obaku temples, the Obaku masters might well have never ventured beyond the confines of Nagasaki. Their influence on Japanese Buddhism would thus have been severely circumscribed. It was the early generation of Japanese disciples who were responsible, in large part, for the continued spread and success of the new school. Therefore, to understand the pattern of Obaku's development in Japan, one must consider both the foundations laid by the Chinese masters and the contributions made by Japanese monks in constructing the nation-wide framework of temples and lay believers. The second half of this dissertation will examine the work of the first generation of Japanese converts, using the monk Tetsugen Dôkô 鉄眼道光 (1630-1682) as its focus.

The main monastery for the new school, Obaku-san Mampuku-ji, was established in Uji through the efforts of a small group of Japanese monks interceding with the civil authorities on behalf of the Chinese master Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i. Of the three Myôshin-ji line monks who lead the effort, Jikuin Somon 竺印祖門 (1610-1677), Tokuô Myôkô 禿翁妙宏 (1611-1681), and Ryôkei Shôsen 龍溪性潛 (1602-1670), only Ryôkei actually became an Obaku monk and continued to promote the new Dharma style after the temple had been built. The Chinese masters themselves, the founder Yin-yüan and such leading disciples as

Mu-an Hsing-t'ao and Kao-ch'üan Hsing-tun, focused their efforts on developing the community at Obaku-san: training disciples, guiding the construction of temple buildings, and composing the basic sectarian texts that would govern life within the monastery. Although they founded temples in other areas of the country, the Chinese masters did not actively seek to spread the school throughout the country or to popularize it among the various classes of Japanese society. That mission fell to an energetic and talented group of Japanese Obaku monks who studied under Yin-yüan and Mu-an and transmitted their Dharma to later generations of Japanese disciples.¹ As Japanese, these monks had the linguistic skills, the cultural familiarity, and the political connections within Japanese society necessary for spreading Obaku Zen in Japan.

Tetsugen Dôkô became the most famous of the young Japanese Obaku monks who joined the new Zen school in the first years of its development in Japan. His prominence derives primarily from his life's work of producing the first and only complete Japanese woodblock edition of the Chinese Tripitaka.² This edition, known alternatively as the *Obaku-ban* 黄檗版 or the *Tetsugen-ban* 鉄眼版³, served for over two hundred years as the standard Japanese edition of the Buddhist scriptures until it was superseded in the modern period by the Taishô edition⁴. Tetsugen's work on this project not only fostered

¹ The number of Japanese disciples who directly received *inka* from one of the three Chinese masters is approximately sixty. Many more Japanese, numbering in the hundreds, studied under them without ever being named as Dharma heirs. Some of these disciples may have, nonetheless, contributed to the spread of Obaku.

² By the early Tokugawa period, approximately twenty woodblock editions of the Chinese Tripitaka had appeared in China and Korea. Copies of these editions were treasured in Japan at the few temples fortunate to possess them. One other Tripitaka project had been completed in Japan a few decades before Tetsugen began his edition. The Tenkai-ban, as it was known, was a complete edition, but had been produced with a moveable type system, rather than the more permanent woodblocks. See below, p. 211, note 61, for further information.

³ The full name of Tetsugen's edition is *Obaku Tetsugen Issaikyô* 黄檗鐵眼一切經. It is sometimes referred to as the *Obaku Daizôkyô* 黄檗大藏經. It consists of 6,956 volumes, based on the Wan-li edition from Ming China which were supplemented by additional materials, primarily Obaku sectarian texts.

⁴ *Taishô shinshû daizôkyô* 大正新修大藏經. 85 vols. Tokyo: Taishô Issaikyô Kankôkai,

further growth of the Ōbaku school, but made a significant contribution to the wider sphere of Japanese Buddhism, filling the urgent and long-standing need for a readily available and affordable version of the scriptures. Tetsugen undertook the project with the full support of his superiors and received so much practical assistance from other Chinese and Japanese Ōbaku monks that one may regard the finished project as the work of the entire sect.

Along with his Dharma brothers Tetsugyū Dōki 鉄牛道機 (1628-1700), Chōon Dōkai 潮音道海 (1628-1695), and Tokuō Ryōkō 徳翁良高 (1649-1709), Tetsugen represents the first generation of Japanese Ōbaku monks, who successfully spread the new school throughout the country. Tetsugen was, in many respects, typical of the early generations of Japanese converts to Ōbaku Zen. He was a young man of considerable drive and talent who was unsatisfied with his experience of Buddhist masters and Buddhist practice before he met Yin-yüan. Like the others, Tetsugen felt drawn to visit the Chinese master when he first heard of his arrival in Nagasaki, hoping to find in his assembly the caliber of Buddhist practice he found lacking in Japan. Tetsugen shared the growing consensus that Japanese Buddhism, especially the clergy, had become degenerate and needed to reform itself. For this reason, Ōbaku's strict interpretation of the monastic code appealed to Tetsugen and others like him.

The majority of the first generation of Japanese Ōbaku monks believed that Ōbaku's Zen style offered the avenue of reform that Japanese Zen needed to revitalize itself. They expended great energy in their efforts to broaden the base for the fledgling school, instructing both samurai and the commoner classes around the country, founding and restoring temples, participating in social welfare activities, and, of course, training disciples and writing religious tracts. Tetsugen served the school in all the above-mentioned ways: he traveled the country lecturing to crowds of believers, often at the invitation of local

1924-1932.

daimyô; he founded approximately eight temples⁵ and had some one hundred disciples under his instruction; he composed one major text, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* 鉄眼禪師仮名法語; and he died in the midst of his greatest relief effort, feeding the destitute in the Osaka region during the famine of 1682. In number of temples founded, texts composed and Dharma heirs recognized, Tetsugen was not the most successful master to promote Obaku Zen. In those terms, both Tetsugyû and Chôn surpassed their Dharma brother on almost every score.⁶ However, Tetsugen embodied in his life and teachings the basic characteristics that set Obaku apart, and, unlike his more prolific colleagues, his work had ramifications beyond the confines of the Zen world. Tetsugen is arguably the best illustration for the first generation of Japanese Obaku monks and their contribution to Japanese Buddhism.

First and most obviously, Tetsugen's life represents in very concrete terms a combination of Zen and Pure Land practice. Tetsugen's family was affiliated with the True Pure Land sect, and his early Buddhist training was focused on True Pure Land teachings and practice. When Tetsugen turned to Obaku Zen, his biographer says that he "immediately cast aside what he had previously learned" and concentrated on Zen meditation.⁷ Indeed, from the time he first met Yin-yüan and entered his assembly, Tetsugen practiced Zen

⁵ Minamoto, op.cit., p. 373 and pp. 362-363. Tetsugen's official biography, the *Tetsugen oshô gyôjitsu* 鉄眼和尚行実, written by Tetsugen's leading disciple Hôshû Dôsô 室洲道聰 lists the names of eight temples: Zuiryû-ji 瑞龍寺 in Osaka, Hôzô-in 宝蔵院 on Obaku-san in Uji, Konzen-ji 金禪寺 in Osaka-fu, Kaizô-ji 海蔵寺 in the Tokyo area, Shôshô-ji 小松寺 in Shiga Prefecture, Sanbô-ji 三宝寺 in his home village in Kumamoto Prefecture, Hôsen-ji 宝泉寺 in Osaka-fu, and Emmei-ji 延命寺 in Shiga Prefecture. There are several modern sources which provide the text of the biography. All references here will be made to Minamoto Ryôen, *Tetsugen*, *Nihon no Zen goroku* vol. 17; the first page reference is for the original Chinese (*kambun*), and the second for the annotated *yomi kudashi*.

⁶ See p. 104, note 17, above, for information on temples founded by Tetsugyû and Chôn. Tetsugyû's recorded sayings amount to some twenty-one fascicles and Chôn's to fifty-six fascicles. Tetsugyû named approximately thirty-three Dharma heirs, representing many of the most important lines of transmission for the school. Chôn recognized at least four Dharma heirs who then extended his Dharma line over several generations.

⁷ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 367 and 339.

under several Chinese and Japanese masters, including Yin-yüan's two leading Dharma heirs, Mu-an and Chi-fei Ju-i 即非如一 (1616-1671; J. Sokuhi Nyoichi), never to return to True Pure Land practice as far as is known. Tetsugen's writings show little direct Pure Land influence on his thought, indicating instead that he believed Zen practice held the superior position among all Buddhist practices. However, Tetsugen continued to use meditation techniques associated with the Pure Land sutras throughout his life in addition to his Zen practice.⁸ One can easily imagine that Tetsugen found the Pure Land elements within the Ōbaku services neither foreign nor repulsive as did many of the monks originally trained in Japanese Zen temples.

Tetsugen exemplified in his writing and his actions other Ōbaku tendencies that typify the sect as a whole. First, as mentioned previously, Ōbaku Zen's stress on the strict adherence to the monastic code strongly appealed to Tetsugen, who, even before he met Yin-yüan, seems to have rejected the True Pure Land position that allowed monks to marry and eat meat. Monastic discipline, particularly the importance of the precepts against sexual misconduct and killing sentient beings, was a recurring theme in Tetsugen's writings and lectures. Second, Tetsugen shared Ōbaku's view that the teachings found in the scriptures and the wisdom attained through meditation are one (禪教一致 *zenkyō itchi*). Although he wrote little about his understanding of the relationship between Zen meditation and scripture study, his work as a lecturer and as the editor of the *Ōbaku-ban* demonstrates his dedication to that belief. Third, Tetsugen's work among the common people was representative of the work done by many Japanese and Chinese Ōbaku monks.

While other Ōbaku monks strove to spread the Dharma and strengthen the sect through other means, such as founding temples, extending contacts among the ruling samurai class, and naming Dharma heirs to carry on the Ōbaku lineage, Tetsugen focused his energies on printing the scriptures which he regarded as his primary means of spreading

⁸ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 9-10.

the Buddhist Dharma. Almost all of Tetsugen's work can be seen as subordinate to that goal. For example, Tetsugen regarded founding temples as a secondary consideration, primarily viewing them as base points for his Tripitaka project. While he did have approximately one hundred disciples at his two major temples, Hôzô-in 宝蔵院 and Zuiryû-ji 瑞龍寺, Tetsugen never actually assumed the role of a typical Zen master. He assigned all of his disciples responsibilities related to the project and was himself usually away for long periods of time, leaving senior disciples in charge. Tetsugen never conferred *inka* on any of his disciples, apparently regarding the Tripitaka as his legacy to the sect. Nor did he produce much in the way of written texts, prose or poetry. Although his remaining works show that he was a gifted writer, he had little time to devote to literary pursuits, and a complete collection of all his writings would amount to no more than three fascicles. However, Tetsugen did contribute to Obaku's continued growth by means of his Tripitaka project. Because of the far-reaching importance of that accomplishment, he stands out as the Japanese Obaku monk who had the greatest impact on Japanese Buddhism as a whole.

As a result of Tetsugen's achievement in completing the *Obaku-ban*, he attained a special status within the Obaku sect. His works enjoyed a wider circulation than those of other Japanese Obaku monks and his are the only texts to have been reprinted in modern editions. Tetsugen's writings, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* 鉄眼禪師仮名法語 and the *Yuiroku* 遺録, were first published after his death by his disciple Hôshû. The original woodblock editions are preserved along with the *Obaku-ban* at Hôzô-in. In fact, the *Yuiroku* and Tetsugen's official biography, the *Tetsugen oshô gyôjitsu* 鉄眼和尚行実, were appended to the scriptures and circulated with them as an additional volume in the collection.⁹ In addition, there have been several modern editions of the *Kana hôgo* and

⁹ The *Jôetsu Kyôiki Daigaku shozô Obaku Tetsugen issaikyô mokuroku* 上越教育大学所蔵黄檗鉄眼一切経目録, a modern index to the *Obaku-ban*, lists the two fascicles of Tetsugen's collected writings, the *Tetsugen zenji yuiroku* 鉄眼禪師遺録 as document number 1658. According to this listing, the text includes the official biography. Editions of the *Tetsugen zenji yuiroku* printed from the same woodblocks that circulated independently do not include the

selections from the *Yuiroku*.¹⁰ As the most famous of the Japanese Ōbaku monks, Tetsugen has been the subject of numerous biographical studies by scholars within the sect.¹¹ Likewise, his fame in the wider circle of Japanese Buddhism resulted in his inclusion in a variety of biographical collections of extraordinary individuals of the Tokugawa era and of famous monks. For this reason, primary materials related to Tetsugen are more readily available than those of other Japanese Ōbaku monks of his generation, and the secondary literature is far more extensive than for any Ōbaku monk with the exception of the founder Yin-yüan.

Source Material Related to Tetsugen

Several types of primary texts can be used to draw a biographical sketch of Tetsugen and his work. First, his disciples recorded their own impressions of events in three documents of this type, beginning with the official biography. Second, Tetsugen's own writings, especially his letters, shed some light on Tetsugen's motivations and his perspective on a few key events in his life. Secondary materials, such as short biographies of Tetsugen that appeared in larger collections of biographies of extraordinary individuals or famous monks, including the *Zoku nihon kôshô den*¹² 續日本高僧傳 and the *Kinsei* biography.

¹⁰ Two modern scholarly texts include the *Kana hôgo* and different selections from the other writings of Tetsugen which appear in the *Yuiroku*: Akamatsu Shinmyô, ed., *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*; and Minamoto Ryôen, op.cit.. Less scholarly editions of the *Kana hôgo* include: Minamoto Ryôen, *Tetsugen kana hôgo*, Zen no koten, vol. 9; and Suzuki Tatsutama, ed., *Tetsugen kana hôgo*.

¹¹ The leading Tetsugen scholars within the sect are Akamatsu Shinmyô, Yoshinaga Yukitaka and Yoshinaga Utarô. Akamatsu has written two full length biographies as well as numerous shorter articles, and published an annotated version of the *Kana hôgo* with several selections from the *Yuiroku*. The Yoshinagas' work with primary source material from the Edo period, presented in Utarô's compendium entitled *Tetsugen zenji*, has been the basis for several popular and scholarly works by other Ōbaku monks.

¹² The *Zoku nihon kôshô den* 續日本高僧傳 is a collection of short bibliographical sketches of 243 famous Japanese monks written in eleven fascicles by Dôkei 道契 (1816-1876) and revised by Ouchi Seiran 大内青巒 (1845-1918). It was first published in 1867. Tetsugen's biography is in

*kijin den*¹³ 近世畸人傳, provide other kinds of information about Tetsugen. In general, these materials are less historically reliable than those of Tetsugen's disciples, since the authors were not witnesses to the original events and wrote their accounts many years later, based on secondhand information and oral tradition. However, they are useful for understanding how Tetsugen was remembered outside of the Obaku sect, and may preserve information suppressed by the official biography.

Hôshû Dôshô 宝洲道聰 (1644-1720), Tetsugen's leading disciple, wrote the official biography, the *Tetsugen oshô gyôjitsu*, more than thirty years after his master's death. Hôshû had worked closely with Tetsugen for over twenty years, longer than any other individual, and wrote much of the biography from firsthand knowledge. His work provides the most detailed and reliable information concerning the events in Tetsugen's life. Hôshû intended the biography, which is dated the third month of Shôtoku 4 (1714), to commemorate the thirty-third anniversary of Tetsugen's death. As he explained in the conclusion, "Few among the young or the old know Tetsugen's life story. Now that some thirty years have passed, most of the people who knew him have died. Therefore... I have written this short summary in order that it might be clearly recorded for future generations."¹⁴ Hôshû crafted the biography to present his former master as he would have him remembered; he glossed over or completely omitted details he would certainly have known which he deemed inappropriate to his purpose. For example, he avoided references, direct and indirect, to Tetsugen's early career as a True Pure Land monk, mentioning neither fascicle 11, p. 344 of the original edition. A modern edition of the text is included in the *Dai nihon bukkyô zensho*, vol. 64, no. 473, pp. 1-98. Tetsugen's biography is found on pp. 93-94 in that edition.

¹³ The *Kinsei kijin den* 近世畸人傳 is a collection of biographical sketches of approximately 200 outstanding individuals, including samurai, government officials, merchants, scholars, monks, farmers and townsmen, from the Tokugawa period. The first edition, published in 1790, was written by Ban Kôkei 伴蒿蹊 (1733-1806) and illustrated by Mikuma Katen 三熊花頼. An additional volume was later published in 1798, written by Katen with Kôtei's assistance. Tetsugen's biography appears in both editions. There are two modern editions of the text: *Sentetsu zô den*, *Kinsei kijin den*, *Hyakka kikô den* (Yuhôdo, 1927), and *Kinsei kijin den* (Iwanami shoten, 1940).

¹⁴ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 373 and 365-366.

Tetsugen's relationship with the prominent True Pure Land master Saigin 西吟, nor that his education in Kyoto would have been centered at that sect's newly founded academy. In fact, Hôshû covered Tetsugen's childhood and youth in a few brief sentences, leaving most of the first twenty-six years a blank. While he described in some detail Tetsugen's first meetings with Yin-yüan and Mu-an at the age of twenty-six in 1655, events which would constitute an important part of any Zen master's biography, he gave no indication at all why Tetsugen made the decision to turn to Zen. Hôshû left the next five years, 1656 through 1661, a lacuna in the biography, creating the impression that Tetsugen continued to practice as an Obaku monk under Mu-an throughout that time. Most modern scholars now believe that those years represent a black period of doubt in Tetsugen's life when he actually abandoned Zen practice altogether.¹⁵ Hôshû took up the narrative in earnest only with the events of 1661, when he would have first encountered Tetsugen personally. For the period in which Hôshû dealt with Tetsugen directly as his disciple, from 1661 until the master's untimely death in 1682, he maintained a reasonably balanced and even pace in describing major events and accomplishments. Hôshû consistently portrayed the master he knew as a generous, compassionate man with great talent for teaching and explicating the sutras, setting out his life story as a model for the Buddhist life. In addition, Hôshû included a number of miraculous events such as one often finds in the portraits of great masters: Tetsugen bringing rain to end a drought, easing the suffering of a soul tormented in hell, and, after his death, his corpse showing none of the normal signs of decay before cremation.

There is some evidence to suggest that Hôshû intended his biography to answer

¹⁵ Yoshinaga Utarô seems to have suggested this theory first, citing the *Jimoku tekkô* 自牧摘稿 to the effect that Tetsugen left the monastery for four or five years after Yin-yüan had departed from Nagasaki; *Tetsugen zenji*, pp. 9-10. Unfortunately, the text is not readily available for examination, so it is difficult to assess its reliability. See p. 204, note 47, below, for further information. Other scholars, including Minamoto Ryôen (*Tetsugen*, p. 112) and Heinrich Dumoulin (*Zen Buddhism*, vol. 2, 307), follow Yoshinaga's lead and make mention of the theory.

accusations made about Tetsugen by a fellow disciple named Tengen Genshu 端愿元珠 (b. 1644). Tengen had left the Ōbaku school and become a Shingon monk in 1697 due to a long-standing quarrel with Hōshū that arose after Tetsugen passed away.¹⁶ Tengen set down his own version of life within Tetsugen's assembly, describing events before and after Tetsugen's death, in a text entitled *Zen'aku jamyōron* 善悪邪命論, which appeared in 1702.¹⁷ Tengen's primary intention was to discredit Hōshū, but in doing so, he presented Tetsugen in less than flattering terms. Tengen described the events surrounding Tetsugen's death in a manner that differs significantly from Hōshū's account. In Tengen's account, we are left with the impression of a man struggling with his own sense of failure rather than the saintly figure familiar from the official biography. Although Tengen's motives make his version somewhat suspect, it does add another dimension to our understanding of Tetsugen. Hōshū is said to have suppressed the *Zen'aku jamyōron*, which would not have had a wide circulation in any case, in order to safeguard his master's reputation.¹⁸ Since its rediscovery earlier in this century, the *Zen'aku jamyōron* has exerted significant impact on modern biographies of Tetsugen.¹⁹

Finally, a third disciple, Kyōdō Genzui 恭堂元髓 (1663-1730) composed another shorter account of Tetsugen, known as the *Eiran gyōjōki* 叡覧行状紀²⁰, in 1723. Kyōdō

¹⁶ For further information on Tengen and his quarrel with Tetsugen's disciples, see below pp. 259-260.

¹⁷ The *Zen'aku jamyōron* was originally two fascicles, written in *katakana* with some *kambun* sections. A modern handwritten copy of the text is preserved at Mampuku-ji. It is not known whether any original copies have survived.

¹⁸ According to Akamatsu, only sixty copies of the text existed, and these were distributed to Tengen's acquaintances and those involved in the dispute. Akamatsu does not explain how Hōshū suppressed the work, but indicate that it was virtually unknown until around 1942. Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 346.

¹⁹ The issues raised by Tengen's work and his influence on the modern scholarship will be addressed in detail below. See pp. 244-247.

²⁰ The complete text of the *Eiran gyōjōki* can be found in Shimoda Kyokusui, *Meisō Tetsugen*, pp. 17-21.

had become Tetsugen's disciple and taken the tonsure at Sambô-ji in Kumamoto at the age of fourteen, in 1676. He accompanied Tetsugen to Osaka the following year, and joined the assembly at Zuiryû-ji. After Tetsugen's death, Kyôdô became Hôshû's disciple and eventually his Dharma heir, emerging as one of the leading monks in what was dubbed the Zuiryû-ji line²¹. It was after he succeeded Hôshû as head monk at Hôzô-in that Kyôdô wrote the *Eiran gyôjôki* in that capacity. He composed it as a tribute to Tetsugen, the temple's founder, and to a lesser extent, to Hôshû who came to be seen as the second founder. Although the text is much shorter than the official biography, it provides another 'eye witness' interpretation of events, and includes some additional details. Like Hôshû, Kyôdô casts Tetsugen in a saintly mold, in this case, referring to him as the reincarnation of Shôtoku Taishi 聖徳太子 (572-621), the Japanese regent renowned for his extensive support for Buddhism.²² With this characterization of Tetsugen as the reincarnation of Shôtoku Taishi, Kyôdô set the tone for later biographies, even many of the modern accounts whose authors were striving for a scholarly tone.

Modern Scholarship

Tetsugen's life became a common topic among Obaku scholars in the first half of this century. It seems likely that they were responding in part to renewed popular interest in Tetsugen generated by a grade school reading lesson that appeared in the national text books starting in 1917, as well as the need to commemorate the three hundredth anniversary

²¹ Since Tetsugen never designated any of his disciples as a Dharma heir, his line ended with his death. However, Hôshû later received *inka* from Mu-an and took up the position as head monk at Zuiryû-ji and Hôzô-in, Tetsugen's two primary temples. Many of Tetsugen's former disciples accepted Hôshû as their master, and some became his heirs. Hôshû transmitted his Dharma to twenty monks, creating the Zuiryû-ji line, among the largest in the Obaku sect. Although the line traces back to Mu-an, it maintained an attitude of deep respect for Tetsugen, and paid him special tribute as founder of its temples and as editor of the Tripitaka.

²² Other Japanese Buddhist masters have been described as the reincarnation of Shôtoku Taishi, including Kûkai 空海 (774-835), the founder of Shingon in Japan, and the Shingon master Shôbô 聖宝 (832-909), known as the founder of one of the more important Shingon Shugendô schools. Matsunaga, *Foundation*, vol. 1, p. 240.

of Tetsugen's birth, celebrated in 1930. The grade school lesson had been based on the short biography of Tetsugen found in the *Kinsei kijin den* rather than the official biography, and presented him in popular, almost romanticized terms.²³ In preparation for celebrating the three hundredth anniversary of Tetsugen's birth in 1930, the Kumamoto Prefecture's Education Association published *Meisō Tetsugen* 名僧鐵眼, a lengthy compendium of primary source materials and explanatory essays edited by Shimoda Kyokusui 下田曲水 in 1929.²⁴ That work focused most of its attention on Tetsugen's connections with his home region, presenting Tetsugen as a famous native of Kumamoto in an almost promotional manner. *Meisō Tetsugen* drew on existing Obaku scholarship and provided a large amount of information on the people and places of Kumamoto related to Tetsugen's biography. However, the author had no expertise in Buddhism and could provide little background information or explanation for the religious issues involved in Tetsugen's life and work. He presents much of the primary material without introductory or explanatory remarks, in many cases not even identifying the author.

Although some small pieces on Tetsugen written by Obaku scholars appeared in Buddhist journals like *Zenshū* before the Second World War, it was during the war years that the most significant large works appeared. The prewar articles tended to be devotional in nature, and even the more scholarly pieces could not yet draw upon the full array of primary materials later available.²⁵ The basic research of collecting and annotating primary

²³ The lesson, entitled "Tetsugen no Issaikyō", written by the True Pure Land monk Fukuda Gyōkai 福田行誠 (1806-1888), appeared in two consecutive editions of the national grade school reader, the *Jinjō shōgaku kokugo dokuhon* 尋常小学國語讀本, published in 1917 and 1932. The lesson can be found reprinted in *Nihon kyōkasho taikai* 日本教科書大系, *Kindaihen* 近代編, vol. 7, pp. 517-519 and vol. 8, pp. 200-202. The lesson was in use from 1917 until it was cut from a subsequent edition published in 1941. For a partial translation of the text, see below, pp. 295-296.

²⁴ As the full name of the text, *Kokutei kyōkasho ni arawaretaru meisō Tetsugen* 國定教科書に現はれたる名僧鐵眼, indicates, the prefecture's Education Association was definitely drawing on the popular familiarity with Tetsugen fostered by the grade school text.

²⁵ In addition to Tansen's book which was rediscovered in the 1940's (see note 16 above), other materials were not yet known to exist or were otherwise inaccessible. For example,

materials that began early in the century came to fruition in the 1940's with the work of two Obaku scholars, Akamatsu Shinmyô (b. 1893) and Yoshinaga Utarô (b. 1881).

Akamatsu was by far the most prolific writer on subject of Tetsugen; after writing a few preliminary works in the 1930's, he published three major texts during the early 1940's that remain the basic resources for the field. In 1941, he made a wide selection of Tetsugen's writings available for the first time in a modern, annotated edition.²⁶ Akamatsu then wrote two biographies of Tetsugen: the first, *Tetsugen zenji* 鐵眼禪師, which appeared in 1942, took the form of a lengthy commentary and translation from Chinese of the official biography; the second, published the following year, and entitled simply *Tetsugen* 鐵眼, relied less exclusively upon the official biography and brought in outside sources of information. Akamatsu intended the former to be more a more popular work that would introduce Tetsugen to the Japanese people.²⁷ The latter was to be a more scholarly piece that reviewed all of the primary materials to create a fuller portrait of Tetsugen's life than is found in the devotional works alone.²⁸ Akamatsu provided extensive commentary on the primary materials, presenting both the positive and the negative in an even-handed fashion. However, into this solid piece of scholarship, Akamatsu inserted large sections that appear to be historical fiction, although he did not identify them as such. For example, Akamatsu tells a series of stories in novel-like fashion without indicating a written source from the Tokugawa period. These stories are probably based on oral traditions that had circulated within the sect, since similar tales appear in other writings, often under the rubric of Tetsugen's original letter requesting the pardon of two true Pure Land monks was not available to Washio in 1903, when his article on Tetsugen first appeared. Washio made his remarks on Tetsugen's plea based only on Lord Kurushima's response; "Tetsugen zenji no shinshû kôgeki", p. 432. Tetsugen's letter was later published in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen kana hôgo*, pp. 75-77.

²⁶ See note 8 above for reference.

²⁷ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji*, p. 7.

²⁸ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 1-9.

monogatari.²⁹

While Akamatsu was a biographer, Yoshinaga Utarō acted more as a bibliographer in his work on Tetsugen. Yoshinaga did extensive research in Edo period texts, concentrating mainly on the *nempu* and recorded sayings of various monks who had known Tetsugen, seeking out references to him. Yoshinaga identified passages relevant to Tetsugen's biography and compiled his findings in *Tetsugen zenji*, which appeared in 1942. The text follows the format of a chronology, placing relevant passages from the original texts under each year. Yoshinaga presents these materials as raw data. He leaves all passages in their original form, without any modern translation or *yomikudashi*, supplemented only by his own carefully distinguished notes and commentary. For this reason, the work is an invaluable resource for studying Tetsugen, but is in no sense a biography. While many passages are annotated at length, Yoshinaga does not attempt to tie them together with a narrative of any sort.

More recently, two scholars outside of the Obaku sect, Minamoto Ryōen 源了圓 and Dieter Schwaller, have worked on Tetsugen's life and teachings. In 1979, Minamoto wrote an extended biographical introduction for an edition of Tetsugen's writings that appeared as a volume in the *Nihon no Zen garoku* series, a set that provides modern translation and notes for the works of Japanese Zen masters. Minamoto's primary field of study is not Japanese Buddhism, let alone the more specialized field of Obaku Zen. He therefore relied heavily on the earlier scholarship, but presented the material in the most clear and organized biography to date. His major contribution to the field was in pulling together and presenting it in straightforward modern Japanese much of the available information on Tetsugen, including background chapters on Tetsugen's teachers, the Zen masters Yin-yüan, Mu-an, and Chi-fei as well as the True Pure Land master Saigin. He maintained a

²⁹ For example, Satō Fumitsugu 佐藤文承 sets out five tales in *Tetsugen monogatari* 鐵眼物語. In his forward (unpaginated), he indicates that he received help from the Tetsugen scholar Yoshinaga, but that the tales are legendary rather than historical.

scholarly tone throughout his work, carefully distinguishing historical fact from legendary materials and scholars' theories. The text's major weaknesses arise from Minamoto's unfamiliarity with Zen and the major Zen figures of the period.

The Swiss scholar Dieter Schwaller published his dissertation on Tetsugen, entitled *Der japanische Obaku-Mönch Tetsugen Dōkō*, in 1989. Unlike Minamoto, Schwaller's primary field of expertise is Zen Buddhism, especially Obaku Zen, and he addressed in his work certain philosophical and religious issues not found in Minamoto's writings. However, the heart of Schwaller's dissertation is his translation into German of Tetsugen's writings; his introduction to Obaku Zen and Tetsugen's life and work is little more than a brief essay which does not match Minamoto's work in depth or scope. Schwaller's primary contributions to the field are his extensive bibliography of works related to Obaku Zen and his careful annotation of Tetsugen's writings, which provides more concise reference information, in the Western academic style, than any Japanese edition.

The following chapters will attempt to supplement the existing literature by providing first, an extended biographical study of Tetsugen that makes the Japanese scholarship and the primary source material accessible in a Western language, and second an evaluation of Tetsugen's teaching based on his writings. The special focus of the biographical chapter will be to further the understanding of Obaku's early growth in Japan through the example of its most famous Japanese convert. The evaluation of Tetsugen's teaching will be based in large part on his longest work, the *Tetsugen kana hōgo*, but will draw on his letters and lesser known sermons (*hōgo*).

Chapter Seven

The Life and Work of Tetsugen Dôkô

While religious biographers often highlight specific details from a master's life that are especially instructive to believers, they often choose to edit out those elements that they deem uninformative or detrimental to the overall portrait they wish to draw. Biographies about the Chinese Ōbaku masters written during the Edo period tend to stress their early connections with Pure Land practice, whether at home or in the early years of their monastic training before they came under the direct guidance of a Zen master. For example, in Yin-yüan's biography, *Fushô kokushi nempu* 普照國師年譜, the master is said to have encouraged his mother in her Buddhist practices by reciting the *nembutsu* with her daily in the years before he entered the monastery.¹ Similarly, Mu-an's biography details the master's early devotion to the bodhisattva Kannon and his exposure to Pure Land teachings from his first master.² Such is not the case with the biographies of Tetsugen. Although his early training in Pure Land teachings and practice may be seen to parallel his Chinese masters' lives, none of his early biographers drew that connection nor did any of them follow the Chinese biographical pattern. Indeed, it would appear that for Tetsugen's Japanese disciples who wrote biographical studies of their master, his connections with the True Pure Land sect posed a problem for the image of Tetsugen they wished to preserve; they made only veiled references to it in their versions of his life.³

¹ *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, pp. 5105-5106.

² *Ōbaku Mokuan oshô nempu* 黃檗木案和尚年譜, pp. 3b and 4b

³ For instance, rather than saying explicitly that Tetsugen's father was a True Pure Land believer, the official biography mentions only that he joined the Lotus Society (*rensha*, 蓮社, short for *byakurengesha* 白蓮華社) in his later years. Historically, the White Lotus Society (*Pai-lien-she*) was a group of monks and lay people who performed Pure Land practices on Mt. Lu 廬山 in China; it was founded by the monk Hui-yüan 慧遠 (334-416; J. Eon) in 420. The term is used in the biography

Tetsugen's Ōbaku biographers from the Edo period chose to focus almost exclusively on his life and work as an Ōbaku monk; so much so, that they provide only the barest outline of his life before he met the Chinese master Yin-yüan at the age of twenty-six. Nowhere in the sectarian biographies from the Tokugawa period do we find any direct reference to Tetsugen having been educated as a True Pure Land monk, nor are there many indirect clues to that effect. Our sources are so limited, in fact, that we do not even know what Buddhist name Tetsugen used in his youth. The biographies give no indication that he was given a new name by Yin-yüan or Mu-an, but that must surely have been the case. Not only was bestowing a new name the common practice when a monk joined a Zen master's assembly, but the name Tetsugen is clearly Zen rather than Pure Land in origin.⁴ While it is possible that Tetsugen's first Buddhist name was not known by his biographers, it seems more likely that it was intentionally omitted, along with many other details, as an unnecessary reminder of his earlier affiliation. Reading the sectarian biographies from the period, one is left with the impression that Tetsugen passed the first twelve years of his monastic practice as a generic Buddhist monk without any sectarian affiliation at all. The biographers provide no specific details or stories that help one form an image of the young Tetsugen. Nor do they suggest possible reasons for his seeking out a Zen master and converting to Zen practice.

Secular biographers had no such scruples about discussing Tetsugen's early life, and they provide anecdotal information about Tetsugen which helps to broaden our sense of the man himself. The *Kinsei kijin den* 近世畸人傳, a compendium of biographies of unusual individuals from all social classes and walks of life of the Tokugawa period, begins with a direct reference to Tetsugen's True Pure Land affiliation and continues with an explanation for his eventual disenchantment with the sect.

as a general reference Pure Land Buddhism.

⁴ The name "Tetsugen" comes from the expression *tetsugen dôsei* 鐵眼銅睛 (iron eyes and copper pupils), from the *Hekigan roku*, case 23; T 48, no. 2003, p. 141a, lines 18-19.

The monk Tetsugen Dōkō was born in the province of Higo in a branch temple of Hongan-ji. Although he was already married, he was dissatisfied that in the [True Pure Land] sect, people without talent or merit held high rank in the temple hierarchy. Therefore, he went up to Mount Ōbaku and followed [the instruction] of Mu-an.⁵

His wife came to [Mount Ōbaku] to find him, but he did not wish to meet her. So she camped outside the temple gate and watched for him to emerge. Finally, one day when he had no choice but to go out, she asked him to accompany her to their home province and return to their village. He escaped up the street and returned to the temple.

After he had inherited [Mu-an's] Dharma, he founded Zuiryū-ji in the Namba area of Settsu province.⁶ Even today, people refer to that temple by his name.

Since he had set his mind on printing a woodblock edition of the Tripitaka, he collected funds. At that time, there was terrible starvation throughout the country. Tetsugen was troubled by this and distributed so much in alms that he had less than half of the money [he had collected] left. Just as before, he solicited funds and after several years collected it once again. For a second time, many people were dying of hunger because the grain crops had failed. This time as well he gave away all his money. However, due to his great virtue, the third time that he raised the money he completed the edition of the Tripitaka. Even now, in the same manner, the funds from distributing these scriptures are allocated from the main temple to the various branch temples. (In much the same way, this sect also sells a medicine called *kintaien*, and the money is distributed to the sect by the medical school.)⁷ Tetsugen's Buddhist learning was profound, and he skillfully taught the Dharma and taught many of the common people. However, it is said that within his own group of disciples he was not forceful enough and so never designated a Dharma heir. He left his temples to his disciple Hōshū. There were difficulties with some of the others. Hōshū also had extensive Buddhist learning and did virtuous deeds.⁸

While this account includes some obvious errors in chronology as well as popular stories

⁵ The text is misleading here. Although Mu-an did later become Tetsugen's master, when Tetsugen first left True Pure Land Buddhism, he went to Nagasaki to meet Yin-yūan and joined his assembly there in 1655. At that time, Ōbaku-san Mampuku-ji had not been built, nor had Mu-an emigrated from China.

⁶ The text is in error here. Tetsugen became the founder/restorer of Zuiryū-ji in 1670, some six years before he received Mu-an's *inka*. The temple was moved from its original, cramped site to its present location in 1678 after Tetsugen had received *inka*. At that time, Tetsugen had both the land and the resources to construct much larger and finer buildings. Both the original and present sites are in the Namba neighborhood of Osaka, and the temple is still commonly referred to as Tetsugen-ji. Even the temple signs give the popular name prominence over the official designation, Jiun-zan Zuiryū-ji 慈雲山瑞龍寺. The temple was leveled in the fire bombing of March 13, 1945 during the Second World War and a modern temple has since been erected on the site.

⁷ The reference here is to the medical academy and pharmacy that the Ōbaku monk Ryōō established; see p. 168, note 43, above.

⁸ *Sentetsu zō den*, *Kinsei kijin den*, *Hyakka kikō den*, pp. 199-201 and *Kinsei kijin den*, pp. 57-59. See p. 177, note 12, for further information.

about Tetsugen that are impossible to check for historical accuracy, it does convey some information about Tetsugen's life before he turned to Obaku Zen not addressed in the sectarian accounts.

Tetsugen's Youth

Tetsugen was born to a family named Saeki 佐伯 who lived in the Mashiki region of Higo province (now Kumamoto prefecture) on New Years day of Kan'ei 7 (1630). Tetsugen's father Jôshin 淨信 seems to have been a deeply religious man, devoted to Buddhism, especially the Pure Land teachings. He was probably a Buddhist monk, although it is not known for certain in what capacity or affiliation. Most likely he was a shrine monk (社僧 *shasô*) who served at the small Buddhist temple within the compound of the nearby Hachiman-gû shrine.⁹ Other traditions suggest that he was the resident monk at an *ikkô* temple, Kônen-ji 光念寺.¹⁰ Virtually nothing is known of Tetsugen's mother except what is recorded on a memorial stone that Tetsugen erected for her on the thirteenth anniversary of her death in 1662. According to the inscription, she died on 1650/6/21 and was given the posthumous name Shingetsu Myôkan 心月妙観.¹¹ A similar stone indicates that Tetsugen had a brother, but nothing else is known of his siblings. The memorial stones refer to mother and brother

⁹ Before Buddhism and Shinto were officially separated in the Meiji period, the distinction between shrines and temples and Shinto priests and Buddhist monks were far less definitive than they are today. For example, shrines commonly contained small Buddhist temples or Buddhist images and, conversely, Buddhist temples incorporated small Shinto shrines on their grounds. Buddhist monks often held positions at the larger shrines, and provided Buddhist services there. In some cases, the same individual served as both Shinto priest and Buddhist monk. Monks who provided Buddhist services at Shinto shrines are referred to as shrine monks, 社僧 *shasô*, to distinguish them from the Shinto priests.

¹⁰ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji*, p. 8. *ikkô-shû* or *ikkô* sect is a popularly used name for the True Pure Land sect. The term literally means "singleminded", and is used because of the sect's singleminded reliance on Amida and their exclusive practice of the *nembutsu*. The term is closely associated with Rennyo 蓮如 (1415-1499), the eighth patriarch, regarded by some as a second founder, who popularized the term in his writings.

¹¹ Shimoda, *Meisô Tetsugen*, pp. 34-35.

as Zen nun and monk respectively. While some scholars have taken this literally and accepted it as historically factual,¹² it is more likely that Tetsugen simply chose to designate his deceased family members as Zen believers without their having any actual affiliation to the Zen sect before their death. In his mother's case, this is fairly certain, since she died several years before Tetsugen had himself converted to Zen; there is no other evidence whatever regarding his brother, so we are perhaps safest in drawing no conclusion in his case.

It is quite possible that, during his career as a True Pure Land monk, Tetsugen married a woman from his home region whom he left permanently only when he converted to Zen. Tetsugen converted at the age of twenty-six by the Japanese reckoning, and it would not have been unusual for a young True Pure Land monk of that age to already have a wife. However, sources from the period are divided on this issue, and there is no concrete historical evidence upon which to base a definitive conclusion. The sectarian biographies are completely silent on the matter of Tetsugen's marital status. Obviously, any author seeking to gloss over Tetsugen's True Pure Land affiliation would exclude any and all information about a wife, since True Pure Land monks were the only Buddhist clergy who were then allowed to marry in Japan.¹³ A number of the secular biographies, including the *Kinsei kijin den* quoted above, make direct references to Tetsugen's marriage, relating the rather amusing tale of the encounters between Tetsugen and his wife. Based on Akamatsu's work, it would seem that several versions of the same basic story existed; some of these lean toward pious interpretations of events rather than the more ribald accounts in which Tetsugen hides from his wife as long as possible and then escapes up the street once she has cornered him. In

¹² Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 13.

¹³ The True Pure Land tradition of married clergy dates back to the founder Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1262), who is said to have married at the behest of his master Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212). Within the sect, married clergy served as one of the most graphic symbols that True Pure Land believers had rejected the path of self power (*jiriki* 自力) and relied completely on the power of Amida Buddha. During the Tokugawa period, they remained the only Buddhist clergy who were allowed to marry and did so openly. After the Meiji restoration, when the government actively encouraged the practice of married clergy, it became common for monks from all Buddhist sects in Japan to marry.

the more sedate and instructional versions, Tetsugen accompanies his wife back to their home village and there converts both wife and mother-in-law to Zen; each of them becoming Zen nuns and helping Tetsugen in his Tripitaka project as his disciples. Unfortunately, Akamatsu provides no references for these stories, so that it is difficult to determine their basis.¹⁴ They may have been simply oral traditions that circulated within the sect in response to the secular biographies, or perhaps written sources that elaborated on one original account.

In much the same manner, modern scholars are divided as to whether or not they believe that Tetsugen was married. Those within the sect tend to reject the idea that a marriage really existed, suggesting alternative interpretations to explain the existence of the popular stories.¹⁵ Outside scholars lean toward accepting the theory that he was married, but remain cautious given the nature of the evidence.¹⁶ Whether or not Tetsugen was married in his youth, the attitude toward marriage seen in his preaching and writings as a Zen monk followed a strict interpretation of the Buddhist precepts, in keeping with the general Obaku attitude. The precept against sexual misconduct, especially marriage for monks, became a central feature of Tetsugen's teachings and engendered some of his fiercest debates with his opponents.

Tetsugen's Early Buddhist Training

Although we have very limited knowledge of Tetsugen's early life and education, we know that his first teachers introduced him to Pure Land practices, and more specifically to the beliefs of True Pure Land Buddhism. According to the official biography, Tetsugen began his Buddhist education at the age of seven when his father taught him to read the

¹⁴ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 177-186.

¹⁵ The modern biographer Akamatsu acknowledges that a woman did exist in Tetsugen's past, but argues that she could have been Tetsugen's fiancée rather than his wife. Without providing any real historical grounds for his argument, Akamatsu suggests that the family arranged the match, but that Tetsugen never consummated the marriage; *ibid.*, p. 187.

¹⁶ Minamoto Ryōen and Dieter Schwaller both favor the theory of a marriage; Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 130-132, and Schwaller, *op.cit.*, p. 48-50.

Kanmuryōjyūō 観無量寿経.¹⁷ A few years later, at the age of thirteen, Tetsugen took the tonsure and continued his education under the guidance of a local monk called Kaiun 海雲 for at least the next four years. Nothing is known for certain about this monk except that he was a True Pure Land believer, and probably the resident monk at Shōsen-bō 勝専坊, a small branch temple of the Nishi Hongan-ji line in the village of Notsu.¹⁸ When Tetsugen was seventeen, he first encountered Saigin 西吟 (1605-1663), a well-known True Pure Land monk, who was to become his next master. Tetsugen had heard that Saigin was to lecture on *The Awakening of Faith*¹⁹ in the nearby town of Kokura in Buzen province, where Saigin served as abbot at Eishō-ji 永照寺, a large Hongan-ji line temple. Tetsugen attended the lecture and, according to the official biography, was deeply affected by it. Although the biography does not say as much, it is generally believed that Tetsugen became Saigin's disciple at the time of the lecture in 1646, and soon after accompanied him to Kyoto in 1647.²⁰

¹⁷ T 12, no. 365. One of the three sutras that form the basic canon for the Pure Land schools of Buddhism. The *Kanmuryōjyūō* is traditionally said to have been translated into Chinese by Kālayāsa (383?-442?); no Sanskrit original is extant, and scholars now believe that it was originally composed in Chinese. The sutra tells the story of Queen Vaidehī who, while imprisoned by her wicked son, was instructed by Sākyamuni Buddha in sixteen forms of meditation centered on Amida Buddha and his Pure Land (*jūrokkan* 十六觀).

¹⁸ Shimoda provides what little information is available about the monk Kaiun and historical information from the temple records of Shōsen-bō, Shimadao, op.cit., p. 86.

¹⁹ T. 32, no. 1666 and no. 1667. *Ta-ch'eng ch'i-hsin lun* 大乘起信論 (J. *Daijō kishin ron*), a short discourse on Mahayana thought that provides a summary of Mahayana Buddhism's basic teachings. The text is traditionally attributed to Asvaghosa, and the two versions are said to have been translated into Chinese by Paramārtha (499-569) and Siksānanda (d. 710). However, there is no evidence that a Sanskrit version ever existed, and scholars now believe that it was probably originally composed in Chinese. The text was one of the basic scriptures for Hua-yen thought, and was an especially influential text for the Zen school as well. See Yoshito S. Hakeda, *The Awakening of Faith*.

²⁰ None of the sectarian biographies connect Tetsugen with Saigin in any way. However, there are True Pure Land documents from the period written by individuals with firsthand knowledge of all the parties involved which state explicitly that Tetsugen had been Saigin's disciple. See, for example, the entry from the *Gekkan nempu* for the year 1674, quoted in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 88-90; Yoshinaga Utarō, op.cit., pp. 55-57; and Shimoda, op.cit., pp. 99-100. See pp. 239-240 for a translation of the relevant passage.

Saigin was a talented teacher and lecturer, more suited than the monk at Tetsugen's local temple to guide a student of his caliber. Tradition says that Saigin excelled in Chinese studies as a young man, first mastering written Chinese by memorizing a classical dictionary page by page, and then going on to study the Confucian classics. When he turned his attention to Buddhist studies, he did not at first limit himself to Pure Land teachings. As a young monk, Saigin practiced for a time under the Zen master Sessô 雪窓 (d. 1649)²¹ in Bungo province, and then went to Kyoto where he studied for a period of three years at the Zen temple Tôfuku-ji 東福寺.²² Only later, when he returned to Kyushu, did he dedicate himself to the exclusive study of True Pure Land Buddhism under the guidance of the master Ryôson 了尊 (1582-1638). Saigin established himself as one of the foremost True Pure Land thinkers in the region and, as the abbot of Eishô-ji, attracted a number of talented disciples. However, his early dabbling with Zen teachings would later cause him considerable trouble within his own sect.²³

The True Pure Land hierarchy recognized Saigin's outstanding abilities as a teacher when they appointed him head of the recently founded True Pure Land institute (now Ryûkoku University 竜谷大学), which the sect's main temple, Nishi Hongan-ji 西本願寺, was building in Kyoto.²⁴ Saigin went to Kyoto in 1647 to take up the post which gave him extensive

²¹ Sessô was a Pure Land believer in his youth, but converted to Rinzai Zen and practiced at Tafuku-ji 多福寺 in Bungo province where he subsequently became the second abbot. In 1646 he received the purple robe and became abbot at Myôshin-ji. Several of the day's leading Rinzai monks practiced under him, including Gudô and Daigû. His Dharma heirs include Kengan Zen'etsu (1618-1690) who likewise served as abbot at Tafuku-ji and later played an influential role in Tetsugen's life.

²² Tôfuku-ji has been one of the leading Rinzai Zen temples in Japan since its founding in the mid-thirteenth century, and was later ranked as one of the Gozan temples. The regent Fujiwara Michiie 藤原道家 (1193-1252) funded the building and Enni Ben'en 圓爾辯圓 (1202-1280) served as founder and first abbot.

²³ Accounts of Saigin's life can be found in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 23-25 and Shimoda, *op.cit.*, pp. 89-92.

²⁴ The school had first been established in 1639, and consisted of an assembly hall and dormitory space for thirty students. The first head of the school was actually a monk named Jakugen 寂玄 (n.d.) who served in that capacity from 1640 until 1646. Due to Jakugen's later problems with

responsibilities in the education and training of young monks from all over the country. He would enjoy far-reaching influence within the whole sect, as the young monks trained at the central sectarian school under his direction returned to their home provinces and serve in temples throughout the country. Saigin determined the guidelines governing the life and training of his charges who lived in the school dormitory and attended his lectures on True Pure Land belief and the scriptures.

Tetsugen was almost certainly among the students who attended the True Pure Land institute and heard Saigin's lectures in Kyoto over a period of several years, starting in 1647. The official biography says of those years:

[When Tetsugen was] seventeen, it happened that Eishô Hôshi 永照法師 [Saigin] was lecturing in Buzen on *The Awakening of Faith*. Accordingly, Tetsugen heard his lecture. [Saigin's] voice penetrated and moved his heart, and Tetsugen gave rise to a deep and wise understanding....

One day, [Tetsugen] heard a report of his mother's death and returned to his home village to perform the memorial services. In the Spring of Keian 3 (1650), he left home and along with a number of companions of like mind went to Kyoto for an education. He attended lectures all over [the city] as he pleased. He was ever polishing his understanding of the Buddhist and Chinese texts, and so his fame spread everywhere.²⁵

Although the chronology is not clear in the official biography, it seems likely that Tetsugen had accompanied Saigin to Kyoto in 1647 when he first took up his post, and that family responsibilities relating to his mother's death temporarily interrupted his period of study.²⁶ Assuming that to be the case, the trip to Kyoto in 1650 mentioned in the biography would have been the resumption of Tetsugen's studies rather than his initial departure from Kyushu. Whatever the timing, Saigin's lectures would have been the central feature of Tetsugen's the sect's hierarchy, Saigin is officially regarded as the first head. For a complete history of the school, see Ashikaga Zuigi, *Ryûkoku daigaku sanbyakunen shi*.

²⁵ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 367 and 338.

²⁶ Yoshinaga Utarô concludes as much in his notes on the relevant passage from the official biography, noting that the passage is somewhat deficient, op.cit., p. 6. Akamatsu goes so far as to rearrange the order of the passage to suggest the same order of events, and thus avoids commenting on the internal inconsistency in the biography; *Tetsugen zenji*, p. 14.

education in Kyoto, supplemented no doubt by the rich array of lectures and sermons given at the area temples.

It is very difficult to assess the lasting influence of Saigin on Tetsugen, especially given the paucity of primary materials connecting the two men. Tetsugen seems to have been deeply impressed by Saigin's lectures, and both men shared a similar passion for teaching and lecturing based on Buddhist texts. As Akamatsu points out, instruction under a master like Saigin would have included a great deal of memorization for Tetsugen and the other monks under his care. They would have listened to his lectures and repeated them in whole or in part, ultimately committing large portions to memory for their own use later.²⁷ In this way, the master's teachings naturally became a part of the disciple's unless some kind of break occurred between them. Tetsugen's change to Zen practice would have constituted such a break. While Tetsugen would have heard Saigin explicate many Buddhist scriptures, as far as we know, he only included one of these, *The Awakening of Faith*, in his own repertoire. Nonetheless, Saigin's overall approach may well have had a more extensive impact than this alone suggests. Certainly, as a Zen monk Tetsugen would not have lectured on the Pure Land texts that comprised the majority of topics for Saigin's lectures. It is perhaps more reasonable to posit Saigin's lasting influence on Tetsugen in his openness to other traditions within Buddhism, especially Zen. As his early monastic training demonstrates, Saigin shared with Tetsugen a basic inclination toward the Zen understanding of Buddhism. Saigin's detractors accused him of contaminating True Pure Land doctrine with Zen ideas and interpretations. In Tetsugen's case, they may have been correct. Saigin's "contamination" of Tetsugen's training, his refusal to teach True Pure Land ideas exclusively, may have actually helped precipitate Tetsugen's break from True Pure Land Buddhism.

²⁷ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 49.

Leaving True Pure Land Buddhism

When considering the possible reasons leading Tetsugen to break off his True Pure Land affiliation in favor of Zen, one enters the realm of speculation. While his reasons for this decision have been the topic of some discussion in the modern literature, we have little information from the primary sources on which to rely. Tetsugen never discussed his decision to leave True Pure Land in any of his extant writings, nor did his disciples address the issue in their biographical pieces. In fact, there is a significant gap in the official biography for the years immediately preceding Tetsugen's conversion to Zen. The biography jumps from the brief entry for the year 1650 quoted above to Tetsugen's departure from Kyoto and subsequent meeting with Yin-yüan in Nagasaki five years later, in 1655. We know from other sources that, during the intervening years, conditions in Kyoto changed significantly, and that these changes would have had considerable impact on Tetsugen. During that period, his master Saigin had come under serious attack within the True Pure Land sect, and the resulting "Jôô incident" (承応事件) led to Saigin's dismissal and the closing of the entire True Pure Land institute.²⁸ Although we have no reason to believe that Tetsugen was personally involved in the internal struggles of the sect, he and other students would have been directly affected by them. They were, in effect, left without a master to guide them or a school to house them. Whatever course Tetsugen would set for himself, as a result of the sectarian disputes of 1655, he faced a serious decision about his future.

In discussing the possible motivations for Tetsugen's decision to make a break with his former affiliation and turn toward Zen practice, there are three constellations of issues that scholars have generally considered. First, the Jôô incident and all of its ramifications for the young student monk seems to have been the immediate impetus for Tetsugen to leave True Pure Land Buddhism. Second, Saigin's intellectual influence may have steered Tetsugen

²⁸ The incident is known within the True Pure Land sect as the Jôô incident because it occurred almost entirely during the Jôô era, 1652-1654.

toward a broader understanding of Buddhist teachings than commonly associated with True Pure Land belief. Specifically, Saigin's familiarity with Zen may have inclined Tetsugen to move toward a Zen understanding of Buddhism. Third, Tetsugen's own feelings of dissatisfaction with the True Pure Land environment in which he had thus far practiced may have motivated him to seek out a form of Buddhist thought and practice more consistent with his growing understanding of the scriptures.

The True Pure Land institute was closed by the bakufu's order in the seventh month of 1654. Saigin continued to lecture at another temple for a short time, but left Kyoto abruptly in the eleventh month without finishing the series of lectures he had begun the month before on *The Awakening of Faith*. Within a matter of months, Tetsugen himself decided to leave Kyoto and headed for Nagasaki where he planned to visit the Chinese Zen master Yin-yüan. The timing of Tetsugen's decision to leave Kyoto and True Pure Land so soon after the Jôô incident suggests that it contributed directly to Tetsugen's decision. The details of the incident are extremely complicated and the issues involved, which primarily concerned the correct interpretation of True Pure Land doctrine, are beyond the scope of this dissertation. However, since the incident may have contributed to Tetsugen's decision to leave the sect and since certain individuals involved had a later impact on his life, a brief outline of the events will be provided here.²⁹

Saigin's leading opponent in the conflict was a monk called Gekkan 月感 (1600-1674) from Tetsugen's home region, Kumamoto in Higo province where he was abbot of the large True Pure Land temple Enju-ji 延寿寺.³⁰ Like Saigin, Gekkan had been a disciple of Ryôson; the two men had been under the master's guidance at approximately the same time and were regarded as his foremost disciples. While Saigin was known for his extensive knowledge of

²⁹ Longer, more detailed accounts of the Jôô incident can be found in Ashikaga, op.cit., pp. 184-198, and Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 24-42.

³⁰ Shimoda gives a brief biography of Gekkan, op.cit., p. 97.

the Chinese language and the Confucian classics, Gekkan enjoyed the reputation as the leading expert in True Pure Land thought. In 1653, when Saigin was already six or seven years into his tenure as head of the True Pure Land institute, Gekkan made a trip to Kyoto. Although he went ostensibly to visit friends at the main temple and pay his respects at the founder's grave, he probably intended the trip as a fact-finding mission to personally scrutinize Saigin's performance.³¹ While in the city, he attended some of Saigin's lectures for students at the institute and was gravely concerned by what he had heard. He promptly composed a petition addressed to the sectarian authorities setting out his concerns and requesting Saigin's immediate removal.³²

Gekkan maintained that Saigin was teaching a Zen interpretation of True Pure Land doctrine, claiming that eighty or ninety percent of Saigin's thought came down to the Zen teaching that the original self is the one mind (*jishō isshin* 自性一心) which was incompatible with orthodox True Pure Land belief. He specifically mentioned the fact that Saigin had studied with the Zen master Sessō as one explanation for Saigin's heretical understanding of True Pure Land thought. Since Saigin was in a position to influence young monks from throughout Japan, Gekkan feared that, left unchecked, he would destroy the sect's true teachings and therefore asked that Saigin be defrocked and removed from his position of authority as quickly as possible.

Saigin quickly responded in writing to Gekkan's charges³³; he repudiated the accusation of heretical understanding, arguing, in part, that he taught such basic Buddhist notions as *jishō isshin* to his students in order for them to grasp True Pure Land's position within the broader field of Buddhist thought. Over the next few months the two men exchanged attack

³¹ According to Ashikaga, Gekkan had heard reports about Saigin's teaching and went to Kyoto to gather firsthand information and to meet privately with him. Ashikaga, op.cit., p. 186.

³² Ashikaga, op.cit., pp. 186-187.

³³ Ashikaga, op.cit., p. 188. Gekkan's initial petition is dated 1652/2/28, and Saigin's 1652/3/5.

and counterattack, each round growing progressively fiercer.³⁴ Eventually, the argument grew so violent that the leader of the sect, Ryōnyo 良如, stepped in to settle the matter. He summoned both monks and gave them each his opinion and instructions in writing. On all doctrinal issues he supported Saigin, rejecting the contention that he had taught anything heretical. However, he warned Saigin to be more careful in the future to clearly distinguish the teachings of True Pure Land from those of other Buddhist sects.

Gekkan was not satisfied with Ryōnyo's response, and he took advantage of Ryōnyo's absence from Kyoto to resume his crusade. He wrote yet another scathing critique of Saigin and continually pressed his superiors for Saigin's dismissal. Finally, discouraged by his failure to convince Gekkan to abandon his suit and unable to force his submission to his authority, Ryōnyo petitioned the bakufu to intervene and settle the dispute. The bakufu set out its determination in 1654; Gekkan was sent into exile in Izumo, and the school, which the bakufu regarded as the original cause of the disturbance, was to be closed and dismantled altogether.³⁵ Although Saigin was not the object of the bakufu's direct censure, he thereby lost his position. He left Kyoto a few months later to return to his home temple Eishō-ji in Kyushu, where he remained until his death in 1663.

Tetsugen had followed Saigin to Kyoto, but he apparently choose not to accompany the master back to Kyushu to continue his studies under his instruction. There are no sources that give us any indication of Tetsugen's feelings toward Saigin after the scandal, nor any that suggest his reasons for staying on in Kyoto after the master had left the city. Perhaps, as the official biography suggests, Tetsugen viewed his education in far more independent terms and was already extending his interest beyond the confines of True Pure Land thought. Certainly, Saigin's own training had encompassed more than one Buddhist tradition, and he

³⁴ Minamoto discusses the content of the written exchanges, *op.cit.*, pp. 27-38.

³⁵ The bakufu order was dated 1654/7/17, and signed by Ii Naotaka 井伊直孝. For a full rendition of the decision, see Ashikaga, *op.cit.*, p. 192 and Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 40. The school was dismantled, but opened again later in 1655.

seems to have regarded such breadth of learning as necessary for his students as well. By exposing Tetsugen to the broader world of Buddhist thought and introducing scriptures not central to an exclusively True Pure Land education, Saigin may well have precipitated Tetsugen's rejection of his sect's teachings. In particular, Saigin had extensive experience with Zen Buddhism and he used that knowledge in teaching his students. Although he denied Gekkan's charge that it had corrupted his understanding of True Pure Land doctrine, some modern scholars still note that the Zen influence in his writings closely resembles the Chinese pattern of combining Zen and Pure Land practices.³⁶ Whether intentionally or not, Saigin seems to have prepared Tetsugen to accept the form of combined practice found in Obaku Zen.

Although the sectarian biographies remain silent on the topic, one naturally assumes that Tetsugen became increasingly dissatisfied with certain aspects of True Pure Land belief and practice, and that this dissatisfaction motivated him to look outside the sect for guidance. There is some basis in the source materials to support this supposition. A number of the secular biographies from the Tokugawa period suggest that Tetsugen became discouraged by the low caliber of the True Pure Land clergy, especially those in positions of authority. For example, the *Kinsei kijin den* explains that, "[Tetsugen] was dissatisfied that in the [True Pure Land] sect, people without talent or merit held high rank in the temple hierarchy."³⁷ The *Kôko ruisan shûi* 好古類纂拾遺 contains a similar observation, in somewhat stronger language: "[Tetsugen] despised the fact that individuals were placed in positions of high rank according to temple custom even though they were lacking in learning and merit in the [True Pure Land] sect's teachings."³⁸ The historical basis for these observations is not known; since Tetsugen never addressed the topic in his writings, it may have been part of the oral

³⁶ Shimoda, op.cit., pp. 93-96.

³⁷ *Sentetsu zô den*, *Kinsei kijin den*, *Hyakka kikô den*, p. 199, and *Kinsei kijin den*, p. 59.

³⁸ As quoted in Minamoto, op.cit., p. 41.

tradition surrounding Tetsugen within the Ōbaku sect.

Major themes from Tetsugen's later writings suggest another area of True Pure Land practice that may have troubled him in his youth, the custom that monks and lay people alike married and ate meat. As an Ōbaku monk, Tetsugen wrote and preached most often on the theme of keeping the Buddhist precepts, especially those against sexual misconduct and killing. For example, in his *Kana hôgo*, he promoted the benefits of celibacy and non-killing even for lay believers by explaining in graphic terms the suffering that the married life and meat eating actually entail from a Buddhist perspective.³⁹ In the context of explicating the *Sûramgama sutra*, Tetsugen argued specifically against monks marrying and eating meat in more direct terms.⁴⁰ Although it is not known for certain whether or not he intentionally directed his arguments against the practices of the True Pure Land sect, his repeated teaching on this theme and his life-long dedication to the *Sûramgama sutra* suggest at the very least his personal rejection of these customs as a basic reason for breaking with the sect.

At times, scholarly discussions related to Tetsugen's motivations have delved deeply into the realm of psychological speculation. This is especially the case when scholars hypothesize about Tetsugen's state of mind when he decided to visit Yin-yüan. For example, Akamatsu explains that Tetsugen was worried that he would be unable to attain enlightenment were he to remain within the True Pure Land sect. He theorizes that Tetsugen's extensive academic knowledge of the scriptures became a hindrance to him as he attempted to attain liberation through reasoning, a process doomed to failure.⁴¹ This line of speculation has little or no basis in the primary source materials; it is difficult to construct a reasonable chronology

³⁹ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 191-195.

⁴⁰ *Mori no hônan ni kansuru kôjôgaki* 森の法難に関する口上書, in Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 287-308, especially, pp. 288-292.

⁴¹ For example, Akamatsu explains that Tetsugen was worried that he would be unable to attain enlightenment. Although he had extensive academic knowledge of the scriptures, this became a hindrance to him as he attempted to attain liberation through reasoning and could only fail; *Tetsugen*, p. 41.

for Tetsugen's early life, let alone attempt a psychological profile. Without any indication from Tetsugen himself, his reasons remain unknown. In any case, the True Pure Land monk departed from Kyoto sometime in the autumn of 1665 and headed for his first encounter with Obaku Zen.

Tetsugen's First Encounters with Obaku Zen

Word of the Chinese master Yin-yüan's arrival in Nagasaki in 1654 spread first through the Zen community of Kyoto and eventually reached the hearing of Tetsugen. Tetsugen determined to pay his respects and set out for Nagasaki, making his way first to Osaka where he awaited a vessel heading for Kyushu. He was fortunate enough meet there the bakufu's administrator of Nagasaki (*bugyô* 奉行), Kurokawa Masanao 黒川正直 (1602-1680), who was then returning to Nagasaki from Edo.⁴² Kurokawa was the bakufu official who had granted I-jan permission to invite Yin-yüan to Nagasaki a few years earlier⁴³, and himself became a lay disciple of Yin-yüan soon after his return to Nagasaki in the autumn of 1655. Kurokawa generously permitted Tetsugen to sail on his ship, and in that way, Tetsugen arrived at Kôfuku-ji.

Tetsugen was admitted to see Yin-yüan, and the two men conversed through an interpreter and in written Chinese. The official biography briefly describes that first encounter in the following terms: "[Tetsugen] changed his robes and entered Tōmyō-zan [Kôfuku-ji]. He explained at some length that he was eager to seek the Way. Master [Yin-yüan] knew with a glance that he was a Dharma vessel (法器 *hōki*)⁴⁴, and instructed him to follow the assembly

⁴² Kurokawa Masanao was a *hatamoto* 旗本 (direct vassal of the shōgun) who became administrator of Nagasaki in 1650. During his years in that post he visited Yin-yüan, Mu-an and Chi-fei and was instructed on the Dharma by each of them. His support for the Obaku masters continued until his death in 1680 at the age of 79. There is a memorial tablet and stone for him at Obaku-san Mampuku-ji.

⁴³ See p. 35, note 53.

⁴⁴ Indicates a person of great promise in a Buddhist sense, especially for attaining enlightenment.

and enter the meditation hall." At that time, the assembly was in the midst of the summer retreat, held from the fourth through the seventh months, and Tetsugen would have participated in its final weeks. The exact date of Tetsugen's admission to the assembly was not recorded, but based on the timing of Kurokawa's audience with Yin-yüan, one can assume that it was sometime early in the sixth month of 1655.⁴⁵

Tetsugen entered Yin-yüan's assembly just as efforts to invite the master to Kyoto were coming to fruition. Ryôkei, Jikuin and Tokuô had gained bakufu permission for Yin-yüan to travel to the Kyoto area, and within a month of Tetsugen's arrival, Yin-yüan accepted their invitation to Fumon-ji in Settsu province. Yin-yüan left Nagasaki early in the eighth month, so Tetsugen spent only two months under the master's guidance before he departed. Tetsugen was once again on his own. Yin-yüan made arrangements for his leading disciple Mu-an to take on the responsibility for many of his Japanese disciples, including Tetsugen, since they were not permitted to accompany Yin-yüan to Fumon-ji.⁴⁶ Mu-an himself had recently arrived in Nagasaki and was still under the travel restrictions applied to all Chinese nationals. He assumed the position as head monk at Fukusai-ji, where he remained until receiving permission to join Yin-yüan in Kyoto several years later.

Tetsugen went to Fukusai-ji to meet with Mu-an, but the first encounter did not go well. The scene from the official biography suggests that Tetsugen behaved brashly with his new master. First, he went straight up to the master's gate and knocked. When he entered the master's room, he stated his mind forcefully, without deferring to Mu-an's authority or trying to come to an accord. In typical Zen fashion, Mu-an slapped his face, dismissed him, and

⁴⁵ There are entries for Kurokawa's audience recorded in Yin-yüan's *nempu* for the sixth month of 1655 which indicate that he became a lay disciple at that time. *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, pp. 5211 and 5217.

⁴⁶ Yin-yüan was allowed to bring a limited number of Chinese disciples with him to Fumon-ji as his personal attendants. However, during the initial period of house arrest, Japanese disciples were not permitted to join his assembly. For a description of the restrictions placed on Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji, see pp. 43-44.

refused him leave to enter the assembly. Zen masters often refuse admission initially, testing the disciple's resolve. In this case, Tetsugen did not remain in Nagasaki to seek another meeting with Mu-an immediately. The biography says that he wandered about "like a wild crane or a wisp of cloud", and eventually made his way to Fumon-ji where he visited Yin-yüan once again and may have practiced under him for a time. Sometime later, he returned to Nagasaki and once again approached Mu-an. This time he was admitted to the assembly and remained there until 1661, or so we are lead to believe by the biography's silence.

With the exception of the events outlined above, the official biography leaves the years from 1655 until 1661 largely a blank. Many scholars have tried to fill in those years, presenting a range of chronologies which indicate that Tetsugen suffered a period of serious doubt during these "dark years", traveling back and forth between Nagasaki, Settsu and Kyoto. For example, Yoshinaga Utarô pieced together a fuller chronology with information gleaned from various documents that supplement the official biography. According to his findings, Tetsugen returned to Fukusai-ji in 1657 and practiced under Mu-an for a short time before returning to Kyoto once more in 1658. He contends that for a period of four to five years, Tetsugen experienced terrible doubts and seems to have even left Zen for a period of time.⁴⁷ Yoshinaga's chronology stands out among the other scholarly reconstructions because he documented each entry with the textual citation used as its basis. Other scholars present their chronologies as if there were no textual problems in explicating this period in Tetsugen's life.⁴⁸ Unfortunately,

⁴⁷ Yoshinaga Utarô, op.cit., pp. 8-10. Yoshinaga based this conclusion on a quotation from the *Jimoku tekkô* 自牧摘稿, a text of 15 fascicles written by Tetsugyû, which briefly describes Tetsugen's early encounters with Obaku Zen. The *Jimoku tekkô*, also known as the *Tetsugyû zenji jimoku tekkô*, was first published in Genroku 13 (1700), the year of Tetsugyû's death.

⁴⁸ The wide variety of chronologies include: Shimoda, op.cit., pp. 2-8, Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, p. 385, and Nakamura Hidemitsu, *Tetsugenji kiroku*, p. 6. Shimoda's is the earliest attempt at a chronology in the modern scholarship; it is based on the Hôzô line's chronology, *Hôzô hage nempyô* 寶藏派下年表, which I have not found elsewhere. According to Shimoda, Tetsugen practiced with Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji in Settsu in 1655 and returned to Nagasaki to practice under Mu-an in 1657. He then returned to Fumon-ji where he published the *Gukai hôgi* 弘戒法儀 in 1658. While Minamoto includes entries for the years 1657 through 1659, he does not introduce this information in the main body of the text. His chronology agrees with Shimoda's for the years 1655 and 1657. For 1658, it

it is impossible to verify much of the additional information included in these accounts, since they do not document their sources methodically.

Based on the historical documents, one can make two amendments to the official biography with a reasonable degree of certainty for the years 1655 to 1661. First, based on Hôshû's introduction to the *Tetsugen yuiroku*, it is possible to date Tetsugen's return to Nagasaki and initial admission to Mu-an's assembly to the year 1657.⁴⁹ Yin-yüan was living under strict house arrest until the eleventh month of 1655, when a few visitors were allowed to enter. Therefore, Tetsugen could not have even visited Fumon-ji before the end of that year. If Tetsugen did actually practice under Yin-yüan at Fumon-ji for an extended period of time, it would have been after the bakufu lightened the restrictions in 1656. After the seventh month of 1656, Yin-yüan was permitted up to two hundred Japanese disciples in his assembly at Fumon-ji, and Tetsugen may have been among those who took advantage of the opportunity. Secondly, Tetsugen probably did make two visits to Fumon-ji during this period. The first visit would have been sometime between 1655, when he left Nagasaki after his first, unsuccessful interview with Mu-an, and his subsequent return to Nagasaki in 1657. The second visit probably occurred in 1658, since Tetsugen's name appears on the original plates as the publisher of the woodblock edition of Yin-yüan's *Gukai hôgi*, dated 1658.⁵⁰

says that Tetsugen returned to Fumon-ji and then went on to Kyoto. Tetsugen attended lectures in Kyoto until sometime in 1659, when he returned to Nagasaki to practice under Mu-an. He left Mu-an that same year because of internal doubts and returned to his home province, abandoning Zen for a time. Nakamura Hidemitsu adds some interesting details about Tetsugen's life in his chronology of the temple Zuiryû-ji. He explains that Tetsugen went to Kyoto in 1658 specifically to do research in the scriptures. As a result of his research into the combined practice of Zen and Pure Land, he experienced serious doubts and left Ôbaku for a time. He published the *Gukai hôgi* during a period of restored faith, but left Fumon-ji in 1659 when those doubts redoubled.

⁴⁹ Yoshinaga Utarô cites the relevant passage, op.cit., p. 8. The original can be found in the woodblock edition of the *Tetsugen yuiroku*, p. 1b of Hôshû's introduction.

⁵⁰ Shimoda, op.cit., p. 179.

Tetsugen's Zen Practice

The year 1661 seems to have been a turning point for Tetsugen, then age 30. Although he had been struggling with Zen for some years, after 1661, he dedicated himself to the practice of Zen with renewed confidence and even accepted his first disciples. Following a common Zen pattern, Tetsugen placed himself under the guidance of several Zen masters in addition to periodically visiting his primary master, Mu-an.⁵¹ Mu-an had by this time left Kyushu for the Kyoto area, where he rejoined Yin-yüan and spent the next several years engrossed in the project of establishing Mampuku-ji. Tetsugen spent more extended lengths of time practicing under the Rinzai monk Kengan Zen'etsu 賢巖禪悅 (1618-1690) at Tafuku-ji in Bungo and the Chinese Obaku master Chi-fei at Fukuju-ji 福聚時 in Kokura, but also made brief visits other masters, including Tu-chan, over the years.

As the official biography notes, Tetsugen attended lectures on the *Śūramgama sūtra* given by Kengan Zen'etsu at Tafuku-ji during the autumn of 1661.⁵² Tetsugen may well have met Kengan at some earlier point in his life, since they had mutual connections. Kengan had been a disciple of Sessō during the period that Tetsugen was studying with Saigin, and the two men might have met on one of the occasions when their masters visited one another. It is also possible that Tetsugen met Kengan when he visited Yin-yüan in Nagasaki. In any case, Kengan introduced Tetsugen to what would become his favorite scripture for lecturing and teaching. Tetsugen lectured on the *Śūramgama sūtra* at least eight times in his life, and

⁵¹ The most common pattern of practice within the Rinzai (and Obaku) sect involves an extended period of practice under one master until a reasonable degree of progress has been attained, generally until the disciple has had an initial enlightenment experience. Once a disciple is somewhat advanced, he commences a period of practice on his own, making occasional visits to his master until such a time that he receives *inka* and becomes a master in his own right. During this period, it is customary to visit other Zen masters and practice under them for short periods of time.

⁵² Kengan was in the Myōshin-ji line of Rinzai Zen. He inherited Sessō's Dharma at a young age, and later succeeded him as abbot at Tafuku-ji at the age of thirty-six, in 1653. The following year, in 1654, he made a trip to Nagasaki to practice with Tao-che at Sōfuku-ji. He had numerous contacts over the years with Obaku monks, including visits with Yin-yüan and Mu-an in Nagasaki, and again later at Mampuku-ji in Uji.

he used extensive quotations from it in his writings. In fact, he chose that sutra as the topic of his very first public lectures, given in his home village in the spring of 1663 at the Sôtô temple Zenjô-ji 禅定寺.

More will be said about Tetsugen's lectures on the *'Sûramgama sutra* in the context of evaluating Tetsugen's teachings, but a few observations are appropriate here. If, as some have theorized, Tetsugen emerged in 1661 from a period of doubt in which he weighed the relative balance between Zen and True Pure Land practice for his own life, then hearing Kengan explicate the *'Sûramgama sutra* may have constituted a decisive factor in his final decision to commit himself once and for all to Zen. Tetsugen once wrote of his own understanding of the sutra,

Practicing without keeping the precepts taught by the Buddha is the False Dharma. Therefore, although practices like the *nembutsu*, *zazen*, and recitation of the sutras are naturally undertaken differently depending on the ability of each believer, the precepts against killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, and lying are called "absolute" (*kettei* 決定) because no matter what one's sect, they are determined and must be preserved.⁵³

Clearly Tetsugen understood this sutra as a rejection of the True Pure Land assertion that, in the Final Age, keeping the precepts against marrying and meat eating was a hindrance to salvation, implying a reliance on the self. If this was the issue causing his doubts, then perhaps Kengan's lecture helped him put that doubt to rest and move ahead in his practice.

Attending Kengan's lectures was important to Tetsugen for another reason; it was at those lectures that he met his two leading disciples, Hôshû and Nyosetsu 如節. Hôshû was a native of Bungo province and was then just eighteen years of age. During the course of the lectures, Hôshû decided to leave his home and take the tonsure. He became Tetsugen's first disciple and followed him thereafter. Hôshû would later become the head monk at all of Tetsugen's temples after the master's death. Less is known about Nyosetsu, since he never

⁵³ Minamoto, op.cit., p. 288.

received *inka nor* achieved a position of high rank in the Obaku sect.⁵⁴ He was a native of Tetsugen's home province of Higo, and was one of his most reliable assistants when they were working on the Tripitaka project later.

Tetsugen had already practiced under Yin-yüan and Mu-an, two of the three great Chinese Obaku masters. The third, Chi-fei Ju-i had a reputation as the most skilled among the Chinese masters at guiding monks in their meditation and kôan practice. When the opportunity presented itself to practice with Chi-fei, Tetsugen responded quickly. In 1665, Chi-fei had already determined that he would be returning to China, but accepted Lord Ogasawara Tadazane's invitation to found a new Obaku temple before continuing on his journey home.⁵⁵ Chi-fei opened the temple, which he named Kôju-san Fukuju-ji 宏寿山福聚寺, in the city of Kokura in Kyushu. He performed the opening ceremony on the anniversary of the Buddha's birth (1665/4/8), just in time to hold the summer retreat.⁵⁶ Around that time, Tetsugen was

⁵⁴ Based on descriptions of the man and certain key dates, I believe that Nyosetsu is an early name for the monk later known as Mue Nyokû 無依如空 (1610-1694). However, materials are too sparse to be certain. Much more can be said with confidence of Nyokû than of Nyosetsu. Nyokû was born in Higo and had served under the *daimyô* of that province, Lord Hosokawa. He participated in the military action to suppress the Shimabara rebellion, and thereafter determined to leave the secular life and take the tonsure. He became a disciple of Tetsugen in 1661 and moved to Osaka with him in 1667 to work on the Tripitaka project. Nyokû acted as steward of Zuiryû-ji when Tetsugen was away, and took on a great deal of responsibility in managing the Tripitaka project. According to Minamoto, Nyokû did not have the disposition to act as Tetsugen's leading disciple, so that role fell to the much younger Hôshû; Minamoto, op.cit., p. 159.

⁵⁵ Chi-fei had previously met Lord Ogasawara Tadazane 小笠原忠真 (1596-1667), the *daimyô* of Buzen, while traveling in Kyoto. Upon his return to Kyushu, Chi-fei went to Ogasawara to request his permission to return home to China. Tadazane granted permission, but convinced Chi-fei to delay his journey for a few years. According to tradition, Tadazane's wife played a part in Chi-fei becoming abbot at Fukuju-ji. She had a dream of an arhat sitting on a jade lotus who she claimed looked exactly like Chi-fei. Tadazane was already a lay patron of Obaku Zen, and had a long relationship with both Yin-yüan and Mu-an.

⁵⁶ Chi-fei came to Nagasaki in 1657 at Yin-yüan's invitation and served for six years as the abbot of the Chinese temple Fukusai-ji 福濟寺. Although he wanted to return to China during that period, he had not yet been permitted to leave the city and visit Yin-yüan at Obaku-san Mampuku-ji. Finally, he was granted permission to travel freely in 1663 and he made a trip to the Kyoto area. Satisfied that Yin-yüan was not being held against his will, Chi-fei decided to return home himself. He never fulfilled that intention. After two years as abbot at Fukuju-ji from 1665 to 1667, he returned to Nagasaki and entered Sôfuku-ji. He died there in 1671.

traveling through the region, giving lectures on the *Lotus Sutra*. When heard that Chi-fei would be opening Fukuju-ji in nearby Kokura, he took advantage of the opportunity to join his assembly and pass the summer retreat there.

Chi-fei selected Tetsugen from among his other disciples to serve as *jōza*⁵⁷ 上座, so that Tetsugen held a high position in the assembly during the retreat. The official biography includes only one encounter between Chi-fei and Tetsugen from that period, but the story suggests that Tetsugen made progress under the master's guidance. "One day", says the biography, "[Chi-fei] instructed the assembly. He asked them, 'How would you remove oil once it has gotten into the noodles?' and had them give their responses (*agyo* 下語). Tetsugen said, 'I'd give up mixing the noodles.'" The master gave [this answer] high praise."⁵⁸ Despite their apparent compatibility, Tetsugen did not stay on at Fukuju-ji when the retreat came to an end, nor did he practice again under Chi-fei. He left Chi-fei's assembly at the end of the summer and returned home to Kumamoto. In the end, the summer session proved to be the last full retreat in which he dedicated himself completely to Zen practice. Soon after leaving Kokura, he began making plans to import a woodblock edition of the scriptures from China, and from that time on worked full time on his Tripitaka project.

The Tripitaka in Japan

When Tetsugen returned to Kumamoto from Kokura, he was already aware of the practical difficulties facing Buddhist scholars due to the scarcity of many sutras in Japan and was considering means to ameliorate the situation. Individual sutras that were important to one or more Buddhist sects such as the Lotus Sutra were widely available, but the great majority of

⁵⁷ The term *jōza* has several meanings. It can be used as an honorific title for any monk that has practiced in the monastery for over ten years, or for a monk that has distinguished himself through his talent. In this case, it refers to the disciple designated by the master to oversee management of temple affairs during the retreat. The position normally falls to the highest ranking monk below the abbot.

⁵⁸ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 368 and 342.

sutras were very difficult to find except at those few temples that possessed complete editions of the Chinese Tripitaka. Only a limited number of these complete editions existed in Japan, so that gaining access to one of them was a practical impossibility for most individual scholars. At that time, if a monk such as Tetsugen wished to study one of the less common sutras or to have access to a complete Chinese Tripitaka for research, he had to travel to a temple possessing a copy and request permission to use it. Generally speaking, that would entail a lengthy journey to Kyoto or Edo without any guarantee of success. Temples guarded their sutras like any other rare treasure, and many monks were turned away disappointed.

Japanese Buddhists had dealt with the sutras somewhat differently over the centuries than had Chinese and Korean Buddhists. As a result of these differences, they were facing serious problems by the early Tokugawa period. The scriptures had come to Japan piecemeal from China and Korea, just as they had poured gradually into China from India and Central Asia. However, unlike the Chinese, the Japanese did not begin the long process of translating the scriptures into their native tongue, and so did not produce a Japanese Tripitaka comparable to the Chinese Tripitaka.⁵⁹ Instead, they adopted the Chinese translations as their own, sometimes marking texts for easier reading by Japanese students, and accepted the Chinese Tripitaka as their canon. In China, woodblock editions of the complete Chinese Tripitaka became increasingly common starting in the tenth century when the first imperially sponsored edition, known as the Szechuan edition, was completed in 983. Successive generations of Chinese leaders sponsored a series of such editions, so that approximately twenty had appeared by the early seventeenth century, with at least three separate editions produced during the Ming dynasty alone.⁶⁰ Korean Buddhists had likewise produced two editions of

⁵⁹ A Japanese translation of the Tripitaka was produced only in the modern period, the *Kokuyaku issaikyō* 国訳一切經, divided into two parts, *Indo senjutsu-bu* 印度撰述部, 154 vols., (Daitō shuppansha, 1930-1936), and *Wakan senjutsu-bu* 和漢撰述部, 101 vols. (Daitō shuppansha, 1936-1944).

⁶⁰ The first two of these editions, known as the Northern Ming and Southern Ming editions respectively, were the basis of the third, the Wan-li edition. The Wan-li was produced by comparing

the Tripitaka, in the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries, using Sung editions as their basis.⁶¹ By contrast, the Japanese had not produced a single complete printed edition before the seventeenth century and were dependent upon imported and hand written copies alone.⁶²

The Japanese naturally accepted the traditional Buddhist concept that transmitting and copying the sutras was a meritorious endeavor. They made handwritten copies of individual sutras, especially such important scriptures as the Heart sutra or the Lotus sutra, as a part of their religious practice. They treasured editions of the Chinese Tripitaka that had been brought to Japan from China or Korea, usually by monks returning from years of study abroad or by emigres. Plans had periodically been discussed to produce a Japanese woodblock edition, but none of these attempts had ever come to fruition before the early Tokugawa period. However, in the seventeenth century several factors converged to make the time ripe for a Japanese edition, and two were successfully completed within a few decades.⁶³

First, Japanese Buddhists came to feel the need for ready access to the scriptures more acutely in the early seventeenth century than at any previous time. Under the stable conditions of peace and economic development, and with the steady encouragement of the central and provincial governments, Buddhist monks turned their attention more and more and correcting the earlier two.

⁶¹ The latter Korean edition, known as the *Koryô de can gyon*, published between 1236 and 1251, is commonly regarded by scholars today as the finest premodern edition of the Chinese Tripitaka. It was known in Japan during the Tokugawa period, but the Japanese seem to have been more familiar with Chinese editions.

⁶² For a detailed history of the Chinese Tripitaka, see *Bussho kaisetsu daijiten* 仏書解説大事典, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Daitô shuppansha, 1933-1978).

⁶³ The first complete Japanese edition of the Tripitaka was printed just a few decades before Tetsugen began his project. This was an official edition, sponsored by bakufu funds. A team commissioned by the Tokugawa bakufu and headed by the Tendai monk Tenkai 天海 (1536-1643) completed the work in 1648. The Tenkai-ban, as it is known, had a few notable problems that prevented it from becoming a standard edition that solved the scarcity problem. First, the edition was printed using a form of moveable type. Unlike woodblocks that can be preserved, thus allowing for an indefinite number of copies, the moveable type was reused from text to text, limiting the number of copies to the initial printing. Only about thirty copies of the Tenkai-ban were actually produced. Second, it had been based on one of the inferior Yüan editions and was so riddled with errors that it was never regarded as reliable. For more information, see Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 282-286.

fully to scholarship. In much the same way that scholars in other fields were rediscovering and emphasizing a return to basic sources, Buddhist scholars of all sects came to stress the need for scriptural studies. The bulk of this research took place in Kyoto where monks and nuns gathered from all over the country to study and hear lectures. Educational institutes were associated with the main monasteries of most sects in the city. The sutras were more readily available in Kyoto than in other regions of the country, but even there the situation was by no means convenient due to the heavy demand for the limited resources. Once scholars left Kyoto and returned to their home provinces, they might easily find themselves with access to nothing beyond their own personal library. As we see in Tetsugen's essays on the subject, monks from the Kyushu area discussed this problem with their colleagues from other temples when they gathered for important lectures. Tetsugen observed in the *Keen no so*, "Here in the castle town of Kumamoto at the Kôto-san Ryûchô-in, there have been lectures and ceremonies related to the Lotus Sutra since the middle of autumn. The audience that gathered was like clouds and the celebrants like an array of stars. High ranking monks from all the temples and Zen monks from the four directions strengthened their resolve and determined that they would seek the sutras from China to have the sweet nectar [of the Buddha's words] rain down on Japan." ⁶⁴ One can easily imagine similar discussions taking place throughout the country.

Second, the Japanese populace was becoming increasingly literate and the general social climate was conducive to supporting a major printing project like the Tripitaka. Publishing rapidly became big business as literacy increased throughout the general population, and the number of works published each year rose significantly during the period. Scholars

⁶⁴ Tetsugen wrote in the *Keen no so*, "Here in the castle town of Kumamoto at the Kôto-san Ryûchô-in, there have been lectures and ceremonies related to the Lotus Sutra since the middle of Autumn. The audience that gathered was like clouds and the celebrants like an array of stars. High ranking monks from all the temples and Zen monks from the four directions strengthened their resolve and determined that they would seek the sutras from China and to have the sweet nectar [of the Buddha's words] rain down on Japan." Minamoto, op.cit., p. 276.

estimate that over seven hundred publishing firms were operating in Kyoto alone during the seventeenth century. By the end of the century, publishers produced close to two hundred new titles each year, and Buddhist texts comprised the largest portion. For example, Kyoto publishers listed some 2,796 Buddhist titles during the second half of the century.⁶⁵ A pool of skilled engravers who made their living carving woodblocks, paper craftsmen who were producing new types of paper especially suited for the purpose, as well as skilled printers and binders were readily available in the major printing centers, primarily Kyoto and Osaka. Various kinds of materials were published, from popular novels to scholarly treatises by Buddhist and Confucian thinkers. Not surprisingly, Buddhist subjects were the most common early on in the Tokugawa period, since literacy was strongest in the Buddhist world.⁶⁶ Even those who could not afford to purchase texts could sometimes rent them from lending libraries which spread in the major cities. Although the scriptures would not have appealed to the general public as reading material, enough people were familiar with published works for the project to be sensible to them.

The Beginning of the Tripitaka Project

When the official biography introduces Tetsugen's resolve to produce a woodblock edition of the Buddhist scriptures for Japan, it presents the plan in its fully developed form, quoting from Tetsugen's statement of intention, the *Koku daizō engiso* 刻大藏縁起疏.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ Moriya, "Urban Networks and Information Networks", pp. 114-123.

⁶⁶ Most Buddhist monks learned to read Chinese as a necessary part of their training. During the centuries of conflict prior to the Tokugawa period, Buddhist temples provided the only formal education available outside of the courtier class. Temple schools, called *terakoya* 寺小屋, also taught commoner children who were not studying for a religious vocation to read and write. These schools served an important role during the early part of the Tokugawa period to spread literacy to the non-samurai populace. See Dore, *Education in Tokugawa Japan*, pp. 252-290.

⁶⁷ The original Chinese text of the *Koku daizō engiso* can be found in the *Tetsugen zenji yuiroku*, vol. 2 下, pp. 27a-28b. Akamatsu gives both the Chinese text and an annotated *yomi kudashi* in *Tetsugen zenji kana hōgo*, pp. 51-54. All references here will be to Akamatsu.

written in 1669, as if that had been Tetsugen's idea all along. In reality, Tetsugen's thinking evolved over a long period of time, beginning at least as early as 1663, when he composed his first essay on the topic, the *Keen no so* 化縁の疏.⁶⁸ In that essay, Tetsugen set out his initial plan, to raise funds from ordinary people and eventually import an edition of the Tripitaka from China. Apparently, this particular idea did not prove practical, since he abandoned it a few years later for reasons unknown in favor of the more ambitious project of producing the woodblocks themselves. Perhaps Tetsugen encountered difficulties in making import arrangements with Chinese merchants, or the cost of acquiring copies in China may have been prohibitively expensive compared to the cost of printing texts in Japan. Certainly, importing individual copies would not have solved the basic problem facing Buddhist scholars throughout the country. In any case, by 1667 Tetsugen had determined that publishing a Japanese edition was the best solution. He made new plans accordingly.

Tetsugen and a small group of close disciples, including Hôshû and Mue Nyokû 無依如空 (1610-1694), left Kyushu and moved to Osaka, which was to be their base point for the duration of the Tripitaka project. Tetsugen left no clues in his writings as to why he chose Osaka, but the city had many advantages for a major publishing venture. First, Osaka was quickly becoming the financial center of Japan with many prospering businesses located there, starting with the rice merchants who handled much of the nation's basic cash crop. The Tokugawa bakufu maintained direct control of the city, but permitted *daimyô* from all over the country to keep households there if they wished. Therefore, both wealthy merchants and members of the samurai class resided there.⁶⁹ In financial terms, Osaka was a much likelier location for raising large sums through donations than rural Kyushu. Second, by the middle of the seventeenth century, the publishing trade had spread to Osaka from Kyoto,

⁶⁸ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 275-283.

⁶⁹ Moriya, op.cit., pp. 99-100.

making it one of the three likely sites with the requisite craftsmen and supplies.⁷⁰ Third, Osaka was reasonably near Kyoto and Uji, approximately a day's journey from each, so that Tetsugen could both be in close contact with his superiors at Mampuku-ji and have easy access to all of the cultural resources in Kyoto. In fact, as a primary transportation node in Japan's extensive system of river and coastal routes, Osaka provided exceptional access to the entire country. Therefore, Tetsugen could travel conveniently back and forth between Edo, Kyushu, Kyoto and Osaka on his fund raising missions from a central base point.

At first, while they went about the business of establishing a financial base for the Tripitaka project, Tetsugen and his disciples made their temporary abode with a merchant family named Okuda 奥田 who were Ōbaku supporters⁷¹. Until this time, Tetsugen had virtually no financial resources of his own upon which to draw. Popular tales speak of him as being so poor that he could not even afford a metal begging bowl, but covered a woven bowl with black paper so that it would resemble the proper utensil.⁷² The first stage of his work in Osaka would be to build a temple to house the project and to provide for the daily needs of himself and his disciples. Tetsugen found a sponsor⁷³, and eventually was able to lease a small dilapidated temple called Yakushi-ji 薬師寺 in the Naniwa section of the city. Tetsugen gave a lecture at Yakushi-ji sometime during 1668, so one may assume that he took up residence there in that year. In 1670, a group of faithful lay supporters restored the temple and invited Tetsugen to become the official restorer and first head monk. Tetsugen then renamed the temple Jiun-san Zuiryū-ji 慈雲山瑞龍寺, though it soon became known by its popular name, Tetsugen-ji.

In the spring of 1668, Tetsugen gave a lecture on the *Awakening of Faith* at a Sôtô

⁷⁰ Ibid., pp. 114-115.

⁷¹ Yoshinaga Utarô, op.cit., p. 24.

⁷² See below, note 96.

⁷³ Tetsugen mentions consulting with this individual in the *Koku daizô engiso*, but does not name him. Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, p. 52.

temple in Osaka, Chôshô-san Gekkô-in 長昌山月江院 and announced publicly, perhaps for the first time, his vow to print the Tripitaka. A woman in the audience, a nun named Myôu Dônin 妙宇道人 (d. 1678) from Kannon-ji, who had already been generous in her donations to other Obaku projects, was so moved when she heard Tetsugen's plan that she donated one thousand *ryô* of gold, an enormous donation for a private individual to make.⁷⁴ Tetsugen responded to her generosity saying, "I have heard it said that even a tower one thousand feet tall must begin with a foundation.⁷⁵ I now have my foundation. Without a doubt, I shall print the entire Tripitaka!"⁷⁶ Tradition regards this as Tetsugen's first donation, since it proved to be the impetus he needed to take further concrete steps. With a substantial sum far exceeding his own immediate needs, Tetsugen was ready to move ahead with the second stage.

Before Tetsugen could actually proceed, he needed to formally ask his superiors' permission to undertake the project. Under normal circumstances, Zen monks would not have participated in this sort of endeavor, since it posed an obvious interruption in regular Zen monastic practice for an extended period of time. Sometime in the summer or early fall of 1669, Tetsugen paid a visit to Obaku-san where he called upon Yin-yüan and Mu-an.⁷⁷ At that time, Yin-yüan had already retired and was living at Shôdô-in 松堂院, his subtemple on Obaku-san, while Mu-an had succeeded him as the abbot of Mampuku-ji in 1664. Tetsugen

⁷⁴ Myôu Dônin's name appears in several places in Obaku records. She donated 1,200 *ryô* of silver in 1665 to Mampuku-ji and the funds were used to construct the bathhouse. She is mentioned in Mu-an's *nempu* and recorded sayings, and from these we know that she had lost a son and made her donations for the sake of his salvation. See Shimoda, p. 198-201 for a review research done on her from Obaku sources. According to Akamatsu, of the three temples named Kannon-ji known to have existed in Osaka, Myôu's was in Kaminochô 上の町; Tetsugen zenji, p. 51.

⁷⁵ Perhaps a reference to a passage from the Tao Te Ching, #64: 九層之台、起於累土. "A nine storey tower begins with a mound of earth."

⁷⁶ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 368-369 and 344.

⁷⁷ Tetsugen refers to the visit as occurring in the summer in the *Koku daizô engibun*; Akamatsu, *Tetsugen kana hôgo*, p. 51 and 54. According to Yin-yüan's biography, the meeting took place that autumn; *ingen zenshû*, vol. 11, p. 5251.

consulted both masters, as is recorded in their respective biographies. Each approved of his plan and marked the occasion with a verse presented to Tetsugen.⁷⁸ Yin-yüan gave his full and enthusiastic support to the project. "I came to Japan for the sake of the Dharma," Yin-yüan said. "The shogun gave me land and I was able to build [Mampuku-ji]. [Our Dharma] style has flourished, and all has gone as I hoped. The only thing missing was to print an edition of the Tripitaka. Now I know that it was in order that I might hear this glorious news that my withered body has not passed away. My wishes have now been fulfilled."⁷⁹ Yin-yüan also expressed his support in tangible terms that further promoted the project. First, he turned over to Tetsugen his own copy of the Chinese Tripitaka that he had brought over from China. Tetsugen used that version, the Wan-li edition, as the basis for his own, copying the Chinese text down to the Ming style of characters, page layout and binding.⁸⁰ Second, Yin-yüan sectioned off a parcel of land on Obaku-san which he turned over to Tetsugen. Tetsugen initially used this land to build a storehouse for the woodblocks which he appropriately named Hôzô-in 宝蔵院. The sources offer no comparable clue as to Mu-an's reaction to the project beyond his permission. Mu-an's biography has only the terse entry, "[The master] instructed Tetsugen Jôza 上座 to carve [woodblocks for] the Tripitaka."⁸¹ Most secondary sources, including the official biography, do not even note that the meeting took place.

With a small financial base to build upon and his superiors' permission secured, Tetsugen had indeed completed the foundation for his Tripitaka. He marked the occasion by composing a short essay, the *Koku daizô engibun*, which served to publicly announce the start of the

⁷⁸ Yoshida Utarô gives the text for both verses in their entirety, op.cit., p. 28.

⁷⁹ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 369 and 344-345.

⁸⁰ There is evidence suggesting that in some cases Tetsugen used other texts, including Japanese editions of individual scriptures and portions of the Korean edition, as the basis for the Obaku-ban. Matsunaga Chikai reviews the existing research on this matter and provides his own findings in great detail in "*Obakuban daizôkyô no saihyôka*".

⁸¹ *Obaku Mokuan oshô nempu*, part 2 下, p. 17a...

project. In the essay, Tetsugen set forth his reasons for undertaking it, progress to date, and his hopes for the future. The text reads in part,

Since ancient times, our country has been called a land of the Buddha. From the time when the teachings were first transmitted to the east during the reign of Emperor Kimmei, successive emperors have received them... and the whole nation, counselors, retainers and all classes of people, have come to revere and follow them. When one reflects upon this, [Japan] is not inferior to places like India and China. It is just that, from the first, there has never been an edition of the Tripitaka published here, making the texts especially scarce.⁸² Whenever I have discussed this with talented men from various temples and monasteries, they can only lament it....

I bow down and pray that counselors, government officials, wealthy [merchants], good men and virtuous women will each give rise to the thought [of enlightenment] that is difficult to find, develop a broad mind, and help with three to five volumes, or perhaps just fund a word or half a verse. That would bind them to wisdom and turn the wheel of the Dharma by completing this commendable task.⁸³

The Project's Structure

After meeting with Yin-yüan and Mu-an, Tetsugen consulted with various colleagues and lay sponsors to determine how best to proceed. They decided to review the contents of the Chinese Tripitaka and select the most important sutras for immediate publication. According to the official biography, this first set amounted to ten volumes. The project was then to proceed as steadily as funds allowed, with Tetsugen taking primary responsibility for raising the money. A certain amount is known about how the project was structured, who participated, in what capacity, and where the work was done, etc.. Tetsugen and his advisors determined many of these practical issues in 1669, just before Tetsugen set off fund-raising. Tetsugen's own disciples and the craftsmen they hired performed the bulk of the work, but other members of the Obaku community participated as well, contributing according to their own talents and resources.

⁸² It would appear from this remark that Tetsugen had no knowledge that the Tenkai edition had already been produced.

⁸³ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, pp. 52-53.

First, Tetsugen created a triangle of work sites, connecting Osaka, Uji and Kyoto, that his followers called *sansho* 三所 (three places). He designated Zuiryû-ji in Osaka, Hôzô-in on Obaku-san and the Inbô⁸⁴ 印房 in Kyoto as the headquarters for different aspects of the project, and assigned disciples to manage each of them in his absence. The latter two structures were built in the autumn of 1669, and Zuiryû-ji, formerly Yakushi-ji, was restored the following year. Zuiryû-ji continued to be Tetsugen's primary temple of residence, where he stayed whenever he was not traveling and where the majority of his disciples remained.⁸⁵ When he was away, which was much of the time, Tetsugen assigned either Hôshû or Nyokû to act as his deputy at Zuiryû-ji. The deputy acted in the place of the head monk to oversee the other disciples' Zen practice. Apparently, Zuiryû-ji functioned in much the same manner as any other Obaku temple, except that the daily work undertaken by the monks was related to the Tripitaka project.

Tetsugen built Hôzô-in on the land within the temple grounds of Mampuku-ji that Yin-yüan had provided him. Although the name suggests that it was a subtemple, the first structure was nothing more than a small storehouse, where Tetsugen planned to keep the completed woodblocks. He was later able to move to a better site, and the new Hôzô-in was spacious enough to house the actual printing work when they went into full production. Eventually, Hôzô-in did become a full subtemple with an abbot's hall and other temple buildings, but that probably occurred after Tetsugen had passed away.

Tetsugen set up a print shop in Kyoto, usually called simply Inbô, where the carving of the woodblocks took place.⁸⁶ This site, in the heart of Kyoto's thriving publishing district,

⁸⁴ The term inbô is actually a temple post, referring to the person responsible for engraving seals and other items, mentioned in the *Obaku shingi*, T. 82, p. 777b. In this context, it was used as the informal name of the shop in Kyoto.

⁸⁵ At the time of his death, Tetsugen had approximately one hundred disciples. Temple records were destroyed in a fire in 1749, so more accurate figures are not available.

⁸⁶ The shop was originally located at Nijô and Kiyamachi. Its role changed several times, but it was still in operation and under the sect's indirect control until sometime during the Taishô era when it

was convenient at that time for gathering the wood-carvers who abounded in Kyoto, and later as a business office for selling the Tripitaka. As the project progressed and the woodblocks were completed, Tetsugen also used the shop as a bindery and distribution center. Since the shop served primarily secular purposes, in particular as the locus for collecting the profits from sales, Tetsugen never regarded it as a regular temple.⁸⁷ However, given the nature of the project, it did function in some respects as a religious site, and was eventually given the temple name Baiyô-dô 貝葉堂. Later directors of the shop all came from Hôshû's line, and generally served simultaneously as the head monk at Hôzô-in. Later generations enshrined images of Tetsugen and Hôshû in one room, where they held memorial services in their honor.⁸⁸

Although Tetsugen had changed his goal and now intended to publish rather than import the Tripitaka from China, certain aspects of his plan remained constant over the years. It was always his intention to involve as many ordinary people as possible in the project and thereby provide them with a special opportunity to participate in a meritorious act. Tetsugen did not limit his fund raising activities to visits with government officials or wealthy merchants, though ultimately a large percentage of the funds collected came from them. He took his idea to the common people and used his project as a means to spread the Dharma among them. The words he wrote in 1663 in the *Keen no so* described his work throughout the long years of travel.

...I will not shy away from the exalted nor overlook the lowly. I will not regard ten thousand *kan* 貫 [of rice] as too much, nor one grain of rice too little. Whatever people donate to me, I will accept and treasure.... If a poor woman [were to

was sold.

⁸⁷ Tetsugen included a section on the Inbô in his rules for Hôzô-in which reads, "The Inbô does not allow guests, neither monk nor lay, to stay overnight. Inbô is not like other temples. Its provisions (lit. rice and vegetables) are all reserved for the sake of the Dharma. If they are misused, then both guest and host will have sinned grievously. Do not do this!" The instructions were dated the first day of summer, Empô 5 (1677), and signed with Tetsugen's seal. Yoshinaga Utarô, op.cit., p. 89.

⁸⁸ For a brief history of the Inbô, see Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 126-127.

donate] even a single *sen*, though it may seem a meager sum, with that single thread she will bind herself in a deep connection to the Dharma. Or if a poor orphan without even a sheet of paper for savings should give a single grain of millet, he will have planted the great seed of *bodhi*.⁸⁹

The vast majority of the donations that Tetsugen collected were small offerings made by ordinary people, sometimes gathered together in their local religious confraternities (*kô* 講). Tetsugen and his disciples did not keep detailed records of the smaller donations they received, so we do not know the exact numbers. Instead, we have lists of place names representing thousands of smaller donations of precisely the sort Tetsugen described in the passage above. In the case of larger individual donations made by government officials or wealthy merchants, Tetsugen recorded the name of the individual and the number of volumes of the Tripitaka the donation had financed. Tetsugen had an inscription carved on the final page of each volume of the Tripitaka, indicating the donation(s), either by groups or individuals, that had sponsored it.

Tetsugen's primary role in the operation was to raise funds to keep the project in business. There are numerous popular tales of Tetsugen begging on the streets of Osaka or Kyoto, asking passersby for even half a *sen* to support his work. One story, told in a number of variations, has been used within the sect to illustrate Tetsugen's determination. Tetsugen was out begging in a bitter winter storm on the Sanjô Bridge in Kyoto. A samurai passed by on horseback, and although Tetsugen called out to him, he proceeded on without responding. Tetsugen followed the man on foot, walking as far as the town of Otsu, approximately ten kilometers away. There he addressed the samurai again, politely asking for a small donation for the Tripitaka. The samurai tossed him a small coin, more to be rid of the tenacious pest than to support the project. But Tetsugen took up the small offering as if it were a treasure. This moved the samurai and the crowd that had gathered to watch, and gave Tetsugen an

⁸⁹ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 277-278.

opportunity to explain his work at some length.⁹⁰

Although Tetsugen continued to beg in the streets to raise funds in the traditional manner, that method would not have attracted the public attention nor garnished the funds necessary for a major undertaking. In order to raise larger sums of money, Tetsugen continued to use his greatest skill, his ability as a public speaker, as the basis for his efforts. Tetsugen had a talent for explicating difficult concepts from the Buddhist scriptures in basic terms that common people could grasp, and he had already developed a reputation in Kyushu for his lecturing before he moved to Osaka. Buddhist lectures were a common feature in Tokugawa life, and served as a form of entertainment as well as religious education in urban centers and rural villages alike. Large crowds numbering even in the thousands might gather to hear a popular speaker. During the first years of Tetsugen's residence in Osaka, he arranged or was invited to give lectures at several temples in the area and began to build his reputation in the Kansai region. As Tetsugen's name became known, he drew larger crowds, and was able to spread the message of his endeavor to a wider audience.

Tetsugen traveled throughout the Kantô, Kansai and Kyushu regions, lecturing in cities and small villages. Over thirteen years of actively raising funds for the Tripitaka, from 1669 through 1682, Tetsugen made five trips to Edo, lecturing not only in the capital itself, but in the outlying areas and along the route between Kantô and Kansai. He spent an extended period of time, from 1674 through 1676, traveling around Kyushu, lecturing at various temples and instructing regional officials. According to Akamatsu Shinmyô's estimation, Tetsugen traveled through and collected funds in some 40 provinces.⁹¹ The official biography lists only six major lecture series that Tetsugen gave at large, important temples over the thirteen years, but other sources mention at least three others. There is no way to estimate the less formal appearances that he made at smaller temples.

⁹⁰ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 225-230; Satô Fumitsugu, *op.cit.*, pp. 46-54.

⁹¹ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji*, p. 144.

Traveling was much safer during the peaceful years of the Tokugawa period than in earlier times, and the well established routes made the process more convenient. Nonetheless, the years of traveling took their toll on Tetsugen and he faced certain hazards. There is one story of his being robbed while returning home to Osaka after a successful trip to Edo. While making his way along a route following the Kiso River, Tetsugen was attacked by a robber. The man took the packet of money that Tetsugen was carrying and pushed Tetsugen into the raging river. Tetsugen only saved himself from drowning by grabbing hold of a willow branch hanging down in the water. Tradition has it that a man named Takehara 竹原, one of the believers who sponsored the restoration of Yakushi-ji and invited Tetsugen to serve as abbot, later confessed to Tetsugen that he had been the robber. Takehara then became one of Tetsugen's most generous sponsors for the Tripitaka.⁹²

Contributions by Other Obaku Monks

Hôshû indicated in the official biography that Tetsugen distributed responsibilities for the project among his many disciples, but we know little of the details. Nyokû was most often left as Tetsugen's deputy at Zuiryû-ji, and was given the title *kan'in* 監院. Other senior disciples would have served similar managerial roles at Hôzô-in and the Inbô to direct the work of the hired craftsmen. Hôshû probably worked primarily at the latter two sites when he was not accompanying Tetsugen on a journey. Early on in the project, Nyokû recommended to Tetsugen that they build a small temple in Fushimi to facilitate communications between the three sites. Fushimi was a key transportation point, where travelers changed boats depending on their destination. Nyokû believed that a temple there could serve as a relay point for messages and as a convenient resting house for Obaku monks in transit. They assigned the job to one of Nyokû's disciples, a young man named Kûgan 空岩 in the first month of 1671, but the arduous process of finding sponsors, arranging for government permission, etc. took

⁹² No one knows which elements, if any, of this story are historically accurate, although Akamatsu says that there was still a memorial stone for the wife of a man named Takehara at Zuiryû-ji in 1941, before the temple was destroyed in the fire bombing in 1945; *Tetsugen*, p. 305.

five years. The temple was not completed until the end of 1675 and never proved to be an important addition.

Somewhat more is known of the help provided by other senior Obaku monks, including Tetsugyû Dôki 鉄牛道機 (1628-1700), Ryôdô Dôkaku 了翁道覚 (1630-1707), and Ta-mei Hsing-shan 大眉性善 (J. Daibi Shôzen; 1616-1673). Tetsugen first met Tetsugyû in 1655 in Nagasaki, when the two of them were practicing under Yin-yüan at Kôfuku-ji. Both monks subsequently became Mu-an's disciples, and Tetsugyû received *inka* from the master in 1667, a few years before Tetsugen began the Tripitaka project in earnest. Tetsugen requested the support of his Dharma brother Tetsugyû, who was then living in Edo, before he had even consulted with Yin-yüan and Mu-an.⁹³ In the autumn of 1668, Tetsugen commissioned one of Tetsugyû's disciples, Chigen Genjô 知幻元成 (?-1654-1697-?), who visited Zuiryû-ji while passing through Osaka on his way to Edo, to carry his appeal to Tetsugyû. Tetsugyû responded enthusiastically to Tetsugen's request for assistance. According to his biography, Tetsugyû commented that he had always hoped to produce an edition of the sutras himself and would gladly extend a hand in any way possible to a Dharma brother with the same intention.⁹⁴

Tetsugyû's biography spells out a number of ways in which the master fulfilled this promise to support Tetsugen.⁹⁵ First, Tetsugyû had extensive contacts among bakufu officials and other leading samurai in Edo, and was well known in the city. He used these connections to promote Tetsugen's plan, setting the stage so that Tetsugen, completely unknown in the capital, would receive a warm welcome when he visited in 1669. When Tetsugen arrived in Edo, the two men were able to confer in person and Tetsugyû advised Tetsugen how best

⁹³ Tetsugyû became Mu-an's first Dharma heir in 1667, and at the time of Tetsugen's request for help, he was serving the first abbot at Chôkô-san Shôtai-ji 長興山紹太寺 in Edo. He later succeeded Mu-an as the second abbot at the Obaku sect's headquarters in Edo, Zuishô-ji 瑞聖寺 in 1675. Tetsugyû spent the majority of his career spreading Obaku throughout the Kantô region.

⁹⁴ As quoted in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 296, and Shimoda, *op.cit.*, p. 207. The biography is otherwise unidentified and I have been able to identify neither the author nor the original text.

⁹⁵ As quoted in Akamatsu, *ibid.*, pp. 296-297.

to proceed. Tetsugyû can be partially credited with the financial success of Tetsugen's first fund raising expedition, since he had vouched for Tetsugen's character among the officials who made substantial donations. Tetsugyû may well have also been responsible for the unusually large turnout that came to hear Tetsugen lecture at Kaiun-ji 海雲寺 in Asakusa in the fall of 1669, his first appearance in the city.⁹⁶ Apparently, Tetsugyû played a similar promotional role within the Obaku sect itself. He defended Tetsugen's plan when other monks scoffed that it was too large a task for any individual monk to manage. He had faith in Tetsugen's abilities when the others did not yet know his mettle, and he convinced them to support the project. Finally, it is said that Tetsugyû took it upon himself to do the proof reading for most of the prepared blocks, although when and where he did this is unclear.

Like Tetsugyû, Ryôdô centered his work in the Kantô area, so he was not directly involved in the Tripitaka project. He practiced under several Obaku masters, including Yin-yüan, Chi-fei and Kao-ch'üan throughout his life, and became Kao-ch'üan's Dharma heir in 1695. His early years of Zen practice were interrupted several times by sickness. As a result, he studied medicine and eventually set up a successful medical school and pharmacy in Edo.⁹⁷ In 1665, Ryôdô made a vow to use the funds acquired from selling his medicines to purchase copies of the Tripitaka and donate them to various temples in order to promote the Dharma. He was especially generous with Tendai and Zen temples, including several Obaku temples. At first, he purchased copies such as the Tenkai-ban or Chinese editions as they became available to him. Later, he began to financially support Tetsugen's project and after the Tetsugen-ban was completed, he ordered numerous complete and partial copies which he presented to temples.

Ta-mei was a Chinese monk who accompanied Yin-yüan to Japan in 1654 and served as

⁹⁶ The official biography claims that the crowd was so large that people would come and camp over night to guarantee a seat. External sources confirm that the crowd was large, numbering around one thousand.

⁹⁷ See p. 168 for further information on Ryôdô's medical school and philanthropic work.

his attendant until the master's death in 1673. Ta-mei received Yin-yüan's *inka* in 1665, and through his lone Dharma heir, Bairei Dôsetsu 梅嶺道雪 (1641-1717), started one of Obaku's largest Dharma lines. Ta-mei assisted Tetsugen in a most unusual manner, donating his own subtemple at Obaku-san for use as the new site of Hôzô-in. Ta-mei had built himself a retreat called Tôrin-in 東林院 in a secluded area of the temple grounds in 1665. His site was to the east of the main temple, far from any other structure, and on high, dry land. His property was quite safe from the dangers of fire or water damage, making it a perfect location for storing the woodblock plates. In contrast, the land that Yin-yüan had given to Tetsugen lay to the west of Mampuku-ji, close to the kitchen, on low, moist ground. Shortly after Yin-yüan had died and Ta-mei was himself sick and dying, he offered to make a trade with Tetsugen: he and his disciples would move to Hôzô-in and Tetsugen would have Tôrin-in.

Ta-mei prepared a deed explaining the trade in order to prevent any trouble or confusion for future descendants. It read in part:

The most revered thing in the world is the Buddha; the most treasured is the Dharma; and the most respected is the sangha. A person who believes in the Three Treasures is called wise. With only the Buddha and not the Dharma, one cannot save sentient beings. The sangha without the Dharma cannot attain enlightenment. Therefore, bodhisattvas make expounding the Dharma tantamount among all their practices.

Be that as it may, though this land has long been called a Buddha land, and though the emperor, retainers and all classes of people revered the Three Treasures and built temples, they had the sutras alone without having the woodblocks. Like a fire without a source or water without an origin, [the Dharma] cannot grow and be transmitted to all the [Dharma] lines.

Tetsugen, a virtuous Zen monk and skilled at spreading the sutras, travels everywhere to give lectures, clearly explaining the Great Teaching. His fame is extensive. He gave rise to the mind of *bodhi* and practices the bodhisattva way. He has gathered great men from the ten directions to print the Buddha's wise commands. His [work] will allow the Dharma to be transmitted forever. How deep is his merit!

Now the woodblocks are halfway done, and Tetsugen believes that he will not have sufficient storage space. He has lamented this fact to me. For the sake of the Dharma, I have given up my whole life just to seek understanding of half a verse. How much more readily will I give up an external thing! I think that my land at Tôrin is especially dry and far removed from any fire hazard, and therefore quite suitable. It is the most secluded area of Obaku-san....

Written by the hand of the founder of Tôrin-in, Ta-mei Hsing-shan, in

agreement with my ten disciples.⁹⁸

The text was dated 1673/9/25, less than a month before his own death on 10/18. As can be seen in the text, Ta-mei had consulted with his disciples, and they were in agreement as well. Although the sources are not explicit on this point, it seems likely that Ta-mei consulted with them as a part of the deathbed distribution of his property. Tetsugen took possession of Ta-mei's retreat and built a larger storehouse on the property, while Ta-mei's disciples moved to the former site of Hôzô-in.⁹⁹

Outside Sources of Support

In addition to the help that Tetsugen's disciples and other Obaku monks offered in completing the Tripitaka project, Tetsugen received practical assistance from outsiders. For example, according to tradition, the bakufu official who administrated the Nara region, identified by some scholars as Mizoguchi Nobukatsu 溝口信勝, was said to have supported Tetsugen's undertaking by enabling him to use Yoshino cherry for the woodblocks. The cherry trees in Yoshino, reputed to be the finest cherry wood in all of Japan, were protected by government

⁹⁸ Yoshinaga Utarô, op.cit., pp. 47-48.

⁹⁹ The story of the exchange of land was passed on orally within the Obaku sect. It also made its way into at least one popular text, the *Settsu meisho zue* 摂津名所圖會, a collection of illustrations of famous sites in Settsu province that includes tales associated with some of the sites. Ta-mei's Dharma heir Bairei had built a temple in Settsu and named Ta-mei as the founder. It was through this connection that a story set in Uji was included in a Settsu collection. Akamatsu provides the text of the story, *Tetsugen*, pp. 123-124. It reads, "One day when Tetsugen was first at Obakusan, he was so poor that he did not have a metal begging bowl for when he left the temple to beg. He found a rough bamboo basket and covered it with black paper and used that. In that area, there was a man called Master Ta-mei of Tōrin-in. He was a wealthy Chinese monk. He had books, Buddhist implements and gold coins. He was a millionaire, but had a close relationship with Tetsugen. One day, Tetsugen was talking to himself and said, 'I have completed the first half of the woodblocks for the Tripitaka, but my temple is small so there is no room to store them. Master Ta-mei's lodgings are larger and off to the side of the mountain...' Ta-mei heard him muttering through the fence, and said to himself, 'I was born wealthy but my life has no merit. Though Tetsugen is poor, he has undertaken the great merit of printing the Tripitaka. After today, I will give him my temple in exchange for his. After today, I will trade places with Tetsugen.' When Ta-mei's disciples asked him if he were taking his Buddhist images and texts with him, he laughed and said, 'No. I said that we would change places. The little bamboo bowl that Tetsugen had is now mine. When we trade places, not one single treasure or implement will be moved.' One can see that Ta-mei was also a wise and virtuous man, and so he has been mentioned here."

order, and cutting them was strictly forbidden. In order to make them available for use, the official proclaimed a group of the trees dead and ordered them to be cleared. He then donated the wood to Tetsugen. Although the woodblocks are actually cherry, scholars have been unable to confirm this tradition as to the source of the wood.¹⁰⁰ As Satô Fumitsugu points out, there are similar stories told about cherry trees being donated from other regions, so it is possible that Tetsugen received donations of wood from a number of bakufu or provincial officials.¹⁰¹

Tetsugen also received support from monks affiliated with other Buddhist sects. There are two examples that stand out in the sources, although a great number of Buddhist monks and nuns contributed funds and promoted the project in other ways over the years. A Shingon master, Kakugen Jōgon 覚彦浄嚴 (1639-1704),¹⁰² met Tetsugen in Kyoto sometime in 1674 and was deeply impressed by his work. Tetsugen invited him to see the printing operation and gave him a tour of the facilities. Kakugen had long wished to have access to the sutras and had arranged an extended stay in Kyoto for just that purpose. When he saw the progress being made by Tetsugen, he wanted to be of some assistance. Kakugen offered to identify the esoteric sutras so that these could easily be grouped as a subset that would then be circulated among Tendai and Shingon temples. Tetsugen agreed, and Kakugen created an index for the esoteric collection within the Tripitaka.¹⁰³ Kakugen also provided approximately

¹⁰⁰ Shimoda, op.cit., pp. 236-240.

¹⁰¹ Satô Fumitsugu, op.cit., p. 29.

¹⁰² Kakugen was a native of Kawachi province, born into a deeply religious family named Ueda 上田. At the age of ten, in 1648, Kakugen climbed Mount Koya and became a Shingon monk. He was known for his scholarship, especially his knowledge of Sanskrit. His writings include over one hundred titles. He had 436 ordained disciples, and bestowed the precepts on over 15,000 lay believers. In addition, Kakugen founded several temples, including Emmyō-ji 延命寺 in his home village in Nishikibe and Ryōun-ji 霊雲寺 in Edo. Kakugen met Tetsugen during his stay at Ninna-ji in Kyoto in 1674. Kakugen spent a total of three years in Kyoto studying the Buddhist scriptures.

¹⁰³ This is based on a passage from the *Ryōun kaizan Kakugen risshi nempu* 霊雲開山覺彦律師年譜, for the year Empō 2, when Kakugen was thirty-six years old, as quoted in Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 51. According to Yoshinaga's note on p. 52, the index of esoteric sutras can be found in the

ten additional texts that were not included in the original Wan-li edition, which he requested that Tetsugen include in the Obaku-ban in order to complete the esoteric canon.¹⁰⁴ The second example of outside assistance came from a True Pure Land monk named Suiin 遂印 from Hita. Sometime in 1675, shortly after Tetsugen had a serious encounter with True Pure Land believers in Mori,¹⁰⁵ Suiin sent one of his disciples to see Tetsugen to reprimand him for attacking the True Pure Land sect. At that time, Tetsugen's relations with the True Pure Land sect had deteriorated so badly, that he was generally regarded as the sect's sworn enemy. Tetsugen cordially received Suiin's disciple and, in order to defuse a potentially volatile situation, expressed his respect for Suiin's learning. As a result, despite the inauspicious beginning to their interchange, Suiin eventually donated one hundred gold coins for the Tripitaka project.¹⁰⁶

Problems with the True Pure Land Sect

As a former member of the True Pure Land sect and as an outspoken critic of the deterioration in monastic discipline in Japan, Tetsugen engendered opposition and even hatred among his former associates. Many True Pure Land believers understood Tetsugen's vehement rejection of monks marrying and eating meat as point-blank attacks against True Pure Land. On at least two notable occasions True Pure Land believers engaged in direct, public conflicts with Tetsugen at his public lectures. In addition, several True Pure Land authors made Tetsugen a target of scorn in sectarian texts from the period.

The public disputes between Tetsugen and True Pure Land believers arose when True Obakuban daizōkyō engishū 黄蘗版大藏經縁記集.

¹⁰⁴ According to Matsunaga Chikai, Kakugen supplied texts that appeared in the Korean edition of the Tripitaka, and in this way a small portion of the Obaku-ban is based on the Korean Tripitaka; op.cit., pp. 155-157.

¹⁰⁵ See below, pp. 232-236.

¹⁰⁶ Washio, *Nihon zenshūshi no kenkyū*, p. 429.

Pure Land believers attended Tetsugen's lectures and took offense at his interpretation of the Buddhist teachings. At the root of much of the antagonism lay Tetsugen's deep dedication to the *Śūramgama sūtra*. Tetsugen selected this sūtra as his primary teaching text throughout his career as an Ōbaku monk, lecturing on it more often than any other sūtra. Although we have no written records of his sermons on this or any other scripture, we can reconstruct some of the themes he emphasized in lecturing on the sūtra from his other writings. It is useful to first review the events surrounding the two encounters, both of which occurred when Tetsugen was lecturing on the *Śūramgama sūtra*. Unfortunately, in neither case do we have sources from both sides of the dispute that would allow us to compare versions. Descriptions of the first encounter in Edo are preserved only in True Pure Land accounts of events.¹⁰⁷ The second, more violent incident in Mori escalated to the point of requiring government intervention. For this reason, we have Tetsugen's official affidavit and a subsequent letter to the *daimyō* describing that event from his perspective.¹⁰⁸

In the autumn of 1669, after building his new headquarters and setting the carving and printing operations in motion to produce the first ten volumes of the Tripitaka, Tetsugen set off for Edo on the first of many fund raising trips. During his time in Edo, Tetsugen spoke on the *Śūramgama sūtra* at Kaiun-ji 海雲寺 in Asakusa. The official biography observes that his lecture series was an overwhelming success and that donations were generous. What the biography excludes from its account is that Tetsugen debated, at least informally, with a True Pure Land believer in the audience sometime during the lecture series. Tetsugen's choice of text as well as the themes he chose to emphasize from it caused some True Pure Land believers in the audience to conclude that Tetsugen was targeting their sect for ridicule. In

¹⁰⁷ For descriptions of the True Pure Land texts and excerpts from them, see Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 63-86 and Yoshinaga, *op.cit.*, pp. 30-32. None of Tetsugen's writing nor those of his disciples mentions this first encounter in any way.

¹⁰⁸ Tetsugen's official statement is entitled *Mori no hōnan ni kansuru kōjōgaki* 森の法難に関する口上書; Minamoto, *op.cit.*, pp. 287-308. The letter he later wrote to Lord Kurushima is known as *Kurushima kimi ni taisuru kyūmei konseisho* 久留島侯に対する救命懇請書; *ibid.*, pp. 311-317.

particular, True Pure Land believers felt that Tetsugen sought to discredit their sect by stressing the necessity for maintaining the monastic precepts against marrying and eating meat. This confrontation sowed the seeds of a long-lasting controversy between Tetsugen and the True Pure Land sect.

Based on True Pure Land accounts of Tetsugen's lectures at Kaiun-ji, Kûsei 空誓, the head monk at Myôen-ji 妙延寺, a True Pure land temple in Edo, challenged Tetsugen's interpretation of the sutra, but was no match for Tetsugen in debate. "Kûsei exhausted his powers repudiating [Tetsugen's words] and arguing with him, but it was like a praying mantis taking on a chariot of war."¹⁰⁹ True Pure Land believers sent word to Kyôto, requesting that someone better able to defend the sect come to Edo and confront Tetsugen. Sectarian leaders at the head temple sent Chikû 智空, the second director of the reopened True Pure Land institute and a master debater. Like Tetsugen, Chikû had studied under Saigin, and it is possible that the two men knew each other from their youth.¹¹⁰ Chikû arrived in Edo too late, and so did not have the opportunity to debate Tetsugen face to face on this occasion. Chikû had only arrived in the post town of Shinagawa on the outskirts of Edo when Tetsugen was finishing up his lectures. Tetsugen departed immediately to return to Osaka, probably unaware that Chikû was on his way.

Thus the confrontation in Edo concluded without any immediate problems for Tetsugen, but also without any sense of resolution for the True Pure Land believers. What followed is unclear, but it seems that many True Pure Land Believers were so dissatisfied that no live debate had taken place that their anger continued to fester for some time. According to a

¹⁰⁹ *San'yo zuihitsu* 三餘隨筆, as quoted in Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 31. This excerpt is from the 92nd section of the *San'yo zuihitsu* which is a compendium of two hundred questions related to True Pure Land practice. The text was written in three fascicles by the True Pure Land monk Erin 慧琳 (1715-1789).

¹¹⁰ Chikû became Saigin's disciple in 1655, the same year that Tetsugen left Kyoto to join Yin-yûan's assembly in Nagasaki. Yoshinaga gives a short biographical sketch of him, p. 32. Akamatsu says that Tetsugen and Chikû studied under Saigin at the same time and that they were once friends, but I found no primary source to support this claim; *ibid.*, p. 65.

True Pure Land text, the *San'yo zuihitsu* 三餘隨筆 by Erin 慧琳, Chikû initially took up study of the *'Sûramgama sutra* to prepare for his debate with Tetsugen, and then began to lecture on the text himself. He refuted Tetsugen's interpretation of the scripture both in his public lectures and in his writings. The *San'yo zuihitsu* mentions a number of texts that seem to represent an ongoing written debate between Tetsugen and Chikû. While the texts attributed to Chikû are genuine, those attributed to Tetsugen are problematic. The first text attributed to Tetsugen, called *Hashaku hyôhan* 破釋評判, seems never to have existed at all: Obaku scholars have found no copies of the text, nor any external confirmation of its existence. The second book, entitled *Kômorî môdanki* 蝙蝠妄談記, did indeed circulate under Tetsugen's name, but modern scholars consider it to have been a fake.¹¹¹ It appears that the written debate may never have directly involved Tetsugen.

Tetsugen clashed a second time with True Pure Land believers in Kyushu several years later. Tetsugen had returned to his native Kyushu to nurse his father through his final illness in 1674. Tetsugen then remained in Kyushu for several years, probably to fulfill the filial obligations related to his father's death. During that period, he traveled in the region, teaching at various temples and instructing government officials who extended invitations to him. In the winter of 1674, Kurushima Michikiyo 久留島通清 (1629-1700), the *daimyô* of Bungo province, who had known and supported Obaku masters for many years, invited Tetsugen to lecture in the castle town of Mori. Tetsugen repeated his sermons on the *'Sûramgama sutra*

¹¹¹ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 80. It is uncertain whether or not any copies of the *Kômorî môdanki* remain extant. Akamatsu gives lengthy excerpts and a synopsis, *ibid.*, pp. 80-82. According to the preface, the title refers to a passage in the *Nirvana sutra* explaining that bats resemble both birds and rats. By analogy, the *Kômorî môdanki* explains that True Pure Land monks resemble both monks and lay people, since they wear clerical robes like monks, but marry and eat meat like lay people. According to Akamatsu, the text makes five basic charges against True Pure Land monks: 1) They do not understand the Buddha mind, so they teach false delusions and cannot foster true faith within themselves or others; 2) They teach worldly matters rather than the Buddha's teachings; 3) They break the precepts by drinking sake, eating meat and other forbidden foods, and having sexual relations. They then defile the Three Treasures by continuing to wear robes and entering temples like real monks; 4) They slander the virtuous and praise themselves who are without merit; 5) They do not understand the One Vehicle of the True Dharma, so they teach an expedient practice.

at the Kurushima family temple at Anraku-ji 安楽寺¹¹², starting at the beginning of the eleventh month.

Within a few days of the lecture series opening, a group of True Pure Land believers from neighboring villages gathered to decide upon their response. They approached the administrator of temples and shrines, Obayashi Sebei 大林瀬兵衛, and demanded his permission to debate with Tetsugen at Anraku-ji. They claimed that both Tetsugen and Kengan Zen'etsu were evil monks who regularly slandered their sect when reading the *Śūramgama* sutra.¹¹³ No doubt they were familiar with the previous events in Edo, perhaps through Chikū's writings. The administrator confirmed that Tetsugen was indeed reading that scripture, but denied their request to debate on the grounds that Tetsugen was not attacking the True Pure Land sect.¹¹⁴

Tensions did not abate within the True Pure Land community after the initial request for a public debate was refused; the protest spread and several True Pure Land temples in the area became involved, including Senkō-ji 専光寺, Kōrin-ji 光林寺 and Kōtoku-ji 光徳寺 in the city of Mori, and Shōren-ji 照蓮寺 in the nearby town of Hita.¹¹⁵ The believers in Kyushu were in contact with the main temple in Kyoto, and a subsequent request for permission to debate came directly from the sectarian headquarters at Nishi Hongan-ji. Tetsugen quoted

¹¹² The Kurushima family temple was Bodaiji 菩提寺, a subtemple within the Sôtō temple Daitō-san Anraku-ji. The temple no longer exists; it burned to the ground in 1883 and was never reconstructed. For brief histories of the temple see Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 60 and Minamoto, op.cit., p. 352.

¹¹³ It should be noted that Tetsugen first heard the *Śūramgama* sutra read by Kengan and may have based his own lectures on Kengan's interpretation.

¹¹⁴ All information related to the incident in Mori is based on Tetsugen's official affidavit and subsequent correspondence addressed to Lord Kurushima. See note 105 for full references. It is not known how Tetsugen learned about the movements and statements of the True Pure Land believers, but it seems likely that he heard accounts from the temple administrator and other officials involved in the case.

¹¹⁵ For more information on these temples, see Shimoda, op.cit., pp. 139, 147-149, and Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 67.

the administrator's reply,

Since Dharma debates are prohibited by national law, you must not have one. Furthermore, I myself have been able to attend Tetsugen's sermons each day. To date I have not heard him disparage any sect at all. As he said, there are in the [*Sûramgama*] sutra such things as the "three absolutes" which are there for all ears to hear. Therefore, there is no reason to call Tetsugen into doubt. If there are matters in the *Sûramgama sutra* about which you would like to ask, then you may go and ask him one by one. This is the etiquette for *mondô*¹¹⁶ in the Zen sect. If you will follow this procedure, even one thousand of you may question him.¹¹⁷

The protestors were not satisfied with this option; they preferred to challenge Tetsugen en masse. By this time, a large number of believers had assembled at Kôtoku-ji, and they continued to press the administrator to concede to their demands. Finally, the protestors threatened that they would take matters into their own hands, charge Anraku-ji and seize Tetsugen by force.

Once the True Land protestors threatened to use force, the administrator consulted with Tetsugen and the other monks at Anraku-ji. The provincial authorities took the threat of violence seriously, perhaps because True Pure Land believers had a history of violent uprisings in insurrections known as *ikkô ikki* 一向一揆.¹¹⁸ The provincial officials suggested to Tetsugen and the others that they discontinue the lecture series and disperse the monks who had gathered at Anraku-ji to hear it. Although the monks felt that the threat was not serious and the sermons could continue, Tetsugen conceded to the wishes of the authorities and left Mori. He explained in his affidavit that he was concerned that since a crowd had already

¹¹⁶ *Mondô* 問答 are verbal exchanges between master and disciple, often occurring within the formal context of monastic practice. The term would not normally be used to describe a member of an audience asking a question of the speaker.

¹¹⁷ Minamoto, op.cit., p. 293.

¹¹⁸ *Ikkô ikki* uprisings began in the late fifteenth century and continued until Oda Nobunaga successfully asserted his military authority over the True Pure Land sect. There are many studies of these uprisings. See, for example, Kasahara Kazuo, *Ikkô ikki — sono kôdô to shisô* and *Ikkô ikki no kenkyû*, and David L. Davis, "Ikki in Late Medieval Japan". McMullin discusses Oda Nobunaga's campaign against True Pure Land opponents, *Buddhism and the State*, pp. 99-161.

gathered, there was a genuine risk of something happening inadvertently. He believed that if he left, "things would probably quiet down naturally, like a fire going out when there is no more kindling."¹¹⁹ Tetsugen feared that even a small disturbance would necessarily involve the Tokugawa bakufu and would cause Lord Kurushima undue anxiety. Moreover, he believed that an angry exchange of words with the True Pure Land believers would be inappropriate behavior for a Buddhist monk, especially one claiming to preach on the 'Sûramgama sutra. "If I were to make firm distinctions between self and other and argue strenuously over right and wrong despite the fact that I was lecturing on the 'Sûramgama sutra, it would be like striking my mother's face with the Book of Filial Piety...."¹²⁰ If I did not swiftly withdraw, but instead insisted on fighting out of self-conceit, then it would be the same as confronting one delusion with another delusion, or fighting bubbles with bubbles."¹²¹

Tetsugen left before dawn on 1674/11/27, without completing his lectures, less than a month after he had begun the series. In order to insure Tetsugen's safety, the provincial officials sent a military escort of ten soldiers with him as far as the coast. The first portion of the trip out of Mori was over difficult mountain terrain, and Kurushima's retainers wanted to take no risk of Tetsugen being kidnapped. From the port of Kashiranashi, he traveled on by boat to Tsuruzaki accompanied by only two soldiers. Lord Hosokawa had a villa in Tsuruzaki, and Tetsugen stayed there for a time, probably composing his official statement for Lord Kurushima during this visit.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Minamoto, *op.cit.*, pp. 307-308.

¹²⁰ Hsiao ching 孝經 (J. Kōkyō), a Han dynasty (206 BCE-220 CE) text, commonly attributed to Tseng Tzu 曾子, a disciple of Confucius. The text takes the form of a dialogue between Tseng Tzu and Confucius, and presents the view that filial piety is the basis of all morality.

¹²¹ Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 305.

¹²² The affidavit as it appears in the secondary sources was not dated, so it is not completely clear exactly where or when Tetsugen composed it. Within Hōshū's line there was a tradition that Tetsugen was poisoned by some True Pure Land believers while he was staying in Tsuruzaki. According to the tradition, poison was put in Tetsugen's tea and cake and he never fully recovered. For this reason, his descendents never offered tea and bean cakes before his image. There is no

Soon after Tetsugen left Mori, the provincial authorities arrested and imprisoned two True Pure Land monks whom they regarded as ringleaders of the incident. Punishment for disturbing the peace and inciting a riot would normally have been death, but the monks were saved by Tetsugen's intervention on their behalf. Tetsugen and Kurushima had been in contact by post in the weeks following the incident, and Tetsugen had learned of the arrest from Kurushima himself.¹²³ He wrote a letter in response to Kurushima asking that the monks be pardoned and their lives spared. Tetsugen's letter is dated simply the sixth day of the first month, but by its contents it was obviously written in 1675, just over a month after Tetsugen had left Anraku-ji.

[I appreciated] receiving your letters [sent] by messenger. I am overjoyed that your province has grown more and more tranquil, as you indicated in your last letter. The affairs of your humble monk remain unchanged. Last winter when you had invited me to visit you [in Mori], some Ikkō monks said various things, and so I was obliged to return to my home province. Afterwards, [the head monks from] Senkō-ji and Kōrin-ji were arrested and imprisoned. Their behavior was truly unreasonable, and it was understandable that you ordered [their arrest]. However, since what occurred at that time concerned the Dharma, and was distinct from worldly affairs, I would be still more grateful if you would pardon [the head monks of] the two temples and restore them to their former state....

At that time, those [True Pure Land] monks went as far as they did because they did not realize that I was stating directly the admonitions of the Thus Come One. Therefore, the golden words of admonition were suddenly inverted in their ears. In the end, what should have been healing medicine was instead bitter to their tongues. They spread some rumors like ordinary folk or children would. As is often the case, when one dog howls to the heavens, ten thousand dogs pass the message along as true. Without fully grasping the root cause of the matter, a large crowd assembled. As for what came of it in the end, basically no harm was done. Though after it happened, it seemed as though a crime had occurred.¹²⁴

Tetsugen's compassion moved Kurushima, and in his reply of 1/16, he agreed to abide by historical evidence to confirm the tradition. Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 97.

¹²³ Although the text of the letter from Kurushima may not have been preserved, Tetsugen makes direct reference to it in the opening lines of his reply of 1675/1/6; Minamoto, op.cit., p. 311.

¹²⁴ Ibid., pp. 311-312 and 314-315.

Tetsugen's wishes.¹²⁵ The Mori incident was thus resolved without any injury or subsequent penalties. There are no indications of any other direct encounters between Tetsugen and True Pure Land believers.

Scholars do not agree whether or not Tetsugen intentionally or directly attacked True Pure Land practice and belief in his lectures in Edo and Mori.¹²⁶ We can only be certain that True Pure Land believers perceived an attack. Whether Tetsugen intentionally provoked the True Pure Land believers is impossible to determine from the sources. Descriptions of Tetsugen's encounter with Kûsei suggest that Tetsugen overwhelmed his opponent with the force of his argument when challenged. Tetsugen was known for his rhetorical skills, so it would be no surprise if he had proven himself a formidable opponent in debate. We simply have no details of the exchange upon which to base a judgment. According to Tetsugen's own account of the second incident, the True Pure Land believers misunderstood his intentions because he was lecturing on the 'Sûramgama sutra. "When they heard I was reading this sort of thing, they thought I was slandering the Ikkô sect. On the contrary, I was not disparaging them at all. This is just the way the Buddha transmitted his precepts." In this case it is clear that he withdrew in order to avoid any inappropriate fighting within the Buddhist sangha and to prevent even the possibility of violence. As Minamoto observes, regardless of Tetsugen's attitude and intentions, the images and themes in the 'Sûramgama sutra alone could have incensed his opponents.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ The text of Kurushima's letter is given in Yoshinaga, *op.cit.*, pp. 72-3.

¹²⁶ Washio takes the strongest position in maintaining that Tetsugen intentionally attacked True Pure Land, seeming to accept the True Pure Land accounts of events uncritically; "Tetsugen zenji no shinshû kôgeki", pp. 426-429. Akamatsu argues that Tetsugen taught out of compassion, not intending to attack True Pure Land, and that he did not seek controversy; *Tetsugen*, pp. 67-68, 82 and 92. Minamoto takes an intermediate position, suggesting that Tetsugen had demonstrated an eagerness to fight in the Edo encounter, but that he had matured by 1674 and had taken a more appropriate attitude of restraint and compassion at the time of the later incident in Mori; *op.cit.*, p. 143.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

Based upon Tetsugen's own description of his sermons on the *Āṣṡramgama sūtra* included in his affidavit, we find which themes Tetsugen drew from the sūtra that proved most offensive to the True Pure Land believers. We learn, for example, that Tetsugen paid close attention to the sūtra's discussion of the "three absolutes" (*sanjō* 三定) of Buddhist practice, namely, the precepts, meditation and wisdom (*śīla*, *dhyāna*, and *prajñā*).¹²⁸

First of all, I lecture on what is called the Three Absolutes (*sanjō* 三定) in the *Āṣṡramgama sūtra*; that is, what [the Buddha] explained about the good and the evil of the False Dharma and the True Dharma in the Final Age. Practicing without keeping the precepts taught by the Buddha is the False Dharma. Therefore, although practices like the *nembutsu*, *zazen*, and recitation of the sūtras are naturally undertaken differently depending on the ability of each believer, precepts against killing, stealing, sexual misconduct, and lying are called "absolute" (*kettei* 決定) because no matter what one's sect, they are determined and must be preserved.¹²⁹

In the sections that follow, Tetsugen considered the consequences of breaking the precepts enumerated above. In doing so, Tetsugen's words parallel those found in the sūtra so closely, that Tetsugen was doing little more than rendering the original text in simple Japanese. Tetsugen is no more adamant nor definitive than the sūtra itself in stressing the necessity for keeping the precepts as the basis of Buddhist practice.

Following the fundamental approach of the *Āṣṡramgama sūtra*, Tetsugen stressed the necessity for all Buddhists to keep the Buddhist precepts as the first step in their progress along the path to enlightenment. By doing so, he rejected the common belief prevalent at the time that in the final age of the Dharma (*mappō* 末法) keeping the precepts had become impossible and even detrimental to the believer.¹³⁰ It was perhaps Tetsugen's identity as a

¹²⁸ T. 19, p. 131c. "The buddha said: 'Ānanda, you have always heard me teach about the discipline (*vinaya*) which consists in the practice of three decisive steps, the control of mind, called *śīla* which leads to stillness (*dhyāna*) and thence to wisdom (*prajñā*). This is called the threefold study of the supramundane way.'" Translation by Charles Luk, *The Śūrangama Sūtra (Leng Yen Ching)*, pp. 151-152.

¹²⁹ Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 288.

¹³⁰ According to Pure Land teachings in Japan, not only had the practice of Buddhist morality from earlier ages become impossible during *Mappō*, but it endangered the believer's salvation by

former True Pure Land believer more than anything else that led his opponents to see his sermons as direct attacks on their sect. Tetsugen had, it would seem, taken the words of the sutra to heart in his own life; he had left the one sect that permitted and encouraged married clergy and turned to Obaku Zen which emphasized strictly maintaining the precepts.

Tetsugen's preaching on the *Śūramgama sutra* caused animosity within other quarters of the True Pure Land sect. For example, the monk Gekkan who had opposed Tetsugen's master Saigin years earlier¹³¹ came to despise Tetsugen as well. Gekkan longed to debate Tetsugen and refute the charges he had supposedly made against the True Pure Land sect. Since Gekkan was old and frail, nothing ever came of this desire, and Tetsugen himself probably never learned of it. However, Gekkan had expressed his feelings to his disciples, and his biographer later described them in the *nempu* entry for 1674, the final year of Gekkan's life.¹³² The biographer, one of Gekkan's disciples, presents a strange, almost pitiful scene of a man obsessed with scorn to the very end of his days, but the story reflects the depth of emotion that Tetsugen's teachings could provoke within True Pure Land believers.

[Gekkan's] letter arrived in Kyoto on the tenth day of the eighth month [of 1674]. It seems that he had taken up his brush to write due to his illness. His letter said: "At the present time, they say that Tetsugen has come down to Zenjō-ji and is lecturing on the *Śūramgama sutra*. That Dharma teacher [Tetsugen] was a disciple of Saigin and studied the teachings of our sect. However, he has forgotten the great debt of gratitude owed to our founder [Shinran] and has gone over to the Zen sect. When he reads the *Śūramgama sutra*, he slanders our sect's practice of marrying and eating meat using the "three absolutes" [mentioned in it]. He has slandered the Ikko sect in Osaka and Edo, and there has never been as evil a monk as he, past or present. He is the sworn enemy of the True Pure Land sect. With each year that passes, I think about subduing and putting Tetsugen down. Right now I would like to take the gold chain I have

Amida Buddha. This was true because following the precepts implied a reliance on one's own ability rather than absolute reliance on the power of Amida's vow. See discussions of Shinran's teachings related to morality and self-power in Ueda and Hirota, *Shinran: An Introduction to His Thought*, pp. 152-163 and Bloom, *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*, pp. 42-44.

¹³¹ See pp. 197-199 for a description of the dispute between Gekkan and Saigin.

¹³² According to Akamatsu, the full name of the biography was *Enjuji kaiki Gekkan daitoku nempu ryakuden* 延壽寺開基月感大徳年譜略傳, and it was written in 1674 shortly after Gekkan's death; *Tetsugen*, p. 88.

in my hand, ram it into his mouth and shut it for good. I have heard that there is a book called *Ryôgon hashaku* 楞嚴破釋¹³³ [circulating] in Kyoto, and that this book refutes the lectures of this Dharma teacher. Please send a copy of it to me by express post. Take care to send it quickly as I instructed last year, and read it after my death. I am gravely ill and believe I will pass away soon, so please try to do as I asked."

After reading the letter, I [the biographer] searched in all the book shops in Kyoto, but since it was published in Edo, there wasn't even one copy. I was also terribly ill and unable to go down to see him.... Meanwhile, (he died on the fifth day of the ninth month) and we gathered at the main temple to hold his memorial service on the twentieth day of the tenth month....

Now until his death, the master thought about Tetsugen's wickedness and his own desire to crush him. Day and night he never forgot about achieving his long-cherished goal of debating with Tetsugen. Therefore, he read the 'Sûramgama sutra from beginning to end and searched through the scriptures at great length. He carefully researched the three types of demons that are mentioned in the section on the "three absolutes". He determined definitively that they all refer to the Zen monk's own line and never afflicted the Nembutsu sect at all. He waited for a chance [to debate Tetsugen] when he came down to his province, but after that, he never came.¹³⁴

It would appear that Gekkan's hatred was motivated as much by Tetsugen's defection from the True Pure Land sect as by his actual lectures, which Gekkan never heard in person. Gekkan had no doubt heard accounts of Tetsugen's lectures in Edo and Osaka, but by the time Tetsugen returned to Kyushu in 1674, Gekkan lay on his deathbed and could neither attend the lectures nor challenge Tetsugen to debate.

Gekkan's biographer appended a story purported to be a description of Tetsugen's own death. In this story, Tetsugen was handing out amulets to protect believers from sickness at a time when the Osaka region was suffering a terrible epidemic. After handing out some ten-thousand amulets over a period of three days at Tetsugen-ji, Tetsugen himself fell ill with the fever. His disciples then held a service to pray for Tetsugen's recovery. When people learned the purpose of the service, they scoffed at Tetsugen who could not even protect

¹³³ The *Ryôgon kôdan hashaku* 楞嚴講談破釋 is one of the texts attributed to Chikû in the *San'yo zuihitsu*. Chikû wrote the book to refute Tetsugen's lectures on the Suramgama sutra, although it is said that he did so without directly mentioning Tetsugen by name; *ibid.*, p. 82.

¹³⁴ *Gekkan nempu*, the entry for 1674, as quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 88-90; Yoshinaga, *op.cit.*, pp. 55-57; and Shimoda, *op.cit.*, pp. 99-100. The quotations are all virtually identical, although Akamatsu provides a lengthier passage.

himself from the fever. The account concludes, "At that time, the Dharma teacher [Tetsugen]'s whole life was devoid of merit. This was his retribution for wickedly attacking the True Pure Land sect and slandering it with his venomous words. Afterwards... I heard that Tetsugen died of the fever in the end. How pitiful! It is said that not knowing one's debt of gratitude is the seed of [falling into] *avici* hell. His exceedingly violent death is truly a clear [example] of this Buddhist teaching."¹³⁵ Although this story bears some vague resemblance to the actual events leading up to Tetsugen's death, there are significant problems with identifying it as such.¹³⁶ Tetsugen did die of a disease probably contracted while working among the common people in Osaka during a famine, but he was lecturing and feeding the people at that time, not handing out amulets against disease. However, more important than the story's historicity is the True Pure Land attitude of contempt for Tetsugen that it exemplifies.

One final example of the True Pure Land response to Tetsugen's work shows a more sophisticated approach to criticizing Tetsugen, a Buddhist master widely respected for his high moral character. In the *San'yo zuihitsu*, Erin pointed out with some amusement that although Tetsugen criticized the True Pure Land sect for breaking the basic precepts against monks marrying and eating meat, he himself was not above reproach when it came to upholding the precepts. In the course of producing and then distributing his edition of the Tripitaka, Tetsugen opened a bookstore at his Zen temple and squabbled over the profits. He thus could not possibly have avoided breaking the precepts against monks handling money. Therefore, Tetsugen's criticism of True Pure Land was rather like the pot calling the kettle black. Erin concluded that Tetsugen's greatest error was in failing to properly grasp and explain the True Pure Land understanding of Buddhist practice in the three ages of the

¹³⁵ *Gekkan nempu*, as quoted in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 89.

¹³⁶ Akamatsu rejects the story as false, arguing that it was recorded in 1674, several years before Tetsugen's death, *ibid.*, p. 89.

Dharma.¹³⁷

Mu-an's Dharma Heir

Sometime after the incident in Mori, probably early in the year 1676, Tetsugen returned to the Kyoto area. At that time, he paid a visit on his master Mu-an at Mampuku-ji and received Mu-an's *inka*. The official sectarian lineage charts indicate that Tetsugen became Mu-an's Dharma heir in the spring of 1676, and there has never been any question within the sect of the validity of that transmission. However, from very early on, a cloud of uncertainty has hung over the event. The first indication of doubt in the written source material appeared in a text published some years after Tetsugen's death, in 1702. The *Zen'aku jamyâron* 善悪邪命論, written by one of Tetsugen's own disciples, raised questions about the depth of Tetsugen's enlightenment experience and the nature of his Dharma reception. This in turn opened up a range of questions concerning such issues as Mu-an's motivations for conferring *inka* or Tetsugen's attitude toward carrying on the Dharma line. These questions influenced Hôshû's portrait of Tetsugen in the official biography and persist in the modern literature. Before introducing these issues, it is helpful to review the primary literature describing the *mondô* between Tetsugen and Mu-an at which time the Dharma transmission occurred.

The occasion of Dharma transmission is perhaps the most essential exchange between master and disciple, and one would normally expect a detailed description of it to appear in an official biography of a Zen master. However, Tetsugen's biographer was strangely reticent about providing such details. The passage from the *Gyôjitsu* says simply, "At the time of [Tetsugen and Mu-an's] *mondô*, their understanding of the *kôan* was in perfect agreement, and for the first time [Tetsugen] received the seal of the [Buddha] mind (*shin'in* 心印)."¹³⁸

¹³⁷ As quoted in Akamatsu, *ibid.*, pp. 75-76.

¹³⁸ Minamoto, *op.cit.*, pp. 370 and 353. The term *shin'in* is an abbreviation for *bushin'in* 佛心印

Other texts, including Mu-an's recorded sayings and Kao-ch'üan's introduction to the *Yuiroku*, provide additional details about the meeting and from these we can piece together a fuller description. Kao-ch'üan wrote, "One day, [Tetsugen] entered Master Mu-an's room. During their *mondô*, the master joyfully bestowed his seal, saying, "Henceforth I shall call you the monk who lectures on the sutras."¹³⁹ By far the most detailed account comes from Mu-an's recorded sayings which provides the gist of their conversation:

When Tetsugen *Chizô* 知藏¹⁴⁰ returned from Higo, he paid his respects [to Master Mu-an] at the main temple and said, "I wish to lecture on the Lotus Sutra and so repay my debt of gratitude [to my father]." ¹⁴¹ The master held up his whisk and said, "You wish to lecture on the Lotus Sutra. In the sutra there is [the verse], 'Do not depart from the four comfortable actions (*shianrakugyô* 四安樂行)."¹⁴² Do you understand this?" Tetsugen said, "I understand." The master said, "What do you understand?" Tetsugen replied, "Going, coming, sitting and lying down are not separate from this." The master said, "Try another verse." Tetsugen gave a shout (*katsu* 喝). The master said, "Henceforth I shall call you the monk who lectures on the sutras." Then he held up his whisk, and presented it to Tetsugen saying, "Here is my whisk." Tetsugen bowed once more.¹⁴³

As is often the case in the Zen sect, the bestowal of the master's whisk during an exchange symbolizes the transmission of the Dharma from master to disciple. From that time forward, which indicates Dharma transmission from master to disciple.

¹³⁹ *Yuiroku*, Kao-ch'üan's introduction, p. 3b.

¹⁴⁰ *Chizô* is an official title for the monk within a Zen monastery who has been put in charge of the temple's library. Mu-an gave Tetsugen this position in 1671 when Tetsugen accompanied him to Edo for the official founding of Shiun-zan Zuishô-ji 紫雲山瑞聖寺, the headquarters for Obaku in the capital.

¹⁴¹ According to the official biography, starting in the fourth month of 1676, Tetsugen did give lectures on the Lotus Sutra at Zuiryû-ji to commemorate the anniversary of his father's death.

¹⁴² Mu-an is probably referring to the verse 若菩薩摩訶薩於後惡世欲說是經當安住四法 (T.9, p. 37a) which immediately precedes the Buddha's lengthy discussion on the so-called "four comfortable conducts" in the fourteenth chapter of the Lotus sutra. Hurvitz translates the verse, "If in the latter evil age a bodhisattva-mahāsattva wishes to preach this scripture, he must dwell securely in four dharmas" (Translation from Hurvitz, *The Lotus Sûtra*, p. 208.) The four comfortable conducts are: 1) to keep away from the wrong people; 2) to understand that all dharmas are empty and exist only as a result of co-dependent origination; 3) to preach the Dharma consistently; and 4) to preach the *Lotus sutra* only when the time is ripe.

¹⁴³ *Mokuan goroku*, as quoted by Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 80.

Tetsugen was a fully qualified Zen master, free to transmit the Dharma to any of his disciples whom he deemed fit.

The above *mondô* and an earlier example recorded in the official biography suggest that Mu-an drew his devices for Tetsugen from the same sutras that Tetsugen lectured on in public. This would be in keeping with the general Obaku preference to draw *kôan* from the immediate context of the disciple's life rather than relying predominantly on traditional *kôan* collections. In the earlier case, dated late in 1669 or early in 1670, soon after Tetsugen returned from his first lecture series in Edo, Mu-an questioned him about his understanding of the 'Sûramgama sutra. On that occasion, Mu-an indicated that Tetsugen's understanding was still dualistic (*Nao kore ryôken ryôshin* 猶是兩見兩心); although he accepted Tetsugen's subsequent verse, he did not acknowledge any enlightenment experience. This was not the case in the later exchange. Based on all three versions of Tetsugen's receiving *inka* quoted above, Mu-an appears to have had no such impression of Tetsugen's response. Although Tetsugen does not seem to have composed an enlightenment verse at the time, Mu-an's action clearly indicated confirmation of Tetsugen's understanding. With the possible exception of Mu-an's comment about "the monk who lectures on the sutras", there is nothing especially unusual about the exchange in relation to other accounts of monks receiving *inka*.¹⁴⁴

There would perhaps have been no further discussion of Tetsugen's inheritance of the Dharma had his disciple Tangen Genshu 端愿元珠 (b. 1644) not called the matter into question. Tangen wrote that Tetsugen had resolved before he died that he would not transmit his Dharma to any of his disciples, even though he conceded that some of them were advanced enough to be designated as Zen masters. Tetsugen reportedly based his decision on his own misgivings concerning his inheritance of the Dharma; according to Tangen, Tetsugen expressed deep regret that he had received Mu-an's *inka*, and he did not wish to contribute

¹⁴⁴ Nakamura Shusei 中村秀晴 has collected relevant passages describing Mu-an bestowing *inka* on all of his disciples, "Mokuan zenji to sono wasô shihôsha".

to the debasement of a Dharma line of worthy masters by continuing the line himself. According to Tange, Tetsugen had been so preoccupied with lecturing and printing the Tripitaka throughout his life, that he had not taken the time to practice Zen diligently. For this reason, he never fully attained enlightenment and his understanding remained inadequate. Although he was held in high esteem by others, he knew his own failings and therefore chose to die without an heir.¹⁴⁵ A detailed comparison of Tange's remarks with the version of Tetsugen's final instructions found in the official biography will be taken up later in the context of discussing Tetsugen's death. At this juncture, Tange's remarks are relevant primarily because of the debates they have generated among modern scholars.

Akamatsu initiated a dispute among modern scholars over whether or not Tetsugen was truly enlightened when he took issue with Tange's claims.¹⁴⁶ Minamoto took an opposing stand, arguing that Tetsugen was not truly enlightened. Minamoto accepted Tange's version of events as reasonably reliable, and then drew upon various other source materials, including Tetsugen's poetry, letters, and the account of his *mondô* with Mu-an, to further bolster the case against enlightenment.¹⁴⁷ Schwaller likewise participated in the debate, and, based on his reading of the *mondô*, concluded that Tetsugen was not an enlightened Zen master.¹⁴⁸ In seeking to determine whether or not Tetsugen had attained enlightenment, Akamatsu, Minamoto and Schwaller have stepped beyond the bounds of historical research and their arguments will not be presented in detail here. Historical methods cannot be used to establish or discredit the validity of an experience which is understood within the tradition to be trans-historical. Furthermore, within the context of Zen practice, such a determination of

¹⁴⁵ *Zen'aku jamyôron*, as quoted in Yoshinaga, op.cit., p.133 and Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 347. Akamatsu gives a more extensive passage in this case.

¹⁴⁶ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 349.

¹⁴⁷ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 162-163.

¹⁴⁸ Schwaller, op.cit., p. 55.

enlightenment can only be made by a master in a face to face encounter with a disciple.

The Monk Who Lectures on the Sutras

Setting aside the issue of enlightenment, discussions generated by Tangen's writing have also touched upon interpretations of Mu-an's attitude toward Tetsugen, relying on close readings of the historical texts. Tangen did not seem to have directly questioned Mu-an's motivations for conferring *inka* on Tetsugen, but modern scholars have moved the discussion in that direction. Akamatsu based his argument against Tangen on the validity of Mu-an's *inka* which in his view could not be challenged. The underlying theme of Minamoto and Schwaller's argument concerning Tetsugen's enlightenment is precisely to attack Mu-an's transmission of the Dharma to Tetsugen. Neither scholar believes that Mu-an could have transmitted his Dharma to Tetsugen solely based on the answers he reportedly gave in the *mondô*. Minamoto harshly criticizes Mu-an in his assessment of the situation, maintaining that Mu-an did not fulfill his obligation toward Tetsugen as his Zen master. Minamoto suggests that Mu-an was feeling pressured to reward Tetsugen for his remarkable success with printing the Tripitaka and that Tetsugen, in turn, accepted the whisk only as an expedient means to further the project.¹⁴⁹ Minamoto believes that this apparent act of kindness actually robbed Tetsugen of any real chance to attain enlightenment and become a genuine Dharma heir.¹⁵⁰

Both Minamoto and Dieter Schwaller have argued that Mu-an's true attitude toward Tetsugen comes through in the short passage describing their *mondô*. They assert that the title Mu-an gave Tetsugen, "the monk who lectures on the sutras", was in fact a form of

¹⁴⁹ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 162-163. Minamoto bases this argument on a quotation he attributes to Mujaku Dôchu which says that Tetsugen at first refused the whisk and only accepted it for the sake of the project. I have been unable to find this quotation in Mujaku's writings. It does not appear in the original version of the *Obaku geki*, though it may have been added to a later copy.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 147.

criticism which demonstrated Mu-an's scorn for Tetsugen's understanding.¹⁵¹ Swaller suggests that these words lessened the value of the *inka* by indicating that Tetsugen's answers were still too bookish.¹⁵² Admittedly, the title does sound somewhat strange in a Zen context, since Zen stresses transmission of the Dharma from mind to mind without the reliance on words. One could argue that the term represented a criticism of Tetsugen to the effect that he promoted "wordy Zen" which was more concerned with intellectual understanding of the sutras than direct experience. On the other hand, the words may have been spoken with kinder intent, sincerely meant as praise for Tetsugen's abilities as a preacher. The Ōbaku tradition did take a very positive attitude toward the scriptures, and the entire sect supported Tetsugen's efforts to make the Tripitaka readily available in Japan. Tetsugen held an unusual place within Ōbaku and within Japanese Buddhism as a whole because of his great undertaking. Moreover, if the words had suggested an element of scorn at the time, it seems unlikely that Kao-ch'üan would have repeated them in his introduction to the *Yuiroku*, which was meant to praise the master.¹⁵³ In any case, we cannot now determine conclusively based on the written account alone how the words were intended or interpreted at the time.

Lecturing on the sutras did not, in fact, distinguish Tetsugen from other Japanese Zen masters. As observed earlier, Tetsugen had learned some of his lecturing skills from the Rinzai monk Kengan Zen'etsu who held public lecture series on the 'Sûramgama sutra at his home temple. It was not uncommon for abbots at large Zen temples to commemorate a special event by holding a public lecture series on a particular sutra or to invite a visiting

¹⁵¹ It is interesting to note that at one point Akamatsu dated this remark to an earlier period in Tetsugen's life, including it in his discussion of the mondô from late 1669 or early 1670 immediately after Tetsugen's return from Edo; *Tetsugen zenji*, p. 75. While this may indicate that Akamatsu also found the remark disparaging, he makes no explicit comment about its meaning. In his later, more scholarly text, he dates the remark to 1676 when Tetsugen received *inka*; *Tetsugen*, p. 47.

¹⁵² Minamoto, *op.cit.*, p. 162; Swaller, *op.cit.*, p. 54-55.

¹⁵³ Kao-ch'üan states that Mu-an spoke these words "joyfully" (*kinzen* 訖然), an attitude in keeping with the bestowal of *inka*. Although Kao-ch'üan was not present to hear the words spoken, his assessment is at least as valid as scholars writing today.

master to do so. Such lectures were intended to promote Buddhism among the populace as well as to educate other Buddhist monks and nuns. The Chinese masters at Mampuku-ji did not, to my knowledge, ever hold such a lecture series, but this was probably due to the practical limitations of their Japanese language ability rather than any philosophical stance. What was somewhat unusual in Tetsugen's case was that he held lectures long before he had attained the status of master. However, as seen in his meeting with Mu-an in 1676, Tetsugen sought and received explicit permission to do so from his master at least on some occasions. It is also likely that his methods for raising funds were approved in a general way by Yin-yüan and Mu-an at the beginning of the project.

Completion of the Tripitaka Project

After twelve years of steady work, Tetsugen's team of assistants finally completed the actual carving of the woodblocks for the Tripitaka sometime in 1680. In the end, there were a total of 6,956 bound volumes, with over 60,000 individual blocks.¹⁵⁴ In anticipation of its completion, Tetsugen ordered an advance copy of the Tripitaka (approximately the first 6,930 volumes) be prepared for the retired emperor Gomizunoo in the fall of 1678. Tetsugen composed a short dedication for the emperor in ornate Chinese, the *Shin shinkoku daizôkyô hyô* 進新刻大藏經表, dated 1678/7/17, and attached it to the prepared volumes.¹⁵⁵ Tetsugen then presented this first woodblock copy of a Tripitaka printed in Japan to the emperor. According to the official biography, the emperor received the volumes with great pleasure and praised the quality of the workmanship and the magnitude of Tetsugen's accomplishment.

"The volumes of the Tripitaka are as numerous as this, and yet they were well printed. One

¹⁵⁴ Each woodblock has four pages of text, two pages carved onto each face. The blocks are about thirty-two inches by ten inches and three quarters of an inch thick. According to literature distributed at Hôzô-in, it takes a team of five expert printers to print and bind an entire set.

¹⁵⁵ *Yuiroku*, vol. 2 下, pp. 29a-30b. Akamatsu provides a *yomi kudashi* with annotations in *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, pp. 55-61.

must regard [Tetsugen's] resolve as firm and sincere. Truly he is a meritorious servant of the Buddhist teachings and will reap good fortune in his future life. Such distinguished service to the court is unprecedented."¹⁵⁶ Gomizunoo eventually dedicated his copy of the Obaku-ban to Shōmyō-ji, the temple dearest to him.

By 1681, four more complete editions were ready for presentation. Tetsugen dedicated the second copy to Ishō-ji 威照寺 in Ise as an offering to the *kami* Amaterasu. The third was intended for the Tokugawa bakufu, although Tetsugen was never able to present it himself. He gave the fourth copy to Lord Hosokawa, *daimyō* of Higo, to repay his kindness over the years. Finally, Tetsugen dedicated the fifth copy to Yin-yūan at Obaku-san Mampuku-ji. Tetsugen's assistants kept a register, known as the *Daizōkyō shōkyō sōchō* 大藏經請去總牒, in which were recorded the destinations by province and temple of the first four hundred complete editions and the partial printings made during the same period. The register basically covers the years when Tetsugen and his disciple Hōshū were alive and managing the operation.¹⁵⁷ Later generations kept similar records, and the officials at Hōzō-in today estimate that something over two thousand complete or partial editions were produced during the two hundred year history of the Obaku-ban.

Tetsugen proceeded to Edo in 1680 in order to officially present his edition of the Tripitaka to the Tokugawa bakufu. Just as he had done for the emperor, Tetsugen composed a memorial essay in Chinese for the shogun, the *Jō daizōkyō so* 上大藏經疏, which he planned to attach to the shogun's copy. Because he was awaiting permission to present the volumes, Tetsugen dated the essay only with the year, 1681, leaving the month and date blank. But although Tetsugen remained in Edo throughout the entire year, his petition was not accepted. Obaku scholars theorize that the bakufu may have hesitated over his request

¹⁵⁶ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 371 and 354.

¹⁵⁷ The entire text of the *Daizōkyō shōkyō sōchō* is reproduced in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, pp. 247-271. The first five dedicated volumes are listed separately at the beginning. The listing then proceeds province by province.

because they had funded the Tenkai edition just a few decades earlier, but the actual reasons for the delay are unknown. Scholars maintain that Tetsugen's manner of address in the two memorials showed far greater respect for the emperor than for the shogun.¹⁵⁸ Akamatsu suggests that this relative disrespect for the shogun may have contributed to the delay, but it is unclear how or when the bakufu would have seen the memorial addressed to the emperor. In any case, Tetsugen left Edo for the last time early in 1682 without completing his mission. After his death, his disciple Hôshû took it upon himself to complete his master's task, but he too failed on his first attempt. The bakufu finally accepted its copy of the Obaku-ban in 1690.

Tetsugen's Social Welfare Activities

Throughout his career, Tetsugen performed a variety of services for lay believers, some of which can only be described as social welfare activities. Buddhism encourages two distinct patterns of service: lay believers should provide compassionately for the physical needs of their neighbors as a natural outgrowth of their own religious practice, while Buddhist monks should serve the religious needs of other sentient beings. Within Buddhist societies, this typically leads to relationships of mutual aid between lay Buddhists and members of the monastic community, in which the laity supplies the monks with food, clothing and other essentials, and monks reciprocate by teaching the people. By the very act of accepting lay donations, monks offer believers the opportunity to build merit, an important element of lay Buddhist practice. Tetsugen fulfilled the more conventional monastic functions vis-à-vis lay believers by instructing individuals through private meetings and Dharma lessons (*hōgo* 法語), lecturing in public, and providing lay people with the possibility of participating in the

¹⁵⁸ Several scholars make mention of this, including Shimoda, op.cit., p. 248, Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 275, and Minamoto, op.cit., p. 149. In examining the documents, one finds that in his memorial to the emperor, Tetsugen used the expression 臣僧道光誠惶誠恐 *Shinsō Dōkō seikō seikyō tsutsunde* (submitted with sincere fear and reverence by the loyal monk Dōkō), while in his memorial to the shogun he used 沙門鐵眼恐惶 *Shamon Tetsugen kyōkō tsutsunde* (submitted with fear and reverence by the monk Tetsugen). The former does appear to be more formal.

meritorious project of printing the scriptures.

By virtue of their religious merit, Buddhist monks had other capabilities to serve the lay community. They regularly performed the memorial services for the deceased, and were sometimes called upon to help the sick or those possessed by spirits through prayers of intercession. In one notable example, described in the official biography, Tetsugen relieved the suffering of a deceased woman whose vengeful spirit had possessed a relative.¹⁵⁹ Of course, such activities can still be understood as meeting the religious needs of others. However, Buddhists did not necessarily draw the somewhat artificial distinction between physical and religious needs. In extraordinary situations, the monastic community might well have provided other sorts of services based upon its members' technical expertise in non-religious fields, their ability to harness broad social support for a project, or their ties to the secular authorities. Japanese monks participated in projects such as building bridges, reclaiming arable land for farming, and other secular activities. Tetsugen likewise sought to alleviate physical suffering, when it was within his power to do so. For example, in 1665, Tetsugen held a ceremony in which he used a *dharani* from the *Śūrngama sūtra* to bring rain during a drought in Kyushu.¹⁶⁰ Specific examples of this type of work mentioned in the biography probably represent numerous events of a similar variety left unmentioned.

In the closing sections of the official biography, Hōshū wrote a short description of his master's accomplishments, praising his intellectual abilities, his deep understanding of Buddhism, his skill as a master with disciples, and his compassion for lay people. In this context, Hōshū lists without details a number of social welfare activities which Tetsugen had carried out.

[Tetsugen] distributed food and clothing to the poor and satisfied each one's desire. He provided medicine for the sick without leaving them alone in their

¹⁵⁹ Minamoto, *op.cit.*, pp. 369 and 348-349.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 368 and 342-343.

homes. When he saw an abandoned child on the road, he would entrust it into someone's care and have him feed and rear the child. When he encountered prisoners on the road, he would petition the authorities to request their release.¹⁶¹

There is no historical data to illustrate how Tetsugen cared for abandoned children, although this task did often fall to Buddhist monks. As for petitioning officials for the pardon of criminals, Hôshû mentioned earlier in the biography that Tetsugen had intervened with the authorities and successfully petitioned to have ten death sentences commuted. Hôshû illustrated this with one outstanding example, which also appears in external sources: A servant in Osaka had falsely accused another of poisoning their master, and the authorities had jailed the accused. Tetsugen appealed for the servant's release, offering to bear the punishment himself if any concrete evidence of the man's guilt were to surface. As a result of Tetsugen's efforts, the authorities pardoned the servant and freed him. External evidence verifies that Tetsugen became involved. He was not universally applauded for doing so. A passage from the *Wakan taiheikôki* 和漢太平廣記 criticizes Tetsugen for his interference in the workings of justice.

Although Buddhism is widely regarded as philanthropic, pardoning terribly evil people is just second guessing Amida. Recently, a monk made it his business to have just such a wicked person pardoned. By doing so, he injured the [workings] of government. If one's sympathy and pity arise from friendship, then that is fine. But when one wishes to pit one's own law against that of the brilliant government, then that must be regarded as a sickness. Last year in Osaka, Settsu [province], there was a case of a servant poisoning his master. At that time the servant, brazenly thinking that he could take everyone in, had his father consult with the monk Tetsugen. Tetsugen did not inquire about the seriousness of the crime, but devised a clever plan and had the death sentence pardoned. What sort of person is this Tetsugen? He is a follower of the Obaku monk Yin-yüan who schemed along with his followers. Doesn't he realize that you can't pardon every criminal? I just heard about this and can't stop thinking about it.¹⁶²

Tetsugen's Work in the Famine of 1681-1682

¹⁶¹ Ibid., pp. 372-373 and 362.

¹⁶² *Wakan taihei kôki*, quoted in Yoshinaga, op.cit., p. 116. The text is otherwise unidentified.

While Tetsugen waited in Edo in 1681 for the bakufu to officially accept his woodblock edition of the Tripitaka, a terrible famine ravaged the entire Osaka /Kyoto region. According to the *Eiran gyôjôki*, Tetsugen heard of the famine in the first month of 1682, and decided to return immediately to Osaka to undertake the direction of a famine relief project. To that end, Tetsugen approached one of the *daimyô* well known to him and borrowed a large sum of money, one thousand *ryô* of gold, before leaving the capital.¹⁶³ He then returned to Zuiryû-ji in great haste, traveling day and night for ten days. He set up a food distribution center at his home temple, and word soon reached the hungry throughout Osaka that they could come there daily for assistance.¹⁶⁴

Our knowledge of Tetsugen's work during the famine is quite detailed thanks to his own dramatic account of it. Within a month of his return to Osaka, Tetsugen could see that the famine was so extensive that his resources would not suffice for long. He wrote a lengthy letter beseeching a wealthy merchant in Edo, Yamazaki Hanzaemon 山崎半右衛門,¹⁶⁵ to donate additional funds.¹⁶⁶ The letter is an invaluable resource of information not only about the famine and Tetsugen's social welfare work, but also as an aid for understanding Tetsugen's attitudes regarding the Buddhist principle of compassion. The following is a translation of the letter in its entirety.

I shall write just a few lines. [I hope that] you are still in good health and have been taking good care of yourself. As I said in my last letter, I reached the Kyoto/Osaka area without any problems along the way. I began distributing alms on the 13th day of the [second] month, and since yesterday, the 21st, I have been lecturing on the *Awakening of Faith*. I am pleased to say that all the arrangements have gone well.

¹⁶³ The identity of the *daimyô* is not given in the *Eiran gyôjôki*, but it was most likely Lord Hosokawa, the lord of Higo who had been very generous to Tetsugen and other Obaku monks.

¹⁶⁴ *Eiran gyôjôki*, as quoted in Shimoda, op.cit., p. 20.

¹⁶⁵ Yamazaki was one of Tetsugen's patrons from the Tripitaka project, but little else is known of him.

¹⁶⁶ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 321-333

Due to the decrease in alms-giving throughout the area, these are troubled times for the beggars. Since we have been distributing alms, we have been able to help many people: on the 13th, about 2,000, on the 14th, 6,000, and since the 15th, 10,000 people [each day]. To date, we have been able to reach more than 20,000 people.

I do not have the resources at hand to continue to meet these tremendous expenses. But, if I were to stop giving alms, they might all die of starvation. So even if I have to sell the temple or chop off my fingers to give them, I must not stop.

People with good intentions [of helping the destitute] are scarce, but we do not lack for scarcity. During this period, we took a break from alms-giving one day because it was raining, and even then the people seemed greatly distressed. There are those who steal the dregs of the *shôchû* and eat it. Rice bran flour is, of course, considered a great delicacy. There are some who take barley, make it into flour, and eat that. Those who cannot even manage this sort of thing are the ones who will die of starvation. I have heard that tenants cry all day and all night that they are starving, so even the landlord class is in trouble. Since I started giving out alms, the [tenants] have not ceased their weeping, and even their landlords are satisfied [that they cannot pay the rent]. I am pleased that charity of this level is helping many people.

However, with such large crowds [coming to the temple for food], even if I were to ladle water from the Yodo River to distribute to them, I could not continue. With the number of people in distress now approaching 20,000, I can see that more than half would starve to death, so neither can I stop. I will certainly try, somehow or other, to continue for another 30 to 50 days. Therefore, since yesterday, I have done my best to give my usual talk to teach the Dharma, but without much success.

Since last year, [my disciples] have been cooking rice gruel and giving out a few *sen*, whatever was appropriate for each individual. Somehow the days have piled up, and with the divine protection of the dragon king, one half to one third [of the people coming to the lectures] could contribute alms. In this way, we have saved a great many people, and now I am asking to borrow a little money from you. If I were to receive 200 *ryô* from you, then I could not only reach Osaka as I have described, but even reach out into Kyoto a little bit. These activities are still recent and I have just begun [preaching] yesterday, so I have not been readily able to extend my reach to Kyoto. However, if I can make something of my work here, I would like to be able to go to Kyoto and help the people there.

If it were somehow possible to have from you the amount of funding you paid towards the Tripitaka, I can tell you that it would be a tremendous help. With just what I have now, even if I have to borrow some money, I won't let things slip in Osaka, but I cannot extend my reach to Kyoto. If I were to distribute alms in Kyoto with my current funds, I don't know that I would have any resources left after five to seven days.

Since this sort of occurrence is rare in one lifetime or even two lifetimes, I ask that you give rise to a great belief in your own Buddha nature and send me funds in the amount of 200 *ryô* as mentioned above. I would like to initially borrow 100 *ryô* from Kisaemon¹⁶⁷ here in Osaka. I'll ask that you send [that amount] to him later. Although I imagine that raising funds will be difficult even

¹⁶⁷ Identity uncertain, although from the context he appears to be an associate or relation of Yamazaki Hanzaemon residing in Osaka.

for you, the situation here is beyond endurance, so I have asked this of you.

Among those who gather here [to receive alms] only one in one hundred is a beggar. The rest are all townsmen or farmers from the rural areas. Last year when we gave out gruel there were three to four thousand, or five to six thousand at the very most. Even then it is said that as many as ten to fifteen dead bodies would turn up each day.

As for the distribution of alms that we do here, handing out small sums of money has been successful. It is even more convenient than the rice gruel, so people who did not participate before do now. The first day we had enough to give something to everyone, and such has been the case until yesterday, the 21st. However, we cannot extend ourselves any more. After today they will receive one *go* of rice. There is no convenient way to distribute it, so we wrap it in thick tissue paper. The monks started yesterday and did not stop; they gathered together and wrapped packets through the night until this morning. They wrapped some thirty bales of rice. Everyone ended up with blisters on their fingertips and laughed that this would make doing anything else difficult. The thirty bales were not nearly enough, but since we couldn't wrap any more, we gave the others five *sen* each and sent them off. Although it was only paper money, it was still a vast amount. I have asked the people to start bringing containers [for the rice] starting tomorrow.

As the situation deteriorates, and I see it before my very eyes, I feel that I must continue doing this at all costs, even if it means chopping off my fingers and breaking my bones to give as alms. It is difficult to explain the situation in words. Some of the people are nearly 70 or 80 years old, but they find it hard to give up their lives, so they [come] leaning on staffs. Others are children of three to five years who are dragged along by the hand by their mothers. Some wear a begging bowl [strapped to their chests]; some wear only straw matting. Some of the sick and the blind have not washed their hands once in a year's time; their hands look as if they have seven or eight layers of lacquer on them. Some haven't eaten in ten days and [their bellies] have become swollen and distended. Others have grown so thin that they are nothing but skin and bones. Truly, it seems that the realm of the hungry ghosts has appeared before my eyes and that these human beings are living in hell. The sight of them clutching what they have received reminds me of Maudgalyāyana's mother who was in the realm of the hungry ghosts grasping at the bowl of rice [her son] had brought her.¹⁶⁸ I have been pushed about by the large crowds; the sound of them crying out reverberates to the heavens, and the shouts of "Give me some! Give me some!" shake the mountains and rivers. The foot traffic on the road is, as they say, more

¹⁶⁸ Maudgalyāyana (J. Mokuren 目連), sometimes called Kolita, was one of the ten great disciples of the Buddha, known for his supernatural powers. It is said that the Obon festival commemorates his efforts to alleviate the suffering of his deceased mother, related in the *Ura bon gyō* 盂蘭盆經, T. 16, no. 685. According to the tradition, Maudgalyāyana used his supernatural powers to search for his mother in hell, who was suffering the fate of a hungry ghost. When he found her, he offered her a bowl of rice, but it burst into flame and she could not eat it. He consulted with the Buddha. The Buddha then established the festival to be held at the end of the summer retreat, on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when those wishing to sooth the hunger of relatives suffering in hell were to offer food to the sangha. The *Ura bon gyō* is believed to have been originally composed in China, although tradition says that it was translated from Sanskrit by Dharmaraksa (法護 J. Hōgo) between 266 and 313.

numerous than the ants visiting Kumano. There are more lice on their bodies than sesame seeds at an oil shop. If we thrust ourselves into the throng a little bit to keep them from pushing, the lice move onto our robes like suspended sesame seeds. When I myself tried to distribute alms, fifty of those lacquered hands grabbed and pulled at my own. Their foul stench striking one's nostrils cannot be described.

Although at first we had two entrances, they rushed at them too hard, so we use four. The speed of the distribution is such that this must be what a *tengu's* nest is like.¹⁶⁹ Even with four entrances, it is still too restricted and they rush the [gates]. Starting tomorrow we will try using six. Originally we had a fence made from bamboo poles and stakes measuring four to five *sun* [5-6 inches] across, but they pushed it over with one shove on the morning of the 15th. Hôshû thought that we should put out the *heikan*¹⁷⁰ until we could get the fence firmly [repaired], and he told some younger monks to do so. On the morning of the 16th, while I was absent, [some people] pushed it down and [crushed] 14 or 15 people who appeared dead. Some of them revived and were given a stimulant to drink and sprinkled with water until they started breathing a little. Then they were fed rice gruel. Although nearly ten of them recovered, the other six or so died. It was pitiful. Just when we thought we had enough money, suddenly a million people were trampling each other to death. How much further can things deteriorate? When I returned, I was shocked [by what had happened], but it couldn't be helped. Since then, the numbers continue to increase, and we have taken various steps. We built fences in several locations; we put up fence posts as big as logs and lashed on large bamboo, about a foot in diameter, sideways just like for water barriers and horse guards. We have made the [entrance] as narrow as possible so that people [must enter] single file. We have used our wits and common sense to keep the people from pushing each other to death. If 50 to 60 of our young monks were to try to hold back the rising tide of people who come each morning and evening to eat, they would probably be trampled and killed by the beggars. I don't think that even 300 or 500 foot soldiers would have been able to prevent it.

Truly this is a case of [too many people] for the blanket to reach. Although in our hearts we are eager to continue, we have not the means at hand.

Even if you could accumulate 1,000 or even 10,000 coins in your storehouse, storing them in your coffers would be pointless. However, if you give alms at a time like this, you will have merit for countless *kaipas* into the future which will become the basis for Buddhahood. Due to hard hearts that are closed up tight and idle, the world is a shameful place where even giving alms to others causes jealous slander. Isn't it a pity that just such people will be born as beggars or fall into the realm of the hungry ghosts?

I ask that, if at all possible, you use your skills to raise the money I have requested. I cannot write more, but I have said only one part in one hundred of

¹⁶⁹ Tengu 天狗 are mythical beings depicted as having human form with wings and extremely long noses, regarded as the guardians of the mountains and forests. Generally speaking, they are portrayed as the enemies of Buddhism, since they kidnap monks and corrupt them. They also are said to kidnap children, usually appearing in the form of a *yamabushi* 山伏 (mountain ascetics). See Blacker, pp. 181-185.

¹⁷⁰ Heikan 閉閑 a marker set out at the gate to indicate that the temple is closed to outsiders or placed by the entrance to a hall to indicate that *zazen* is in progress.

my thoughts.

Yours sincerely, Tetsugen
Dated the 22nd day of the 2nd month

To Yamazaki Hanzaemon and company

Please give my regards to your wife, to Kisaemon and to the people in town. In haste.

Tetsugen's letter is an unusual document for a number of reasons. First, Tetsugen described the suffering that he witnessed in more graphic detail than one would normally expect to find in a Japanese account. Rather than employing the more typical style of suggestion, Tetsugen paints both the suffering and the filth in gruesome detail. One may speculate that he hoped to translate the horrors that he himself had seen so accurately that the images would likewise move his patrons in Edo and motivate them to donate generously. Second, stricken by the urgency of the situation, Tetsugen made direct, even blunt requests for funding. He mentions the specific amount needed no less than three times, twice directly and once with the indirect reference to the amount previously donated for the Tripitaka. Although this directness may not sound strange in translation, it is highly irregular in a Japanese context. It would almost seem that Tetsugen wished his patrons to regard feeding the destitute in such an emergency situation to be analogous to producing the Obaku-ban itself.

In the letter, Tetsugen illustrated his own dedication to saving the destitute with graphic expressions of determination. He expressed his intention to continue even if it meant selling his temple or offering his own flesh and blood as alms. According to the more popular accounts of Tetsugen's social welfare work, he placed the immediate needs of people in distress ahead even of his dedication to printing the scriptures, and used funds intended for the Tripitaka project to feed the poor. While this may not be historically accurate, it does convey the intensity of his commitment. In the end, Tetsugen did, in a sense, offer his life to the cause, dying during the relief efforts before the famine had begun to ease.

As Tetsugen indicated in his letter, he started distributing alms on 1682/2/13, as soon as he reached Zuiryû-ji. He began lecturing on the *Awakening of Faith* on 2/21 in order to

raise additional funds, following the general pattern of lecturing in the morning and then distributing food and money after the noon hour. According to his own estimation, he and his disciples were then feeding 10,000 people each day. This continued for only a week before Tetsugen himself fell ill on 2/29. He continued to lecture as usual for as long as he was able, but his illness soon made that impossible. Within a week he had taken to his bed never to recover. We do not know for how long his disciples continued to feed the hungry, nor do we know how Yamazaki responded to Tetsugen's letter. Tetsugen died in the midst of the famine, at a time when the common people in the region had come to regard him as a sort of living Bodhisattva sent to save them.¹⁷¹ They paid tribute to him by attending his funeral in large numbers. If we are to believe the official biography, more than 100,000 people attended the ceremony on the day of his cremation, and "the sound of their wailing shook the forests."¹⁷²

Tetsugen's Final Instructions and Death

We do not know the nature of Tetsugen's final illness; the official biography provides no description of it at all. Given that Tetsugen and his disciples were working among the poor and destitute, it seems likely that he contracted some disease associated with the famine. Natural disasters and famines were almost always accompanied by epidemics of communicable diseases of various sorts, and Tetsugen and the others came into close physical contact with hundreds of people each day in the process of distributing alms. We know from other accounts that approximately thirty of Tetsugen's one hundred disciples also took ill at about the same time, and that four or five of them died as a result.¹⁷³ Tetsugen grew progressively weaker,

¹⁷¹ According to Hōshū, the people called him *kyūsei no daishi* 救世の大士. Daishi is one of the many epitaphs for a bodhisattva, commonly used for Kannon. Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 371 and 356.

¹⁷² Ibid., pp. 372 and 358-359.

¹⁷³ *Zen'aku jamyōron*, as quoted in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 339-340.

gradually taking less and less food and drink. As the illness grew more grave, he refused the medicines urged on him by doctors, accepting that the illness would be terminal.

On 1682.3.7, Tetsugen summoned his closest disciples to divide his property among them and give them his final instructions as was customary. According to Hôshû, Tetsugen said to them, "My work [in this life] is almost finished. With good fortune, you will prosper through the years. Be careful not to become entangled with worldly affairs. Just continue on the Way with each thought and investigate the Great Matter. A person who does this is my disciple. Printing the Tripitaka is the way to spread the Buddha's wise commands. Therefore, I endured great suffering throughout my life [for its sake], and now it is completed. If you would obey my wishes, then see to it that [the Tripitaka] is transmitted forever."¹⁷⁴ Tetsugen was more concerned that his disciples continue in the ongoing process of printing, binding and distributing the scriptures throughout Japan than that they preserve his own teachings. He did not name a Dharma heir on his deathbed as many masters taken ill so suddenly would. Instead, the Obaku-ban was the only Dharma that Tetsugen transmitted.

On the 22nd day of the same month, Tetsugen wrote a final verse and passed away peacefully. The verse read,

Fifty-three years of falling down seven times and stumbling eight times.
I mistakenly preached about wisdom,
And my sins piled up to the heavens.
Peacefully floating through the sea of the lotus treasury¹⁷⁵,
I tread across the heavens through the waters.

According to Hôshû, Tetsugen fulfilled his own prophecy, made in Edo less than three months previously, that he would die by the end of Spring. The body was cremated on the third day, with many high ranking monks and masses of the common people attending the services.

¹⁷⁴ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 371 and 356-357.

¹⁷⁵ Tetsugen wrote the characters 華藏海 *kezôkai*, literally meaning the sea of the lotus treasury. This expression does not exist in the Buddhist literature, but is reminiscent of the term 華藏界 (an abbreviation for *rengezô sekai* 蓮華藏世界) which has the same pronunciation. The latter term is often used in reference to Amida's Pure Land.

Tetsugen's remains were eventually buried in the Western corner of the grounds at Hôzô-in, expressing his disciples' belief that the master would never forget the Tripitaka.¹⁷⁶

Although Hôshû did not mention Tetsugen's instructions for the continued maintenance of his temples, Tengen, the disciple who later rejected Ōbaku and wrote critically of Tetsugen and Hôshû, explained his understanding of Tetsugen's wishes on that score. Tengen claimed that instead of establishing his lineage by transmitting his Dharma to one or more advanced disciple, thus placing his temples under a Dharma heir's guidance, Tetsugen preferred to set up his eight temples as *heisôji* 平僧寺, that is, temples where no monk has attained the rank of master. According to Tengen's account, Tetsugen decided that he would not transmit his Dharma due to his own sense of unworthiness. Tengen observed,

Throughout his life, [Tetsugen] was, without pause, constantly preoccupied with lecturing and printing the Tripitaka. Although he did this for the sake of the Dharma, his own careful practice and true understanding were deficient, notwithstanding the high reputation and fame of his teaching style. Therefore in his dying verse, he expressed his true feelings with the line, "Fifty-three years of falling down seven times and stumbling eight times".... He said that in the end he could have made Hôshû, Jikai and Unshû his Dharma heirs, but he feared that this would diminish the virtue of previous masters, so he did not.¹⁷⁷

Tetsugen refrained from naming an heir to preserve Mu-an's line from any deterioration from his own shortcomings as a master.

In assessing the relative value of Tengen's observations, there are a number of factors to bear in mind. First, Tengen was a disciple of Tetsugen for many years, having joined him at the time of Tetsugen's first lecture series in Edo in 1669. He had the opportunity to observe firsthand Tetsugen's work and practice over a period of about twelve years. Tengen was present at Zuiryû-ji when Tetsugen lay dying, although he was not a part of Tetsugen's inner circle of disciples. He remained a part of the Zuiryû-ji community for several years after Tetsugen's death. He, therefore, had direct experience on which to base his observations

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 372 and 357-359.

¹⁷⁷ *Zen'aku jamyôron*, as quoted in Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 347.

about Tetsugen and his assembly. On the other hand, Tangen wrote the *Zen'aku jamyôron* explicitly for the purpose of discrediting Hôshû, who emerged as the new leader at Zuiryû-ji. Tangen penned the work sometime after Hôshû had expelled him, and Tangen had permanently broken with Obaku. For this reason, one may assume that his account was heavily biased against Hôshû. While this does not necessarily mean that he fabricated the whole episode of Tetsugen's dying instructions, he would certainly have presented whatever he knew of Hôshû in the worst possible light. Discrediting a monk by disparaging his master would not have been an unusual response. Moreover, Tangen did not claim to have been present when Tetsugen gathered his closest disciples to explain his last wishes; he maintained that Tetsugen only revealed his decision to cut off his Dharma line to his three dearest disciples, including Hôshû. Tangen did not hear Tetsugen's explanation himself, and his version is in direct conflict with Hôshû's, the only eyewitness account recorded. We are therefore faced with balancing the merits of one account written to discredit the leading disciple and his master, and the other written to praise Tetsugen and preserve the reputation of his disciples.

There is, in fact, one letter from Tetsugen addressed to Hôshû which sheds some light on Tetsugen's attitude toward his disciples and the matter of bestowing *inka* on any one of them. Unfortunately, although the letter is a New Year's greeting sent to Zuiryû-ji while Tetsugen was away, it is otherwise undated. The content suggests that at the time of its writing the Tripitaka project was either completed or near completion, and that Tetsugen was already contemplating his approaching death. Therefore, it is possible that he composed it in Edo in 1682, a few months before his passing. However, there is no concrete evidence to definitively establish the date. In the text of the letter, Tetsugen indicated that he was indeed seeking a worthy Dharma heir and, at the same time, expressed some regrets about his own attainments. He lamented in his opening remarks, "My one concern is that my Dharma will decline like a temple in the late autumn. If only I could find one person or even half a person

who possesses the eye of Zen practice."¹⁷⁸ The sentiment expressed here does not suggest dismay with himself or his own unworthiness to transmit the Dharma, but rather a concern for his disciples' progress or lack thereof. Tetsugen indicated that the basic problem with Zen practitioners in his day was that they lacked the quality of selflessness, they "seek only their own enlightenment and spiritual growth, and thereby fall into the dark demon pit [of nihilism]."¹⁷⁹ In Tetsugen's opinion, just the opposite was true of Hôshû whom he regarded as a truly rare individual. In the body of the letter, Tetsugen wrote what amounts to a *hōgo*, or Dharma lesson, encouraging Hôshû to persevere in his practice and take the final and crucial step toward enlightenment. Then in his closing remarks, Tetsugen became self-reflective.

Although I have not yet attained the land of the ancient [masters], still I have not deteriorated into the rut of today's [masters]. My only regret is that the responsibilities for printing the Tripitaka has been heavy and making the books has been complex. I have been pulled by karmic connections and have not attained freedom. Now I am old and for the first time I realize my mistake.

These comments may well have been the basis for Tansen's remarks about Tetsugen's assessment of his own attainments and his regrets about his laxity in Zen practice over the years. However, the letter does not support his contention that Tetsugen had determined not to name a Dharma heir regardless of his disciples' progress.

Tetsugen's Disciples

Most of Tetsugen's disciples stayed on at Zuiryû-ji or Hôzô-in in the years immediately following Tetsugen's death and continued Tetsugen's work as he had wished. There is no indication in any of the sources that Tetsugen explicitly encouraged his disciples to seek the guidance of another Zen master, such as Mu-an. This would have been the normal practice for them, in any case. We know that Hôshû did turn to Mu-an, and that he became Mu-an's

¹⁷⁸ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hōgo*, pp. 85 and 87.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid. pp. 85 and 87.

Dharma heir a few year's later in 1684. This elevated Hôshû in the lineage from Tetsugen's disciple to his Dharma brother, but Hôshû continued to revere Tetsugen throughout his life as his former master. Although Tetsugen could not technically be accepted as the founder of the Zuiryû line, a lineage officially traced back to Mu-an through Hôshû, Hôshû and the others saw to it that Tetsugen was honored nonetheless. Even today, Tetsugen's image is given preeminence over Hôshû's at Hôzô-in. Hôshû took it upon himself to complete Tetsugen's final, unfinished task in the Tripitaka project by officially submitting the Obaku-ban to the bakufu officials in Edo. He also honored his former master by editing the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* and the *Yuiroku*, a short collection of Tetsugen's other writings, in 1691. He later wrote the official biography in 1714 to mark the thirty-third anniversary of Tetsugen's death.

After Hôshû became a Zen master in his own right, he assumed a position of authority as the master at Tetsugen's temples. Hôshû thus effectively changed the temples' status from that of *heisôji* to temples with a designated head monk, an action which some disciples felt contravened Tetsugen's dying wishes. While several of Tetsugen's former disciples, perhaps half of the original number,¹⁸⁰ accepted Hôshû as their master, others left the assembly at this time in protest to the change. It is sometimes assumed that Tangen broke with Hôshû at this time, since he wrote of the dispute later; in fact, he remained within the group for several years, accepting positions of authority at some of Tetsugen's smaller temples. For example, Tangen served for three years as the head monk at Sambô-ji 三宝寺, the temple Tetsugen established in honor of his parents at his family's residence in Kumamoto. Tangen secretly joined the Shingon sect in 1697 and changed his Dharma name at that time to Shinryô Rindô 真亮林堂. As a consequence, Hôshû officially expelled him from the Obaku sect that same year. His reasons for converting to Shingon are not clear. It was after this that Tangen recorded his version of life under Tetsugen and Hôshû in his *Zen'aku jamyôron*,

¹⁸⁰ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 348.

which appeared in 1701.

The Continuation of the Tripitaka Project

Tetsugen's disciples fulfilled their master's final wishes, and the Tripitaka project continued to prosper. Under the guidance of Hôshû, Kyôdô, and later generations of abbots in the Zuiryû line who managed the work at Hôzô-in and the Inbô, a few selective titles were appended to the original set of woodblocks, primarily Obaku sectarian texts including works related to Tetsugen. Printing activities remained in full swing well into the modern era, until the Obaku-ban was superseded by the Taishô edition of the Tripitaka. For two and a half centuries, the Chinese Tripitaka was inevitably associated with the name Tetsugen in Japan. In the modern period, copies of Tetsugen's edition even made their way to Europe and the United States, and were used by Western scholars in early studies of the Buddhist scriptures.¹⁸¹

The original woodblocks have been carefully preserved at Hôzô-in where they are stored in a new structure, specially designed to retard deterioration. Even after generations of steady use, they remain in excellent condition. Printing does continue today on a very limited basis. The temple still employs one craftsman trained in the traditional art of printing and binding who instructs visitors on the history of the woodblocks while demonstrating his craft. He regularly produces a few of the more popular sutras, especially the *Heart sutra*, and fills special orders as they arise. In this way, the temple continues to honor Tetsugen's final command: "Printing the Tripitaka is the way to spread the Buddha's wise commands... See to it that [the Tripitaka] is transmitted forever."¹⁸²

¹⁸¹ Ibid., p. 247.

¹⁸² Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 371 and 356-357.

Chapter Eight

The Teachings of Tetsugen

Tetsugen is known principally as the editor and driving force behind the Obaku edition of the Chinese Tripitaka, and that work must be regarded as his primary contribution to Japanese Buddhism of the early modern period. In addition, Tetsugen is remembered as a Buddhist teacher who strove to convey the principles of Buddhist thought and practice to the common people. By editing the scriptures and making them readily available in Japan, Tetsugen lent concrete support to one of the major scholarly movements of Tokugawa Buddhism, the study of the basic and definitional texts of Buddhism. Tetsugen's life work on the Obaku-ban provided generations of Buddhist scholars access to the most important texts of the Buddhist tradition. However, Tetsugen believed that access to the scriptures was necessary not only to serve the purposes of scholarship, but in order to better serve the needs of lay believers. Tetsugen stressed the responsibility of Buddhist monks, as the educated elite within Buddhism, to convey their knowledge to others. During his lifetime, Tetsugen touched scores of lay believers throughout the country with the lectures he gave on fund raising tours. After his death, he continued to have some influence through a small corpus of his written works which were published and circulated. These texts were prepared by his disciples, and portions were appended to the Obaku-ban as additional volumes. In particular, Tetsugen's largest piece, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, was known throughout the Zen world and can be seen as Tetsugen's contribution to the growing corpus of vernacular Buddhist texts that developed during the Tokugawa period. Tetsugen thus participated in another major movement that characterized Tokugawa Buddhism, the fostering of Buddhism on the popular level among the lay community.

This chapter will look at Tetsugen's work as a popular teacher by first placing him in the

general context of the growing movement of popular Buddhism. Tetsugen was by no means unique in his dedication to educating the laity and deepening their understanding and practice of Buddhism. Many of the important Buddhist figures of the period were equally involved in spreading Buddhist practice among the common people in addition to their work within the confines of the monastic community. By viewing his work in this context, the concerns and methods of teaching that Tetsugen shared with other Buddhist masters as well as those aspects which set his work apart become clear. We will then examine Tetsugen's teachings, first identifying and describing the larger themes that characterize his work and writings as a whole, and then focusing on his major composition, the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, with a close reading of the text.

Popular Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan

The Buddhist clergy has always regarded instruction of the laity to be a basic part of their responsibility; traditionally, lay people provide for the physical needs of the monastic community while monks and nuns reciprocate by providing for the spiritual needs of the laity. However, during the Tokugawa period, we find that Japanese monks placed a particularly strong emphasis on this aspect of their Buddhist practice. If we focus our attention just on Zen Buddhism, we find that Tetsugen is one among several Zen masters during the early Tokugawa period, a group which includes among others Takuan Sôhō 澤庵宗彭 (1573-1645), Suzuki Shôsan 鈴木正三 (1579-1655), Ungo Kiyô 雲居希膺 (1583-1659), Bankei Yôtaku 盤珪永琢 (1622-1693), and later Hakuin Ekaku 白隠慧鶴 (1686-1769), who directly taught lay Buddhists through their sermons or writings. With the single exception of Suzuki Shôsan, these masters held positions in Zen temples and were primarily responsible for training ordained disciples within the monastic framework. These masters became popular teachers by extending their monastic roles to incorporate instruction of lay people in a variety of ways, sometimes by accepting individual lay disciples and sometimes by reaching out to a wider audience of common

people.

Unlike the other masters mentioned above, Bankei did not compose written lessons or even letters for his lay disciples. He did, however, open many of his sermons to the general public and presented to them his basic teaching about the Unborn Buddha Mind that they all possessed.¹ The written accounts of these sermons, preserved by his disciples, provide a clear idea of the style of Bankei's teaching on these occasions. He used colloquial language and presented his message with images drawn from the immediate context of the sermon itself. Bankei does not seem to have drawn upon either the Buddhist scriptures or Zen literature for his material, although the term unborn (*fushô* 不生) was, of course, a traditional Buddhist expression.² He said on one occasion, "I don't teach people by quoting from the words of the buddhas and patriarchs. Since I can manage simply by dealing with people's own selves, there's no need..."³ Bankei preferred a direct approach to teaching regardless of his audience, and seems to have presented the core of his teaching to ordained and lay disciples in much the same manner.⁴

Other prominent Zen masters of the period used written texts to instruct their lay disciples, and generally composed their letters or lessons in vernacular Japanese, using the native *kana* script.⁵ Before the modern period, educated Japanese tended to use classical

¹ The collection of Bankei's sermons can be found in Akao Ryûji, ed., *Bankei zenji zenshû*. In addition there are two English translations: Haskell, *Bankei Zen*, and Waddell, *The Unborn*.

² Buddhist texts commonly use the expression *fushô fumetsu* 不生不滅 ("unborn and unperishing", or "not arising and not passing away") to express the ultimate reality of things. Although phenomenal existences (dharma) seem to arise and pass away, from the perspective of ultimate reality, they do not exist. The expression appears in many texts, including the *Heart Sutra* (T. 8, p. 848), and is by no means limited to the Zen corpus.

³ Haskell, op.cit., p. 8.

⁴ Ibid., pp. xxxii-xxxiii.

⁵ For this reason, the Buddhist lessons on the Dharma written in Japanese are referred to as *kana hôgo* 仮名法語 (sometimes written *kanaji hôgo* 仮名字法語). Such writings are often treated as a genre, as, for example, in Furuta Shôkin's *Zenshû kana hôgo*. However, the style and format may differ significantly from work to work, with the use of the vernacular being the basic common factor.

Chinese in writing letters, scholarly texts and official documents. In particular, Zen monks had to master classical Chinese in the course of their training, since the practice of kōan was inexorably linked with the language of its origin. For this reason, the recorded sayings of Japanese Zen masters were preserved in classical Chinese despite the fact that the original sermons would have been given in Japanese. Zen monks in Japan continued to write predominantly in Chinese down to the modern period, so that the growing number of vernacular texts written in the Tokugawa period represented something of an innovation for Zen.⁶ The movement to produce Buddhist materials for lay believers, in addition to scholarly texts intended for the more educated ordained audience, was encouraged by the emergence of a thriving publishing industry and the concomitant growth in literacy on all levels of Tokugawa society. For the first time in Japanese history, a large segment of the population was both willing and able to read popular literature and religious texts alike written in the vernacular, and Zen masters responded to this potential audience.

For the most part, Zen masters tailored their message to suit the audience, using language and images familiar to the lay disciple(s). The Buddhist tradition regards such variable usage as a form of expedient means, and Buddhist masters sometimes attained high reputations for their skillful use of such devices. For this reason, it is not unusual to find texts written for beginners in which a master used a bare minimum of Buddhist terms while in another context the same author made extensive use of technical terms and references to the Zen corpus. This form of expedient means is especially obvious in the writings of Hakuin. Hakuin wrote letters and composed Buddhist lessons (*hōgo*) for individual disciples which were then circulated among wider groups and later published for the general public. In letters written to government officials, such as the letter to Lord Nabeshima or to Ikeda Munemasa⁷, Hakuin used the language and images of Confucian thought with only occasional references to

⁶ Furuta, *Zenshū kana hōgo*, pp. 1-3.

⁷ Yampolsky translates these two letters, *Zen Master Hakuin*, pp. 29-73 and 181-222.

Buddhist scriptures or Zen masters. For officials trained in the Chinese classics and working within the world of samurai government where Confucian philosophy remained the dominant intellectual force, Hakuin had chosen the appropriate vehicle to convey his ideas. In letters that Hakuin wrote for monks, nuns or lay women, however, were replaced by some other comparable set of references. For example, in his letter to a Nichiren nun, Hakuin expressed his thoughts in terminology related to the *Lotus sutra*, the single most important scripture for the Nichiren sect.⁸

While Hakuin used language and images that would be familiar to his audience, he did not leave his readers unchallenged. He addressed them in a manner appropriate to their religious practice and life, but moved them toward a Zen understanding of reality. In his letter to the Nichiren nun, Hakuin commended chanting the title of the *Lotus sutra* (*daimoku* 題目)⁹, saying, "One recitation of the title of this *Sûtra* has no less virtue than a single Zen *kôan*."¹⁰ Nonetheless, he challenged the common assumption held by members of the Nichiren sect that recitation is the only valuable form of Buddhist practice¹¹. Moreover, he tried to steer her understanding of the *Lotus sutra* toward a Zen approach by speaking of the "Sûtra without words" as the true sutra¹² and explaining his own contention that there is no *Lotus sutra* outside the mind.¹³ This practice of pushing disciples beyond their current level of understanding characterizes the best of the vernacular Zen literature.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 86-106.

⁹ *Daimoku* 題目, that is, chanting the title of the Lotus sutra, is the primary religious practice for Nichiren believers. Nichiren taught that in the final age, salvation was possible only through chanting the title using the expression *Namu Myôhōrengekyô* 南無妙法蓮華經.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 95.

¹¹ Ibid, pp. 96-97.

¹² Ibid, p. 91.

¹³ Ibid, pp. 86-87.

Tetsugen's Teachings

Tetsugen spent most of his career as a Zen monk traveling throughout Japan, preaching the Dharma and raising funds for his Tripitaka project. His lectures were open to all classes of people: monks, nuns, and lay believers alike. We know from outside sources and the donation lists associated with the Obaku-ban that he drew large crowds and thus reached extensive numbers of people on his tours. Unfortunately, we have no written accounts of Tetsugen's sermons with the exception of the description of his lectures on the *Śūramgama sūtra* found in his affidavit concerning the incident at Mori. His remarks in that context are limited to those issues which had aroused True Pure Land believers' ire, and so even that account is partial. Without the benefit of textual sources, there is no basis to judge Tetsugen's style of oration; we cannot know whether he spoke in a formal or colloquial manner, whether he drew examples from the immediate context or relied exclusively on traditional images. Our knowledge of Tetsugen's teachings rests upon the small corpus of his written material gathered and published by his disciples after his death.

Tetsugen showed a willingness to set his teachings on paper, although he subordinated literary pursuits to his primary responsibilities related to the Tripitaka project. He had little opportunity during the years of constant travel to write at any length. Since he died immediately following the Tripitaka project's completion, just at the stage in his life when he may have had the leisure time to take up the brush, his complete works form only a slender volume. Nonetheless, he left behind a varied collection of writings, the bulk of which can be described as teaching materials. These texts include letters to ordained and lay disciples, short essays, a number of lessons in Chinese (*hōgo*) which were compiled and published by Hōshū in the *Yuiroku*, as well his longest piece, the *Kana hōgo*, a lengthy lesson written in Japanese and published as an independent volume.

Tetsugen composed other types of texts including poetry, bell inscriptions, and introductory essays for specific copies of the Obaku-ban, but these materials were not

pedagogical in nature. The prose texts can be distinguished from the teaching materials according to the language employed. When writing for purposes of instruction, whether using classical Chinese or vernacular Japanese, Tetsugen used a clear, direct style of prose. He set out his arguments in a logical progression that led the reader along to the desired conclusion. Although he made generous use of technical terms and canonical quotations, he took care to explain and elucidate the terms and references so that they advanced his argument. By contrast, Tetsugen employed a florid style of Chinese in his non-teaching materials, peppering the prose with obscure references and unusual characters which he left for the reader to decipher. In these cases, it seems that Tetsugen was intent upon impressing the reader with his erudition rather than conveying the teachings of Buddhism. For this reason, the non-teaching materials are equally uninformative for the present purposes of elucidating Tetsugen's teachings, and will not be mentioned further.

Before moving on to describe the basic themes and motifs in Tetsugen's teachings, a few general comments about his style as a teacher will serve to illustrate his skill in that role. First, like any Buddhist master, Tetsugen tailored his message to address the needs and abilities of his intended audience. In the *Kana hôgo*, Tetsugen expressed a self-conscious awareness that a master must take care to consider how much of the truth can appropriately be revealed to a given disciple lest the master inadvertently undermine the disciple's continued progress. In the section explaining the final hindrances to enlightenment, specifically the types of confusion that arise in relation to the *alaya* consciousness, Tetsugen maintained that even the Buddha faced this basic pedagogical quandary.

Since this consciousness resembles the true original mind, but isn't the original mind, even the Buddha couldn't easily teach about it to foolish people. This is because, if he taught that this consciousness itself was the truth, then sentient beings would stop there, and thinking this [level of attainment] was sufficient, not persevere in their practice. [On the other hand,] if he taught that it wasn't true, then sentient beings would think that everything is completely void, doubt the existence of the original mind and fall into nihilism. Then they would indeed be unable to awaken to the original mind. That is what I mean when I say that

this is a very great matter, and not even the Buddha can easily teach it.¹⁴

Based on this awareness, one would expect to find changes of emphasis and varying degrees of difficulty in the lessons that Tetsugen himself wrote for disciples at different stages of Zen practice.

When comparing the lessons that Tetsugen wrote for beginners and those for advanced practitioners, one finds just this kind of appropriate variation in language and focus. In a lesson addressed to a relative beginner in the practice of Zen, the champion archer Hoshino Kanzaemon 星野勘左衛門¹⁵, Tetsugen used a bare minimum of Buddhist terms, preferring instead the language of archery to convey a simple message: perseverance in the practice of Zen, as in archery, will lead to the desired goal.

If archery is your single focus, then you will hit the bull's eye. When your practice is already fully concentrated, then your hand responds to what you have attained in your mind. In this way, you will always hit the bull's eye and finally attain the skill of causing monkeys to cry out [just by lifting the bow] and [be able to] shoot lice. The way of learning is also like this. When you have a single kôan in your heart and practice diligently night and day without cease, then your practice will ripen. When the right time comes and you are fully enlightened, then the mind that transcends mind is illuminated, the thing that transcends things becomes manifest, right and left converge at the source, warp and woof meet in the groove, and on the brink of birth and death, you attain the great freedom.¹⁶

Contrast the terminology and simplicity of this message to that found in lessons for advanced practitioners, such as in a letter to his leading disciple Hôshû, and Tetsugen's ability to employ skillful means is clear. In writing to Hôshû, Tetsugen made free use of Zen terminology and

¹⁴ Minamoto, op.cit., p. 254.

¹⁵ Hoshino Kanzaemon 星野勘左衛門 (n.d.) wanted to be the greatest archer in Japan. In 1662, he was named the best when he shot arrows in the great hall of Rengein Sanjûsangendô in Kyoto and made 6600 hits. In 1668, he was surpassed by Kasai Sonouemon 葛西園右衛門 who made 7,000 hits. Kanzaemon heard of this, and starting on 1669.5.1, he shot arrows for two days, making 8,000 hits. Although he still had some strength, he decided to hold back so as not to discourage young people and thereby weaken the art of archery. In 1687, he was again surpassed, this time by a youth of 15 from Wakayama, Wasa Daihachirô 和佐大八郎 (1663-1713), who shot 13,000 arrows and made 8,033 hits. Kanzaemon was in the grandstand encouraging the boy. *Dai jimei jiten* 大人名事典, vol. ____, (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1979), p. 509.

¹⁶ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, p. 91.

employed numerous images from the Zen corpus which the two men shared as common knowledge. Moreover, in that letter, Tetsugen was pushing Hôshû to take the final step towards enlightenment in terms that would have confounded a beginner.

[If you retain any vestige of the belief in the self,] when you attain enlightenment, then enlightenment becomes a web of mistaken views, when you complete the Way, the Way becomes demonic and heretical... when you give rise to compassion, then compassion becomes attachment to self. It would be better to slay this self and be unfettered and unattached.¹⁷

Tetsugen refers here to the most subtle of attachments, attachment to the Dharma itself, which afflicts only the most advanced disciples.

Tetsugen quoted extensively from the sutras in his teaching materials. Although this fondness for scriptural quotations cannot be separated from Tetsugen's attitude toward the written Buddhist canon, a topic to be addressed directly in the next section, relevant here is the way in which he used the scriptures. To an extent unusual in the writings of Buddhist masters before the modern period, Tetsugen quoted directly and exactly from the sutras. No doubt this can be attributed to his own easy access to the texts as editor of the Obaku-ban. Most masters at the time gave rather loose renditions of whatever quotation they had in mind, conveying the general sense of the passage, often without even specifying the sutra. There are only a few occasions when Tetsugen quoted from the sutras in such an inexact manner.¹⁸ In addition, Tetsugen consistently named the sutras he quoted rather than using generic references like "as it says in the scriptures". As a rule, Tetsugen would first render the original Chinese into classical Japanese, and then clarify the quotation with a paraphrase in simple Japanese. His lectures on the *Śūramgama sūtra*, for instance, seem to have been little more than a paraphrase of the original text given in clear Japanese followed by a commentary to further elucidate the meaning of the text.

¹⁷ Ibid, pp. 86-87.

¹⁸ It is interesting to note that in those cases where Tetsugen does give inexact quotation, the sutras in question are the Pure Land sutras which he had studied and memorized his youth. See p. 334, note 27 (Appendix Two).

Tetsugen followed the example of Buddhist teachers throughout the tradition in using simple illustrations from everyday life to teach difficult and sophisticated concepts that the audience might not otherwise grasp. In some cases Tetsugen drew upon the common store of images and parables from the Buddhist scriptures, such as the story of the burning house from the *Lotus sutra*, the shining mirror, or the example of the water and the waves, which would have been familiar to much of his audience. He also supplemented this set with images of his own devising. He used familiar examples like conjuring tricks of magicians and the behavior of scavengers to express the intangible ideas of consciousness only and the interdependence of all dharmas. It is not so much the originality of his examples as their effectiveness in expressing Buddhist concepts that marks his work.

Themes in Tetsugen's Teachings

There are a number of major themes found throughout Tetsugen's teaching that characterize his approach to Buddhist thought and to the spread of the Buddhist Dharma: 1) his positive attitude toward the written scriptures, 2) his strong commitment to maintaining the precepts, and 3) his criticism of the Buddhism of his day, especially of Zen Buddhism. Tetsugen's attitudes on these three issues fit well within the general Obaku approach to Zen teachings and were shared by many other Zen masters of all periods and lineages. However, the balance that Tetsugen and other Obaku masters struck on these basic issues was by no means the only possible position that Zen masters could validly defend. In many respects, Tetsugen's position on each issue represents one side in an ongoing debate based on interpretations of tensions found in classical Zen literature.

1) Many of the early writings of the school in China show that Zen Buddhism has at its root a basic ambivalence toward the written scriptures. For example, a passage from the eleventh century *Tsu-t'ing shih-yüan* 祖庭事苑 (J. *Sotei jion*) reads:

In transmitting Dharma, all the patriarchs in the beginning used the doctrines of

the Tripitaka together with the practice. Later, however, the founder Bodhidharma transmitted the Seal of Mind only, destroying dependence on [the Tripitaka] and clarifying our Cardinal Doctrine. This is what we mean when we say: "A special transmission outside the scriptures, not founded upon the words and letters..."¹⁹

Although these and similar comments do not absolutely determine a negative attitude toward the written scriptures as characteristic of all Zen, they have allowed Zen masters to take a spectrum of positions vis-a-vis the Tripitaka. These range from the more radical views of complete rejection, sometimes graphically illustrated by masters literally burning sutras, to far more positive attitudes of reverence for the sutras characterized by the continued maintenance of scripture recitation and study as a part of Zen monastic practice. That is not to say that Zen masters who took the more positive view regarded study and recitation as sufficient in themselves; Zen masters have always maintained that the practice of meditation and the immediate experience of enlightenment are the crux of Zen Buddhism.

Tetsugen falls squarely in the category of masters who took a positive attitude toward the scriptures. Through his life work, he promoted the concept that the truth realized through meditation and that found in the sutras are one, *zenkyô itchi* 禪教一致. Tetsugen never recorded his understanding of the concept *zenkyô itchi* directly in his written works, but one episode recorded in his official biography effectively illustrates his understanding of the relationship between the teachings found in the sutras and Zen meditation.

Someone once said, "Our sect values illuminating the mind and seeing one's nature, but [you] master are always preaching on the sutras and commentaries. Isn't that at variance with the teaching of 'direct pointing [to the mind, seeing one's nature and becoming Buddha]?" Tetsugen laughed and said, "Isn't what you said a little simplistic? Meditation (*zen* 禪) is the water and the teachings (*kyô* 經) are the waves. When you seize onto meditation and throw away the teachings, it is like seeking the water while rejecting the waves. The teachings are the vessel and meditation is the gold. When you seize onto the teachings and throw out meditation, it is like casting off the gold and looking for the vessel. The waves and the water are not separate. The vessel is itself the gold. Meditation and the teachings are not two things."²⁰

¹⁹ ZZ 2: 66c. 10ff. English translation adapted from Miura, op.cit., pp. 229-230.

²⁰ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 373 and 363-364.

For those who had progressed sufficiently along the Buddhist path, Tetsugen never advocated giving preference to the study of the sutras over the practice of Zen meditation; for his own disciples he encouraged the single-minded pursuit of meditation on their kôan, fully aware that scripture study was a preliminary element in their monastic training which could not in itself bring an enlightenment experience. Nonetheless, he did regard training in the scriptures as the necessary basis for monastic practice and the fundamental tool for spreading the Dharma among the laity who could not always undertake meditation themselves.

Tetsugen's attitude toward the scriptures is best exemplified by his life's work of printing the Obaku-ban, which made the texts accessible to ordained and lay Buddhists alike, in ways appropriate to their respective roles in life. In his very first essay on the need to increase the number of ready copies of the Tripitaka in Japan, the *Keen no so* 化縁の疏, Tetsugen compared the sutras to medicine used by a great physician (the Buddha) and his nurses (the sangha) in order to relieve the suffering of sentient beings. He lamented that "in this country, although we have had the Buddha and the monks from the beginning, the curative Dharma has never been complete. How, then, can the people's illness be healed?"²¹ Tetsugen regarded the scriptures as crucial for the promotion of Buddhism among the laity. His own style of teaching concurs with the role set out for monks in the above simile, that of a nurse administering medicine: Tetsugen lectured directly to the people on the sutras. Although he wrote more general lessons on Buddhist practice or Zen meditation for specific individuals, his public sermons were almost certainly extended commentaries on specific sutras which included paraphrases or translations of the Chinese texts into colloquial Japanese. Not only did he preach, but he made the physical texts of the sutras accessible to scholar monks who had the skills to read them for themselves in order that they could better play their part in making the texts accessible to the common people through their lectures.

2) Just as there is a creative tension within Zen thought concerning the status of the

²¹ Ibid., p. 275.

written scriptures, there is likewise tension regarding the proper understanding of the monastic precepts. Nearly all Buddhist schools, including the lineages of Zen, share the common *Vinaya* tradition of monastic discipline. In the case of the Zen schools, this has taken the form of a distinctive genre of literature, the "pure rules" or *shingi* 清規. However, the same movement within Zen that cautions against reliance on an external Buddha or external scriptures takes aim at external codes of conduct. For example, the Sixth Patriarch Hui-neng conferred the "formless precepts" (無相戒 *musôkai*) on his disciples, redefining the related terms in such a way that he elevated the discussion beyond the literal.²²

If in your own mind you rely on truth [the Dharma], then, because there is no falseness in successive thoughts, there will be no attachments.... If in your own mind you rely on purity [the Sangha], although all the passions and false thoughts are within your own natures, your natures are not stained.²³

Based on this sort of passage, the tendency to uphold the freedom of enlightenment in opposition to any external monastic code emerged within Zen Buddhism. In some extreme cases, this has led Zen masters to blatantly break precepts in order to illustrate their point. It is best to bear in mind that these extreme ideas and actions were situated within the context of monastic discipline. They were intended less as absolute denials of the precepts than as shocking reminders to disciples that even subtle attachments to the Dharma are a hindrance. Even those Zen masters who stressed the trans-literal meaning of the precepts continued to use those precepts to govern their monastic life.

As seen earlier, the Rinzai sect in Japan was torn by an eruption of the recurring dispute over the proper understanding of the precepts early in the Tokugawa period. Once in Japan, Obaku masters became embroiled in the dispute, which predated their arrival. The Chinese masters attracted to their ranks many Japanese monks who shared their view that the precepts had to be strictly preserved and agreed that this was the best method for reviving

²² For a discussion of *musôkai* in the *Platform sutra*, see Yanagida Seizan, *Shoki zenshû shishô no kenkyû*, p. 153ff.

²³ Yampolsky, *Zen Master Hakuin*, p. 145.

the Rinzai sect. Their opponents in the dispute were also dedicated to reviving Rinzai, but favored a less literal interpretation of the precepts. Nonetheless, neither party advocated a literal rejection of the precepts in practical terms, and both sides continued to live and practice in accordance with the monastic codes. Tetsugen came to this debate from a distinctive background for a Zen monk. As a former True Pure Land monk, Tetsugen had practiced within a tradition that did challenge the precepts on a literal and practical level. We might reasonably expect that his perspective on the relevant issues was somewhat different because of his unique personal history.

Tetsugen's strong dedication to strict monastic observance can be seen in his preference for the *Śūramgama sūtra* as the most common topic for his sermons. In lecturing on the sutra, he gave heavy emphasis to the section of the text that addresses the necessity of keeping the precepts against sexual misconduct, killing, stealing and lying. Although he followed the pattern and images of the sutra faithfully, he also expressed something of his own frustration with those monks who failed to uphold the precepts.

Why is it that thieves don the robes of the Thus Come One, take on the form of one who has left the home life, and turn the Buddha into an object for sale and a source of their livelihood. They create all sorts of karma and say it is all the teachings of the Buddhist Dharma. They malign monks who are able to practice the precepts and call that the Lesser Vehicle. They cause countless sentient beings to err and so cause them to lapse into the *avīci* hell. One must not take those sutras that do not reveal the full meaning of the Dharma as one's own opinion and so cause beginners to err.²⁴

While Tetsugen was railing primarily against his former True Pure Land colleagues, there lay in his concern for misleading beginners a warning to other Zen masters against preaching carelessly about the freedom of Zen.

Like other masters, Tetsugen believed that enlightened beings were free from any external constraints, because they fulfilled the precepts as a natural result of their enlightened perspective. Enlightened beings "have great compassion, they [can look upon] all sentient

²⁴ Minamoto, op.cit., p. 291.

beings as their own body, and regard them as their children."²⁵ They therefore cause no harm to other sentient beings without needing to conform their inclinations to any external proscriptions like the monastic precepts. Nonetheless, beginners have not yet attained the shift in perspective necessary to fulfill the precepts organically, and it could be detrimental to their progress along the Buddhist path to hear prematurely about such freedom. Tetsugen recognized that keeping the precepts was merely a device designed to promote progress toward enlightenment and not sufficient in itself to attain enlightenment. By maintaining that keeping the precepts was the indispensable basis upon which to build the practice of meditation and strive for wisdom, Tetsugen was in substantial agreement with the standard Buddhist understanding of the Buddhist way.

3) Like many Zen masters of his day, Tetsugen was highly critical of some of his contemporaries who called themselves Zen masters. He believed that many so-called masters had fallen into a trap that all Zen practitioners face: having once attained some degree of proficiency in meditation, the practitioner may mistake this preliminary stage of realization for ultimate enlightenment itself and cease striving. In several of his writings, Tetsugen warned his own disciples against falling into this trap which he regarded as a shallow understanding of the ultimate truth. For example, he wrote a strong response to a lay disciple who had expressed his realization that, "Birth and death are themselves Nirvana. The afflictions are themselves enlightenment".

[Your expression] means that there is no deluded mind outside of and apart from the original mind. That is, the deluded mind is itself the original mind. Views like this look like the real thing, but they are not yet correct. Those who practice Zen at the present time often have this kind of view. They seek after reflections and shadows, and take them to be the true self...²⁶

Tetsugen saw not only the problems that this shallow attainment implied for the mistaken individual, but the ramifications it could have for others as well if it were not recognized and

²⁵ Ibid, p. 194.

²⁶ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo*, pp. 83-84.

corrected. If the master were to be taken in by the practitioner's error, then he might seriously compound it by attesting to the validity of the experience and so perpetuate the pattern.

"Many of those who teach Zen everywhere take this sickness to be the Dharma and cannot see their mistake. In the end, the blind lead the blind into the flaming pit."²⁷

In Tetsugen's view, false masters posed a threat because they were able to pass themselves off as true masters by imitating the actions of the patriarchs described in the Zen literature.

They raise their fists, point their fingers, raise their eyebrows, blink their eyes. Some give a shout and others wipe their sleeves. All tricks to make a living in a dark world.... Their inaccurate understanding is not the eye of enlightenment. On the contrary, they receive a false *inka* and immediately bestow *inka* on others. They seek after "clarity and spirituality" and take this to be the teaching of the patriarchs. In their rushing forward and shrinking back they create an illusion and make an appearance [of true Zen masters].²⁸

Having deceived their own masters, these charlatans then create the illusion of being a true master for their own aggrandizement. They cause harm to the next generation of practitioners who come to them sincerely seeking guidance. Tetsugen never indicated specific individuals that he believed were conferring "false *inka*", but his writings suggest that he felt it pervaded the Zen world of his day. He mentioned the problem in some way in almost all of his writings to advanced disciples. It would not be an exaggeration to say that Tetsugen viewed this problem as one of the greatest dangers facing Zen in his day.

The *Kana hōgo* of Zen Master Tetsugen

Tetsugen composed his *Kana hōgo* sometime toward the end of his life, though the actual date of the original text is unknown. His leading disciple Hōshū edited the first woodblock edition in 1691²⁹, adding a postscript which provides what information we have of the text's

²⁷ Ibid., p. 90.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 83-84.

²⁹ The full title of the woodblock edition is *Zuiryū Tetsugen zenji kana hōgo* 瑞龍鐵眼禪師仮

history. According to Hôshû, Tetsugen wrote the lesson "for a woman deeply committed to Zen".³⁰ The woman's identity is otherwise unknown, even whether she was a nun or lay practitioner. We may surmise from the content that she was somewhat advanced in her practice, since Tetsugen wrote to her of the difficult problems related to the *alaya* consciousness which, he says, even the Buddha did not teach to beginners. Nonetheless, it seems likely that Tetsugen had in mind a wider audience when he wrote this extended lesson. It was common for larger examples of this genre to circulate among believers, first copied out by hand and then in printed editions. Tetsugen himself had edited and circulated a number of the master Yin-yüan's Dharma lessons, so he was fully aware of the possibility. Moreover, the text shows signs of careful planning and presentation suggesting that Tetsugen regarded it as a formal composition.

In his shorter *hōgo* written in Chinese, Tetsugen generally used a very simple structure and concentrated on a single issue appropriate for the specific individual addressed. In contrast, he used a longer format with an intricate structure for the *Kana hōgo*. On the most obvious level, the entire work takes the form of an extensive commentary on a single verse from the *Heart sutra*: "When he realized that the five *skandhas* are all empty, he escaped from all pain and distress."³¹ Following the pattern set by this verse, the *Kana hōgo* divides naturally into six sections. After a very brief preface in which Tetsugen introduces the verse and gives a preliminary explanation of its terms, there follow five sections addressing each of the *skandhas*

名法語. It was produced at Hôzō-in as a part of the on-going printing of Buddhist texts that supplemented the Ōbaku-ban. Unlike the block style of the characters employed in all other texts produced for the project, the woodblocks of the *Kana hōgo* imitate the cursive style of calligraphy, using *hiragana* rather than *katakana* which was more common at the time. Chinese characters are used throughout the text, but phonetic readings (*furigana*) are provided for nearly all of them, even the simplest. Subsequent editions in the Tokugawa period made use of the same woodblocks and differ only in the frontispiece and portrait. Modern editions including those by Akamatsu and Minamoto are based upon the original woodblock edition; any differences in the text can be attributed to typographical error.

³⁰ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen zenji kana hōgo*, p. 268.

³¹ T. 8, p. 848.

individually. In these sections, Tetsugen strives first to define the *skandha* under consideration, to elucidate the delusions and attachments specifically associated with it, and finally to expose its underlying illusory quality. Through examples, parables, and quotations from scripture, Tetsugen describes the process by which one recognizes each *skandha* as empty. Beginning with attachment to form which is the coarsest and continuing along to attachment to consciousness which is the most subtle, Tetsugen uses the five sections to describe a person's development along the Buddhist path from ignorance to enlightenment. Tetsugen's overall message for his reader can be encapsulated in a simple restatement of the verse: When you realize that all the five *skandhas* are empty, you will escape from all pain and distress.

The structure of the *Kana hôgo* can be viewed in a number of alternative ways which elucidate other aspects of Tetsugen's teaching. In his preface, Tetsugen reduces the five *skandhas* to two simpler categories: body and mind. "The five *skandhas* are form, sensation, perception, psychic construction, and consciousness. Although there are five items, they come down to just [two], "body" and "mind". First of all, "form" is the body, and the other four [*skandhas*] are mind." This suggests that on some level Tetsugen's full discussion of the five *skandhas* also falls into two distinct parts: the section on form (section 1) addressing delusions related to the body and the sections on sensation, perception, psychic construction, and consciousness (sections 2 through 5) addressing those related to the mind. Tetsugen does indeed use this division to clarify the distinction made by Mahayana Buddhism between the Lesser (Hinayana) and the Greater (Mahayana) Vehicles. Those sentient beings said to be afflicted with delusions related to the body include both ordinary human beings who cannot rightly be said to be on the Buddhist path as well as those following the Lesser Vehicle, *śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* who have made some progress beyond the confines of ordinary ignorance. Tetsugen creates a contrast between those afflicted with delusions of the body, and the practitioners of the Great Vehicle, Bodhisattvas, who transcend the delusions of the body and progress toward enlightenment by eliminating the delusions of the mind.

In section 1, Tetsugen explains that ordinary human beings mistake the body for an eternally abiding self and become attached to this illusion of self. *Sravakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* are more advanced than this and have overcome the crude attachment to self. "Those in the two vehicles are wiser than ordinary people, and so they clearly recognize this body as a temporary configuration of earth, water, fire, and wind, and regard it in fact as white bones. They have no thoughts of attachment to their body in the least. Nor do they give rise to attachment to self or self-pride."³² Despite their understanding of no-self, they are still deluded by the body (form) on a more subtle level; *sravakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* have not yet taken the further step and seen that all dharmas are likewise devoid of self. Bodhisattvas, transcending the delusions of ordinary people and of *sravakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* alike, understand the truth of emptiness. They recognize that they themselves and all dharmas are the *Dharmakāya*. In the traditional language of Mahayana Buddhism, they have realized that *samsara* and nirvana are one and the same. Or, in the language of the Heart Sutra, "Form is emptiness, and emptiness is form."³³

Having dealt in section 1 with the preliminary stages of complete delusion and the limited progress of the Lesser Vehicle, Tetsugen then describes the path of Mahayana Buddhism proper, that is the path of the Bodhisattva, in sections 2 through 5. Although divided into four sections according to the number of *skandhas* related to the mind, the underlying structure of the text seems to fall into three rather than four parts. This recalls a number of common three-part archetypes used to describe Buddhist practice found throughout the scriptures, sometimes based on the threefold refuge of Buddha, Dharma and Sangha, and other times on the traditional divisions of precept, meditation and wisdom. In the sixth fascicle of the *Śūramgama sūtra*, a chapter for which Tetsugen showed an abiding predilection, we find an example of the latter.

³² Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 181-182.

³³ T. 8, p. 848. Tetsugen comments on this verse in the context of his discussion of Bodhisattvas transcending the two-fold delusions related to the body; Minamoto, op.cit., p. 183.

The buddha said: 'Ananda, you have always heard me teach about the discipline (vinaya) which consists in the practice of three decisive steps, the control of mind, called sila which leads to stillness (dhyāna) and thence to wisdom (prajna). This is called the threefold study of the supramundane way.³⁴

In the case of the *Kana hōgo*, Tetsugen follows a slightly different three-fold pattern, namely the movement of Buddhist practice through discipline (keeping the precepts), teachings (the study of the Dharma) and finally meditation (transcending the intellectual, dualistic understanding of the Dharma experientially), a movement which roughly reflects Tetsugen's conceptualization of a Zen practitioners training. Specifically, Tetsugen deals with issues of discipline in sections 2 and 3, with the teachings in section 4, and with meditation in section 5.

Tetsugen's use of source material and his style of argumentation support the three-part pattern. In sections 2 and 3, Tetsugen makes no direct references to the scriptures, relying exclusively on examples drawn from human life to illustrate his points. In laying down the precepts as the foundation for all forms and levels of Buddhist practice, Tetsugen seeks to establish an intuitive understanding of the underlying principles rather than a scholarly explication based upon the written canon. In section 4, Tetsugen changes his style and begins to introduce extensive quotations from the scriptures to frame his argument on psychic construction. At this stage, Tetsugen recognizes that a certain degree of understanding is attained by the believer, but that it is almost certainly an intellectual and therefore dualistic understanding. In section 6, Tetsugen finally introduces meditation, and for the first time makes use of the images and quotations characteristic of Zen literature. Naturally, Zen believers rely upon the same basic pillars of precept and scripture as other Mahayana Buddhists, but Zen is distinguished by its focus on meditation as the ultimate form of Buddhist practice. Particularly in the monastery, the life of the Zen practitioner is not very different from that of other Buddhist monks; they follow the rule of monastic discipline to govern their communal

³⁴ T. 19, p. 131c. Translation by Charles Luk, op.cit., pp. 151-152.

life, and chant and study the sutras as a regular part of their daily practice. Tetsugen mirrors this pattern in his *Kana hôgo* by leaving the specifically Zen discussion to the final section. Viewing the text in this manner helps to explain why Tetsugen, a Zen master, uses so little Zen vocabulary and references early on in the piece and reserves his discussion of meditation for the final pages.

In sections 2 and 3, Tetsugen turns his attention toward the Mahayana path leading to enlightenment. In the process of explicating the *skandhas* "sensation" and "perception", Tetsugen shows his concern for keeping the precepts, discipline being the first element in the practice of Buddhism. Although he mentions other Buddhist precepts against stealing, lying, drinking liquor, etc., he singles out that against killing in section 2 and, in a more subtle and indirect fashion, against sexual misconduct in section 3. It is probably not accidental that he chose the very precepts that, for him, define Buddhist practice on the lay and monastic level, respectively. The two sections thus function as a single unit on discipline, but taken separately refer to the basic division in Buddhist practice between ordained and lay believers.

In his general discussion of the ideal of non-killing, Tetsugen concentrates his attention on meat-eating. By singling out meat-eating among the many possible examples of killing, Tetsugen has chosen an instance which affected the lives of most of his audience. Moreover, he selected a behavior which anyone could change, even those lay people like farmers who kill inadvertently in the normal course of their work. Tetsugen used graphic images like that of the crow eating rotten flesh to shock his reader into reinterpreting the commonplace activity of eating meat through the eyes of an enlightened being.

[When] a crow... sees a dead cow or horse rotting or a human corpse festering, it thinks it is a rare treat. First it enjoys looking at it, then its enjoyment increases as it smells it and grasps it. It thinks this is the greatest of pleasures. Seen from the human perspective, this seems immeasurably impure and repulsive. If we were forced by others to eat such putrid things, it would be incomparable suffering. What is worse than being forced to eat them is that crows devour such things greedily, and think it is pleasant. Although it isn't [truly] pleasant, their minds are foolish and base, and so they think that pain is pleasure. What human beings find pleasurable is similar. Because of foolish minds, we are consumed by wife

and children, are deluded by wealth, eat fish and fowl, and take this to be pleasant. Viewed from the perspective of Buddhas and bodhisattvas, this looks even more wretched than the crows seem to us from our human vantage. Conjecturing from this, [we see that] what deluded people find pleasant actually brings pain, they only believe it is pleasure.³⁵

Tetsugen teaches the most basic of all Buddhist precepts by explaining its rationale through example: We refrain from killing because like the Buddhas and bodhisattvas, we recognize that all sentient beings are our own children, our very bodies. What we perceive from our limited perspective as pleasant, is seen from a more advanced vantage point as suffering.

In the context of defining the *skandha* of "sensation", then, Tetsugen introduces a crucial element of the Buddhist understanding of the human condition, perception and misperception. Because sentient beings misperceive pain, confusing it with pleasure, like a moth going into the flame or a fish snatching the bait, they seek pleasure and reap pain. Tetsugen juxtaposes the human perspective of the crow's behavior with the enlightened perspective of ordinary human behavior. It is when playing with these levels of perception that Tetsugen shows his reputed talent for language. His images in this section are by far his strongest, and his prose flows naturally without the interruption of quotations and their interpretation.

Appropriately, Tetsugen continues to develop the theme of perception/misperception in the section on the *skandha* of "perception". His dominant image in this section is the dream which he uses to expose the fundamental unreality of waking thoughts.

Everyone thinks that nighttime dreams are the only fabrications that lack a basis in fact, and that what they think about during the day is true. This is a terrible mistake.... Whatever we think of as hateful, lovable, reproachful, enviable, beloved, or dear, are all illusions that don't change the dreaming mind at all. Originally we have no such illusions in our true minds, which are like a shining mirror or pure water. Because we fail to realize our true mind, we leave the images of illusion reflected on our true mind. We believe they are true and become firmly attached to them, and so these illusions become increasingly extensive, and the delusions grow deeper and deeper.³⁶

³⁵ Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 192-193.

³⁶ Ibid, pp. 199-201.

In particular, Tetsugen exposes the illusion inherent in love, particularly romantic love. He thus continues his development of the theme of the importance of the precepts by his subtle allusion to the precepts governing sexual conduct.

The monastic rules governing sexual conduct are based upon the realization that there is no basis for distinctions between loved and unloved from the perspective of the enlightened mind. Tetsugen explains this rationale by exposing to close scrutiny the sentiments of love that lead to romantic entanglements.

Thinking that something is repulsive and thinking something is attractive are both figments of your own imagination.... As we gradually get to know someone, feelings of intimacy deepen toward a person we find compatible, and we create the feeling that they are attractive. It is precisely because of this circumstance that when we follow the paths of affection, however much it changes our lives, to that extent the ties of tenderness likewise increase. When you develop feelings of love in this way, love seems inevitable, and whichever way you turn it over in your mind, it is love without a trace of hatefulness. When love reaches an extreme, and you think that even if you were to live one hundred million *kalpas* your feelings wouldn't change, you are mistaken. Though you are intimate friends, you will have some differences of opinion, and will quarrel. Then the quarrels grow into arguments. Or, as is the way of love, if your [lover's] feelings shift to another, however deep were your feelings of love at the beginning, that is how deep your hate will now become. These feelings of hatred and bitterness are so deep that you may even think that they will eventually kill you.... If the thoughts of love were not false in the first place, then you would probably not have changed your mind in a short time and decided it was repulsive.³⁷

According to Tetsugen, if, from the beginning, one recognizes the passing illusions like romantic love for what they are in the first place, then they can easily be expelled. Precisely because we latch on to them and allow them to pile up, they take on the appearance of reality.

In section 4, Tetsugen introduces the concept of "psychic construction", identifying it with the steady flow of ideas and images that run unceasingly through the mind. Ordinary people are deluded by psychic constructions and mistakenly identify this flow of ideas with the true mind. Tetsugen employs the familiar image of the mirror to explain the relationship between the true mind and the ideas that pass through it.

³⁷ Ibid. pp. 201-204.

When you see images reflected in a bright mirror all day long, it reflects the sky, the land, flowers, willow trees, people, animals and birds. All the colors change and the types of things [reflected] change without a moments rest, but the true form of the mirror is not the birds and animals, nor the people, nor the willows, flowers, the land, nor the sky. It is just the shining and unclouded mirror itself. Our original minds reflect and illuminate the ten thousand *dharma*s, but have no connection to their distinctions.³⁸

The mind, like the mirror, is independent of the images it reflects and remains unchanged by them. Therefore, there is no need to purify it of them. While it is possible to still the flow of psychic constructions in meditation, there remains a dualism inherent in the practice. For the enlightened mind, the mirror should be visible "even if images of blossoms and willows are reflected".³⁹

Tetsugen presents the two-fold vision of the enlightened mind with an example that illustrates the Madhyamika teaching of the two levels of truth without employing technical philosophical language. Tetsugen invites the reader to consider an array of figurines made from gold. When regarded as shapes, they are each distinct, but when regarded as gold, they become indistinguishable. "The ten thousand *dharma*s are the same. When we look at them from the perspective of True Thusness, just as with the gold, there is no distinction at all. When we look at them from the perspective of the ten thousand *dharma*s, they are distinguished as different shapes." While the ordinary person is confused and deluded by the shapes, the enlightened person can see beyond the distinctions. The freedom to operate on both levels of the truth is the only difference between the enlightened and the ordinary person.

By breaking down the seemingly insurmountable distinction between ordinary sentient beings and enlightened Buddhas, Tetsugen undermines one of the more subtle forms of delusion, the attachment to the Dharma and the Buddha themselves. Tetsugen demonstrates that terms like "Buddha" and "nirvana" associated with enlightenment are temporary

³⁸ Ibid., pp. 214-215.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 215.

designations used for convenience in teaching. He applies the adjective "illusionary" identically to the vocabulary describing both enlightenment and the pain and suffering of sentient beings in the six paths. Aware that this kind of teaching may confuse some believers who will mistake it for nihilism, Tetsugen hastens to reassure the reader that from the perspective of enlightenment, this is not the case. The difficulty is almost always one of perspective: what appears as food to an ordinary human being takes on the semblance of fire to the eyes of a hungry ghost. In a similar manner, when perfect enlightenment is the subject of the discriminating mind rather than a matter of direct experience, it too becomes a hindrance.

Although Tetsugen continues to use simple, graphic illustrations to explain the more complicated ideas in section 4, he changes the style of argumentation to incorporate a large number of quotations from the sutras. Tetsugen quotes from at least seven sources, showing a strong preference for those texts that support the unity of the teachings and meditation, especially the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra*⁴⁰ and the *Śūramgama Sutra*. Yet despite his obvious enjoyment of sutra explication, Tetsugen never loses sight of the need to transcend an intellectual understanding of the Dharma. In the midst of arguing through proof texts, Tetsugen moves the reader forward to his discussion of meditation by demonstrating the limits of the very scholarly approach employed.

It says in the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra*, "Since they have not yet escaped transmigration and realized perfect enlightenment, it is said that even perfect enlightenment leads to transmigration."⁴¹ This means that while your mind is not yet enlightened, you use your discriminating mind to distinguish and consider perfect enlightenment itself, and so even perfect enlightenment turns into transmigration. In reality, if you think that you have realized enlightenment itself, and you do not cast off all intellectual understanding and cleverness, if you do not stop thoughts of right and wrong or wickedness and correctness, it is just

⁴⁰ *Daihōkōengaku shutara ryōgi kyō* 大方広円覚修多羅了義經 T. 17, p. 914c. This sutra is generally regarded as apocryphal in its entirety. It was, however, very popular among Zen practitioners including Tetsugen who used it, along with the *Śūramgama Sutra*, as the basis for the position that the teaching and meditation are one (*kyōzen itchii* 教禪一致).

⁴¹ T. 17, p. 915c.

like coming face to face with a silver mountain or a wall of iron.⁴²

Tetsugen concludes this section with examples of monks who have taken the teachings to the limits of intellectual understanding and then transcended those limits with the direct experience of enlightenment. Here Tetsugen gives us our first glimpse into the world of Zen Buddhism proper and so bridges the discussion to the final section on meditation and enlightenment.

Tetsugen began section 5, his commentary on the fifth and final *skandha*, "consciousness", with a brief review of the material covered under the other three rubrics related to the mind, sensation, perception and psychic construction. This time, however, through image and example, he works backwards, returning finally to distinctions like pleasure and pain associated with sensation. Generally speaking, Buddhist texts use descriptions of the five *skandhas* to explain the processes and workings of human life, starting with form and building to consciousness. By reversing the order, Tetsugen is inviting the reader to reverse the process, to deconstruct the false understanding of consciousness, and finally return to the original state of enlightenment. The means to accomplish this reversal is meditation.

Section 5 is the only opportunity that Tetsugen takes in the entire essay to focus on specifically Zen teachings. In particular, he describes various stages of meditation and the dangers inherent in them for the practitioner; the danger increases sharply after an initial breakthrough has occurred. The beginner remains trapped within the polar distinctions of good thoughts and bad thoughts. Transcendence of these distinctions marks the student's maturity in meditation.

Once this happens, you must persevere in your meditation. If you sit in meditation intently without being negligent, at first your mind will clear for short periods, but gradually your mind will be clear while you meditate for one third of the time or two thirds of the time. Then it will be clear from beginning to end, neither good nor evil thoughts arise, nor is the mind indifferent. Like the clear Autumn sky or a polished mirror on a stand, the mind is the same as empty space, and you feel as if the Dharmakāya were within your breast. Nothing can compare with the

⁴² Minamoto, op.cit., pp. 236-237.

coolness within your breast. This is the state of someone who has perfected sitting in meditation more than half of the time. In the Zen sect we call it "beating everything into one", "the realm of one form", "a person who has died the great death", and "the world of Fugen"⁴³

But Tetsugen explains that even though the student has become adept in this manner, it is possible to confuse this stage of significant progress with ultimate enlightenment, which has not yet been attained. Having fallen into this trap, the student may lack the motivation to forge ahead, blinded to the need for further effort. At this point, the student may even manage to deceive a Zen master and receive *inka* prematurely, thus compounding the danger by entangling another generation of students in the error.

Tetsugen identifies this intermediate stage of Zen meditation with the highest attainments achieved through Taoist and Neo-Confucian meditation. In Buddhist terms, he associates it with the *samadhi* of arhats and *pratyekabuddhas*. Practitioners at this level of meditation have become aware of what is known in Yogacara thought as the *alaya* consciousness.

All of the [above-mentioned attainments] are free from the distinctions of seeing, hearing, learning and knowing. They indicate a place of no-thought and no-mind like the one that the Buddha and the patriarchs mention. The place of no-thought and no-mind which is like the clear blue sky is known as "the eighth consciousness of sentient beings" (i.e. *alaya* consciousness)...⁴⁴

Attachment to this advanced level of attainment constitutes the most subtle of all the hindrances that Tetsugen describes in the movement from attachment to form to enlightenment. The believer has reached the very precipice of enlightenment, but has not yet taken the final step.

According to Tetsugen, a master must take great care in instructing disciples about the *alaya* consciousness. Even the Buddha himself showed extreme caution at this critical juncture.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 248-249.

⁴⁴ Ibid., pp. 252-253.

Since this consciousness resembles the true original mind, but isn't the original mind, even the Buddha couldn't easily teach about it to foolish people. This is because, if he taught that this consciousness itself was the truth, then sentient beings would stop there, and thinking this [level of attainment] was sufficient, not persevere in their practice. [On the other hand,] if he taught that it wasn't true, then sentient beings would think that everything is completely void, doubt the existence of the original mind and fall into nihilism. Then they would indeed be unable to awaken to the original mind.⁴⁵

Awareness of the *alaya* consciousness is the final plateau in Zen mediation, after which, figuratively speaking, one must let go of the branch while hanging over a cliff or step off the end of a hundred foot pole.

At the end of each section, Tetsugen states in one way or another that by overcoming the delusions associated with the particular *skandha* under consideration, the believer attains enlightenment. He concludes section 5 with a similar, though much more extensive version of this observation. While Zen masters have always maintained that mere words cannot capture the experience of enlightenment, Tetsugen takes this opportunity to attempt a limited explanation of the experience. In order to describe an experience that transcends the confines of human speech, Tetsugen resorts to images such as a dawn of ten-thousand suns rising simultaneously, seeing the Buddhas of the Three Worlds, and penetrating to the marrow of Sakyamuni and Bodhidharma.⁴⁶

Rather than conclude his essay with the description of enlightenment at the end of section 5, Tetsugen closes his lesson on a decidedly different note. He relates two enlightenment accounts designed to illustrate the way in which a Zen master can help a disciple take the final step toward enlightenment. In each case, the master diagnoses the illness, understands that the disciple believes he has attained enlightenment, and so provides a final challenge. Nothing can substitute for the face to face encounter between the master and the disciple. In the context of a written lesson, Tetsugen can only recommend diligent

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 254.

⁴⁶ Ibid. p. 256.

meditation and concentration on the kôan before and after one reaches the critical juncture. While his tone retains the positive element of hope and encouragement that with diligence the goal can be attained, his final words are a warning: You must not make a mistake and fall into a fox's cave.

Teaching by Example

Tetsugen's legacy as a teacher cannot be reduced merely to his words. In his abbreviated career, Tetsugen could reach only a circumscribed number of individuals through his lectures; even in the case of the written words which have been preserved since his death, his most widely circulated text, the *Kana hôgo*, has only been influential within a limited circle of readers, predominantly Zen believers. Nonetheless, the story of Tetsugen's life, told and retold in short biographies and legendary stories, has remained a force even into the modern period. Oral traditions about Tetsugen have been preserved within the confines of the Obaku sect, and some have been recorded in the modern period in pamphlets designed for instructing lay people.⁴⁷ Starting with the biographical sketches that appeared in the Tokugawa period sources such as the *Zoku nihon kôsô den* 續日本高僧傳 and the *Kinsei kijin den* 近世畸人傳⁴⁸, Tetsugen has remained one of the standard *meisô* 名僧, or famous monks, included in modern anthologies.⁴⁹ Such popular stories had an appeal beyond the

⁴⁷ Satô Fumitsugu published a series of such stories, *Tetsugen monogatari*, explicitly conceding in the introduction (unpaginated) that they are not historically accurate. Akamatsu Shinmyô incorporated many of the same stories into his biography *Tetsugen* without distinguishing them from other, more factual sections; see especially pp. 179-187, 191-199, 225-231, and 304-306.

⁴⁸ For full references, see p. 177, notes 10 and 11.

⁴⁹ Tetsugen has appeared in far too many anthologies past and present to give a complete listing. The following is a sampling of the titles that were available in bookstores in Kyoto in January 1991, in which his biography appears: Zen bunka kenkyûsho, eds., *Zenmon itsuwa sen*, vol. 1, pp. 215-223; Nakajima Shigeo, *Nihon meisô 100 hanashi*, p. 165; Fujishima Tatsuô, *Nihon bukkô o sasaeta 33 hito*, pp. 210-216; and Fujiwara Tôen, *Zen no meisô retsuden*, pp. 74-86. Three passages from Tetsugen's writings were included in a somewhat different genre of popular religious texts, a compendium of inspirational verses for daily reflection: Akane Shôdô, *Meisô no kotoba*, pp. 39, 158, and 383.

scope of Obaku believers, bringing the message of Tetsugen's life to a much wider audience.

The genre of biographical anthologies found in Japan, both in its religious and secular examples, closely resembles the hagiography or "saint stories" common to other Buddhist cultures as well as other religious traditions. These stories hold up exemplary individuals and are intended to instruct and inspire readers in their own ethical and religious practice. As Jack Hawley observed in his introduction to *Saints and Virtues*, "the great religions did not gain their hold on us by precepts alone. Within each religion a powerful body of tradition emphasizes not codes but stories, not precepts but personalities, not lectures but lives."⁵⁰ Clearly the Buddha and his leading disciples are the most important subjects of Buddhist hagiography, and to speak of Tetsugen as a Buddhist saint on that level is indefensible. Nonetheless, the Japanese treasured the stories of lesser luminaries from closer to home who were regarded as great men in Japanese culture and Japanese Buddhism. Within the limited context of early modern and modern Japanese Buddhism, Tetsugen holds a distinguished place of honor.

Tetsugen's status as one of the Japanese *meisō* was firmly established by the successful completion of his life's work, the production of the first complete woodblock edition of the Buddhist scriptures for Japan. Without this truly outstanding accomplishment, Tetsugen would probably have remained another obscure disciple of Obaku Zen. Nonetheless, other aspects of his life attracted the attention of biographers. Most if not all give equal weight to Tetsugen's social welfare work, especially his almsgiving during periods of extreme calamity, treating this as a second major feature that made Tetsugen worthy of respect as a model for others. In some cases, authors stressed his defection from True Pure Land to Zen and related matters that made him unusual, even something of an oddity within the Buddhist world. In particular, the stories related to his wife have been used, sometimes for comical effect and sometimes to edify, but always to set Tetsugen apart as an unusual figure.

Biographies of Tetsugen can be classified according to two criteria: first, whether the

⁵⁰ Hawley, *Saints and Virtues*, p. xi.

author strove to present material in an historically accurate manner or was more heavily influenced by legendary material, and second, whether the text was intended to serve religious or secular interests. Historical accuracy has often been subordinated to moral instructiveness in biographies of religious figures; this is the case not only in the premodern texts, but also in a number of modern examples of the genre, written when scholarship had already begun to investigate the "historical Tetsugen". In both religious and secular versions of the biography, pedagogical concerns often take priority over producing a strictly factual account. If the legendary material helps to drive home the message about Tetsugen's virtuous deeds and so inspire others, then it serves a valuable purpose. For the most part, it is the Tetsugen of legend rather than the historical Tetsugen who has had an impact on the moral education of ordinary Japanese.

The most obvious example of legendary material that has survived and been overwhelmingly preferred to strictly historical renderings of Tetsugen's life is the story that Tetsugen raised funds to print the Tripitaka three times. According to this version of events, Tetsugen twice spent the money that he had raised for the printing project on relief work to save the victims of natural disasters. It may be recalled that the official biography offered evidence for only one instance of a major relief effort, which occurred after the Obaku-ban had been completed. The other, legendary version first made its appearance in the *Kinsei kijin den* and reached its fullest form in the grade school lesson used earlier in this century in schools throughout Japan.⁵¹ The relevant portions of that text are as follows:

Some 210 years ago, there was a monk named Tetsugen at Obaku-san Mampuku-ji in [the city of] Uji in Yamashiro [province]. He decided to try to publish the Tripitaka as his life's work. No matter how many trials he had to endure, he pledged that he would complete his task. For many years, he traveled widely to various regions collecting funds. Finally he had raised it all. Tetsugen was overjoyed and was just about to start publishing, when there happened to be a flood in Osaka. There were many killed and injured. Homes were washed away, property lost, and countless numbers of people were [wandering] lost by the roadsides. Tetsugen saw these conditions and felt disconsolate. Without

⁵¹ See p. 181 for full reference and further information.

hesitation, he decided, "When I became determined to publish the Tripitaka, it was in order to spread Buddhism. Spreading Buddhism is done for the sake of saving people in desperate straits. The money that I have received as donations will serve the same purpose whether I use it to finance the Tripitaka or to save the hungry. Although it is necessary to spread the Tripitaka throughout the world, saving people from death is even more urgent." Therefore, he told the people who had donated the money of his intention and received their blessing. He spent all the funds on relief efforts.

Not a penny remained of the funds Tetsugen had collected at such great pains for publishing [the Tripitaka]. However, Tetsugen did not flinch at all. Once again he began to solicit funds and strove at this task for many years. His efforts were not in vain, and once again his long-cherished desire neared completion.

However, this time a great famine occurred in the Kinki region, and people's suffering exceeded even that from the flood. Even though the bakufu set up small relief offices and used its power [to further] the relief efforts, the people's suffering just kept increasing day by day. Once again, Tetsugen made a decision. He explained to the people who had donated the money and halted the publication project. He saved as many people as was within his power.

Twice he had collected funds and twice he had spent it all. As energetic as ever, Tetsugen began to raise funds for a third time. Tetsugen's deep compassion and his determination not to waver from his original decision made a strong impression on people. The number that made donations was unexpectedly high. This time, carving the plates and printing them progressed steadily. Thus, seventeen years after Tetsugen decided to undertake this great project, the publication of the 6,956 volumes of the Tripitaka was finally completed in 1681...⁵²

The legendary material not only makes for a better story, but it emphasizes certain virtues that religious or secular authorities would hope to instill in the audience, such as perseverance, subjugation of personal goals for the greater public good.

The distinction between religious and secular interests depends primarily upon the targeted audience and, by inference, the purpose for which the text was written. Religious biographies of Tetsugen may have been written to bolster the prestige of Obaku Zen, to encourage sincere practice among Buddhist believers in general, or both. Older examples of secular biographies like the *Kinsei kijin den* were meant to be both entertaining and edifying, but not in a strictly religious sense; this is indicated by the wide range of subject matter covered, encompassing unusual figures from every social class and walk of life. The intended audience was the wider reading public, and not Buddhist believers per se. In a

⁵² *Nihon kyōkasho taikai* 日本教科書大系, *Kindaihen* 近代編, vol. 7, pp. 517-519 and vol. 8, pp. 200-202.

similar manner, one may suppose that the grade school lesson based on Tetsugen's life was intended to promote virtues valuable in good citizens rather than to further the cause of Buddhism in modern Japan.

The virtues which Tetsugen's life seems to exemplify remain largely constant throughout the body of biographical literature whether it is religious or secular. Tetsugen demonstrated a remarkable degree of perseverance and dedication to his goal in life as well as an abiding compassion for the suffering of others, which expressed itself in concrete actions. Not surprisingly, the interpretation of these virtues takes on slightly different contours depending on the purpose of the specific biography. To illustrate this point, one need only contrast a religious portrait of Tetsugen, such as the one found in *Zen no meisô retsuden* 禅の名僧列伝 by Fujiwara Tôen 藤原東演⁵³, with the secular lesson quoted above. The grade school lesson stressed both Tetsugen's perseverance and his compassion by making use of the legendary material found in the *Kinsei kijin den* rather than the official biography. It dramatized the threefold repetition of his arduous labors to collect funds and filled out the circumstances surrounding his decision to spend the money on relief work. One is left with the strong impression not only of a man determined to overcome any obstacle in order to fulfill his desired end, but of an individual with a highly developed social conscience, willing to set aside his own ends for the sake of the welfare of the greater community. Such are the virtues that a nation might well hope to inspire in its citizens.

Fujiwara's portrait stands in contrast to the school lesson not only for its obvious religious intent, but for its closer adherence to an historical rendering of Tetsugen's life. While retaining something of the legend's tone of perseverance in the face of adversity, Fujiwara refrains from using any legendary material. In his account, we see Tetsugen traveling the dangerous roads, willing to face the elements of blazing summer sun and pouring rain with

⁵³ Fujiwara Tôen, op.cit., pp. 74-86.

only his torn robes, sandals and staff for shelter. Rather than currying favor with the wealthy and powerful to raise the money quickly, he gratefully accepted small donations from common people. Fujiwara paints a portrait of an ideal Zen practitioner who has staked his life on a "single matter" (*ichiji* 一事), dedicated to the cause of bringing the teachings of the Buddha found in the sutras to others. Fujiwara explains that Tetsugen boldly maintained that teaching the scriptures to the common people was at the heart of the Bodhisattva path in the face of the Zen tradition's ambivalence to the written word. He further embodied the Bodhisattva path by risking and ultimately losing his life while working among the sick and destitute during the famine of 1682. Rather than establishing Tetsugen as an exemplar of civil virtues, Fujiwara suggests him as a model of the Bodhisattva path, a Zen master whose compassion took an unusually graphic form.

Conclusions

Tetsugen's small body of teachings do not show him to be a creative force in Buddhist thought. Instead, his work presents in a clear, carefully crafted fashion, the Buddhist tradition as he understood it. His talent lay not in elucidating new ideas for the tradition, but translating the existing tradition for believers of his own generation. Each generation of believers requires a similar translation of the tradition using the forms and language appropriate to the times. In his early life, Tetsugen immersed himself in the study of the scriptures as much as was then possible. Tetsugen excelled as a teacher, using the vernacular language in his writings and the pulpit to foster belief among the common people of his day. Like many talented teachers, his energy was spent in spreading the Dharma in the present and preserving it for future generations. In his case, preserving the Dharma took concrete form in his edition of the scriptures. In that way, Tetsugen participated in the continuing process of Buddhist masters studying the scriptures and explicating them for lay believers in sermons and written texts.

Chapter Nine

Conclusion

Soon after Master Yin-yüan arrived in Nagasaki, elements within the Japanese Rinzai community dampened the initial warmth of his welcome in Japan with negative criticism of the man, his disciples, and his Zen style. When Yin-yüan began to feel the sting of reproof, he is said to have observed, "When the First Patriarch Bodhidharma came to the west [i.e. China], he was given poison.¹ When Lan-hsi came to the east [i.e. Japan], he was falsely accused of slander.² If such things happened to people in ancient times, then it is no wonder that they still happen today."³ According to this account, Yin-yüan put into perspective the negative criticism he himself was receiving by comparing himself to two pivotal figures in Zen history: the founder of Zen in China, and the very first Chinese Zen master to emigrate to Japan. Bodhidharma's story and his importance to the Zen tradition needs no elaboration, but a few words about Lan-hsi's contributions to Japanese Zen are perhaps in order. Before Lan-hsi came to Japan in the mid-thirteenth century, Japanese monks had already introduced Zen to Japan after practicing with Zen masters in China. However, starting with Eisai, all Japanese Rinzai masters had found it necessary to incorporate Tendai and Shingon rituals

¹ Bodhidharma (d. 532) is honored by all schools of Zen as the founder. He is regarded as both the twenty-eighth Indian patriarch and the First Patriarch of Ch'an in China. Traditional accounts relate that he faced serious opposition in China, and that his enemies attempted to kill him with poison a total of six times, but his powers protected him. See Durnoullin, *Zen Buddhism: A History, vol. 1, India and China*, pp. 85-94.

² Lan-hsi Tao-lung 蘭溪道隆 (1213-1278; J. Rankei Dōryū) was the first Chinese Ch'an master to emigrate to Japan. He received the patronage of Hōjō Tokiyori 北條時頼 and founded Kenchō-ji 建長寺 in Kamakura. He later became the abbot at Kennin-ji 建仁寺 in Kyoto. In 1265, he was accused of slander by a disciple and was exiled for a brief time before being pardoned. See D. and A. Matsunaga, *op.cit.*, vol. 2, pp. 219-220, and Collcutt, *op.cit.*, pp. 65-68.

³ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 46. I have been unable to confirm the account in other sources or identify the verse in the *Ingen zenshū*.

into the Zen practice at their temples. Lan-hsi introduced a strict version of the Sung style of Zen that he had learned in China, free from these esoteric accretions. He is therefore credited with establishing the first pure Rinzai practice in Japan. Both Bodhidharma and Lan-hsi traveled to foreign cultures, where they introduced new forms of Buddhist practice. As a result of their work, both faced serious opposition from native masters.

Whether Yin-yüan himself made the remark or his descendents created the episode, the import of the story and the implications inherent in the comparison remain the same. Just as Bodhidharma and Lan-hsi successfully planted the seed of Zen in foreign soil, so Yin-yüan planted the seed that would grow into the Obaku sect, or the True Rinzai sect (Rinzai shōshū 臨濟正宗), as it was known to believers. According to this understanding, Yin-yüan reintroduced the true form of Rinzai Zen at a time when the existing Japanese Rinzai school had reached a low ebb. The story therefore serves as a fine example of the believers' perspective of Obaku Zen's history and the place they reserve for their founder in Japanese Buddhism. The comparison implicitly expresses the earliest generation's hopes for the impact that the Obaku style would have on Japanese Rinzai.

The comparison of the three masters also suggests something of the modern believer's interpretation of Obaku's history. In the modern period, Obaku scholars have crafted different images for their sect, based upon their vision of its history. While the images are multiple, stressing this or that aspect of Obaku's early history, they all present Obaku as a form of mainline, or even pure, Zen Buddhism. Whether they argue that the inclusion of Pure Land elements uniquely captures the proper balance between the high and low tradition, or they prefer to minimize the differences with Japanese Rinzai and emphasize only the similarities, Obaku believers do not regard Obaku as marginal. They take the position that the first generation's hopes were realized not only in the successful transmission of the Obaku line, but in the reforms that revitalized Rinzai in the eighteenth century. They understand Yin-yüan as a pivotal figure in the history of Japanese Buddhism, who played a role in the early modern

period comparable to Bodhidharma in China and Lan-hsi in medieval Japan.

Few Rinzai believers would accept Yin-yüan as the third great transmitter of Zen after Bodhidharma and Lan-hsi. Obaku's position in the tradition seems somewhat different when viewed from the Rinzai perspective. While Yin-yüan and Obaku Zen admittedly influenced Japanese Rinzai, it did not happen in the manner that Yin-yüan or his supporters envisioned. Unlike Lan-hsi, Yin-yüan did not introduce his Zen style at the leading Rinzai temples of the day, nor did his style become the dominant one in Japan. Instead, Obaku took on independent status as a third school of Zen: Rinzai, but not Rinzai; peripheral, rather than mainstream Zen. Rinzai masters eventually adopted many Obaku propensities, including a preference for the recorded sayings of the great masters over kōan anthologies, strict observance of the summer and winter retreats, and renewed emphasis on direct encounters between master and disciple, rather than on literary mastery of kōans. What some have seen as evidence that Obaku reintroduced traditional aspects of Rinzai practice to Japan, others regard as Japanese Rinzai's independent process of recovering its own tradition, independent of Obaku's influence. From the general Rinzai perspective, Obaku remains at best a marginal aspect of the tradition, and at worst an heretical one.

Obaku's greatest contribution to Rinzai Zen may have been in providing an "other" against which Rinzai masters could refine their own understanding of what Rinzai practice should be. The Obaku masters came to Japan at a time when Rinzai monks generally agreed that the sect suffered from severe problems and needed revitalization. Individual masters, especially abbots at various major temples, attempted reform programs throughout the early years of the Tokugawa period. These attempts eventually culminated in the work of Hakuin, whose reforms shaped the form of Rinzai Zen familiar today. Unfortunately, initial attempts at reform met with only limited success, because a consensus had not yet been forged as to the best method to attain the common goal. Indeed, the early Tokugawa masters did not even agree on the content of the goal of reform. Tensions over issues like the proper

understanding of the precepts demonstrate that deep divisions existed within the school. While Rinzai masters were struggling to delineate the contours of true Rinzai practice, Obaku Zen proved a useful foil. For instance, despite Obaku's clear preference for strict observance of the monastic rule, Rinzai monks like the author of the *Zenrin shûhei shû* presented Obaku practice as riddled with corruption based upon that very rule. Rinzai adherents could use the image of Obaku as impure Zen to help define their understanding of pure Zen. Much of this process of self-definition took place after Obaku had attained a high degree of independence from Japanese Rinzai. However, it created the strong impression for later generations that Rinzai and Obaku had originally divided because Rinzai rejected Obaku as impure Zen.

Throughout this dissertation, I have argued that the schism between Obaku and Rinzai Zen resulted from a highly complex web of tensions, tensions based on factors internal to the Rinzai community and external, religious and political in nature. Moreover, the internal issues over the proper understanding of Rinzai practice that arose between pro- and anti-Obaku factions were not simply the result of differences between "pure" Sung style of Zen and the syncretic Ming style. They were largely the result of tensions within the Zen teachings themselves that resurfaced in the early Tokugawa period. By exploring Obaku's position within this landscape of tensions— in general terms in the first half of the dissertation, and in more specific terms in the examination of the teachings of Tetsugen Dôkô— I have demonstrated that the schism was not a simple matter of Rinzai rejecting Obaku, but a manifold process of alienation coupled with mutual influence. The result of this process was two distinct, independent schools of Zen that, oddly enough, have more in common after two and a half centuries than they had at the start.

Much of the analysis presented in this dissertation has necessarily been preliminary in nature. Since existing secondary sources do not adequately set out Obaku's history or its place within the religious and sociopolitical context of early Tokugawa Japan, that first level of

inquiry necessarily had to precede higher levels of analysis. For example, the brief presentation in Chapter Three on Obaku's ritual practice could be greatly enhanced by the application of ritual theory in conjunction with closer readings of the primary source material based upon its normative interpretation by Obaku practitioners. This would provide a much clearer portrait of the distinctive aspects of Obaku practice in relation to other schools of Zen. Such a study has not, to my knowledge, ever been undertaken. It would be, in any event, virtually unintelligible without the basic framework of Obaku's history and teaching style laid out here in the first portion of the dissertation.

Despite the basic limitations in the present work, the study nonetheless introduces a number of possibilities for further research and analysis. For instance, Obaku's manipulations of its own history to enhance its chances of survival in the modern period were only touched upon here as they related to an understanding of Obaku in the Tokugawa period. However, the evidence presented suggests that a further study of Obaku in the Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa periods could fruitfully be used to explore the process of history formation as a creative force within the sect's redefinition in the face of new challenges. It would also be possible, in the same context, to explore the validity of observations made recently by Obaku scholars that Obaku masters of the modern period purposefully distorted Obaku's teachings, specifically the Pure Land elements, in an effort to popularize the sect. There exists a wealth of material to conduct this kind of research, including historical studies by Obaku scholars of the modern period, popular materials that appeared in devotional periodicals like *Zenshū* or were independently published at Obaku-san Mampuku-ji for lay believers. Such a study would contribute to work being done by scholars like James Ketelaar, who have examined movements of self-definition within the broader Buddhist context in Japan in the modern period.⁴

Research into Obaku in the Tokugawa period could likewise be extended laterally through detailed studies of the more prominent among the first generation Chinese masters

⁴ Ketelaar, op.cit. See especially Chapter Five, "The Making of History: Buddhism and Historicism in Meiji Japan", pp. 174-212.

and Japanese converts, as done for Tetsugen Dôkô here. Much work has already been done on the founder, Yin-yüan, but the other Obaku masters remain virtually faceless, despite their impact on the development of Obaku. Yin-yüan's successor, Mu-an, trained and certified nearly fifty Dharma heirs, thus determining to a great extent the human character of the sect. The third of the triumvirate of great Chinese Obaku masters, Chi-fei, comes across in the traditional accounts as a colorful figure, who behaved much like the Zen masters of the T'ang and Sung dynasties.⁵ Of the Japanese masters, there are several that warrant more attention. Tetsugyû not only involved himself with spreading Obaku by gaining support among the samurai class and founding temples, he also worked among the common people on practical projects like land reclamation. Chôn deeply involved himself in the disputes of the day, especially on the issue of kôan practice and Dharma transmission. A work on a select group of early Obaku masters could potentially provide insights into the process of Obaku's expansion in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. It would give a clearer picture of the degree to which Obaku masters participated in the various disputes of the day, leading to the eventual reform of Rinzai Zen under the guidance of Hakuin.

When Tetsugen approached Yin-yüan for his permission to undertake the Tripitaka project, Yin-yüan is said to have warned him about the harsh criticism he would inevitably encounter. Yin-yüan gave to Tetsugen the verse he had originally applied to himself: "When the First Patriarch Bodhidharma came to the west [i.e. China], he was given poison. When Lan-hsi came to the east [i.e. Japan], he was falsely accused of slander. If such things happened to people in ancient times, then it is no wonder that they still happen today."⁶ Yin-yüan

⁵ One story about Chi-fei is commonly used by Obaku scholars to illustrate his similarity to the great masters of the past. Apparently, Chi-fei and Mu-an both officiated at the ceremony dedicating the images of the eighteen arhats enshrined in the Daiyûhô-den at Mampuku-ji. The ceremony is called *kaigen* 開眼, literally "opening the eyes". Mu-an solemnly lit the incense, bowed, and intoned the words of scripture in front of each of the eight images whose eyes he symbolically opened. Chi-fei walked up to each image in turn, rapped it sharply between the eyes, saying, "This monk's eyes are already open." Takahashi Ryôwa, *Obakusan Mampukuji*, pp. 197-198.

⁶ Akamatsu, *Tetsugen*, p. 46.

encouraged Tetsugen to understand his own situation by drawing upon examples from Zen history. Zen masters of every generation do the same. One may say that Zen is constantly in the business of creatively reformulating its history as a means to understand the present and the teachings. Zen literature abounds with examples of histories of the sect, stories of the transmission of the lamp of the Dharma that locate individual lineages in the sacred history of Buddhism. Obaku has been no different in the modern period as it retold its own story to meet the needs of the moment.

Bibliography

- Addiss, Stephen. *Obaku: Zen Painting and Calligraphy*. Lawrence, Kansas: Helen Foresman Spencer Museum of Art, 1978.
- Akane Shôdô 赤根祥道. *Meisô no kotoba* 名僧の言葉. Tokyo: Chûkei shuppan, 1988.
- Akamatsu Shinmyô 赤松晋明. "Obaku kôyô" 黄檗綱要. In *Bukkyô daigaku kôza* 仏教大学講座, vol. 5. Tokyo: Bukkyô nenkansha, 1934.
- , ed. *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* 鉄眼禪師仮字法語. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1989 (Reprint of 1941).
- . *Tetsugen zenji* 鐵眼禪師. Tokyo: Kôbundô shobô, 1942.
- . *Tetsugen* 鐵眼. Tokyo: Yûzankaku, 1943.
- . "Obaku no shinpû" 黄檗の新風. In *Daihôrin* 大法輪, 24/5 (1957), pp. 76-78.
- . "Tetsugen to Issaikyôhan" 鐵眼禪師と一切經版. In *Zen bunka* 禪文化, no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 56-64.
- Akao Ryûji 赤尾龍治, ed. *Bankei zenji zenshû* 盤珪禪師全集. Tokyo: Daizô shuppan, 1970.
- Ashikaga Zuigi 足利瑞義. *Ryûkoku daigaku sanbyakunen shi* 龍谷大学三百年史. Kyoto: Ryûkoku daigaku shuppanbu, 1939.
- Ban Kôkei 伴蒿蹊. *Kinsei kijinden* 近世畸人傳, vol. 2. Kyoto: Hishiya Magobe, 1790.
- . *Sentetsu zô den, Kinsei kijin den, Hyakka kikô den* 先哲像傳、近世畸人傳、百家畸行傳. Tokyo: Yûhôtô bunko, 1927.
- . *Kinsei kijin den* 近世畸人傳. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1940.
- Bellah, Robert. *Tokugawa Religion; The Cultural Roots of Modern Japan*. New York: The Free Press, 1985.
- Berling, Judith A. *The Syncretic Religion of Lin Chao-en*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.
- Bielefeldt, Carl. *Dôgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- . "Ch'ang-lu Tsung-tse's *Tso-ch'an* / and the "Secret" of Zen Meditation". In *Traditions of*

Meditation in Chinese Buddhism, Peter N. Gregory, ed, pp. 129-161.

Blacker, Carmen. *The Catalpa Bow: A Study of Shamanistic Practices in Japan*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982.

Bloom, Alfred. *Shinran's Gospel of Pure Grace*. Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1985.

Bodiford, William M. *The Growth of the Sôtô Zen Tradition in Medieval Japan*, 2 vols. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1989.

———. "Dharma Transmission in Sôtô Zen; Manzan Dôhaku's Reform Movement." In *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 46, no. 4 (Winter 1991), pp. 423-451.

Chan, Wing-tsit, trans. *Reflections on Things at Hand: The Neo-Confucian Anthology*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Chang, Garma C.C. *The Buddhist Teaching of Totality*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.

Chang Sheng-yen 張聖嚴. *Minmatsu Chûgoku bukkhô no kenkyû-toku ni Chigyoku o chûshin to shite* 明末中国仏教の研究—特に智旭を中心として. Tokyo: Sankibô busshorin, 1975.

Chappell, David W. "From Dispute To Dual Cultivation: Pure Land Responses to Ch'an Critics". In *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., pp. 163-197.

Ch'en, Kenneth. *Buddhism in China: A Historical Survey*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.

Collcutt, Martin. *Five Mountains; The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1981.

———. "Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication". In *Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*, Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman, eds., pp. 143-167.

Conze, Edward. *Buddhist Wisdom Books: The Diamond and the Heart Sutra*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1988.

———. *Buddhist Scriptures*. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1959.

Cook, Francis H. *Sounds of Valley Streams; Enlightenment in Dôgen's Zen*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.

Cowell, E.B., ed. *Buddhist Mahayana Texts*. New York: Dover Publications, 1969.

Dai nihon bukkhô zensho 大日本佛教全書. 100 volumes. Suzuki Gakujutsu, ed. Tokyo: Kodansha hatsubai, 1970-1974

David L. Davis. "Ikki in Late Medieval Japan." In *Medieval Japan: Essays in Institutional History*, John W. Hall and Jeffrey P. Mass, eds. Stanford: Stanford university Press, 1974.

- Dôkei 道契 and Ouchi Seiran 大内青巒. *Zoku nihon kôshô den* 續日本高僧傳. In *Dai nihon bukkyô zensho* 大日本佛教全書, vol. 64, no. 473, pp. 1-98.
- Dore, R.P. *Education in Tokugawa Japan*. London: The Athlone Press, 1984.
- Dumoulin, Heinrich. *A History of Zen Buddhism*. Paul Peachey, trans. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.
- . *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 1, India and China*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988.
- . *Zen Buddhism: A History, Volume 2, Japan*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1990.
- Fan Hui 梵輝. "Ingen zenji to chûnichi ryô Obakusan no yurai" 隱元禪師と中日両黄檗山の由来. Nishio Kenryû 西尾賢隆, trans. In *Zengaku kenkyû* 禅学研究, 61 (1982), pp. 118-123.
- Foccardi, Gabriele. *The Last Warrior: The Life of Cheng Ch'eng-kung The Lord of the "Terrace Bay" A Study on the T'ai-wan wai chih by Chiang Jih-sheng (1704)*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Otto Harrassowitz, 1986.
- Foulk, Theodore Griffith. *The "Chan School" and Its Place in the Buddhist Monastic Tradition*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1987.
- Fuji Masaharu 富士正晴 and Abe Zenryô 安部禅梁. *Mampukuji* 萬福寺. Koji junrei Kyôto 古寺巡礼京都, vol. 9. Kyoto: Tankôsha, 1977.
- Fujishima Tatsurô 藤島達朗. *Nihon bukkyô o sasaeta 33 hito* 日本仏教をささえた33人. Kyoto: Hôzôkan, 1991.
- Fujiwara Tôen 藤原東演. *Zen no meisô retsuden* 禅の名僧列伝. Tokyo: Kôsei shuppansha, 1990.
- Fujiyoshi Jikai 藤吉慈海, ed. *Zen to nembutsu: Sono gendaiteki igi* 禅と念仏その現代的. Tokyo: Daizô shuppan, 1983.
- . *Zen to Jôdokyô* 禅と浄土教. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1989.
- Funaoka Makoto 船岡誠. Takuan 沢庵. Tokyo: Chûô kôronsha, 1988.
- Furuichi Katsuzen, ed. 古市活禪. *Gomizunoo tenno to Obaku* 御水尾天皇と黄檗. Uji, Japan: Tôrin-in, 1929.
- Furuta Shôkin 古田紹欽. *Zenshû kana hôgo* 禅宗仮名法語. Tokyo: Daizo shuppan, 1980.
- . "Dôsha Chôgen no raichô to sono eikyô" 道者超原の來朝とその影響. In *Furuta Shôkin chosakushû* 古田紹欽著作集, vol. 2 *Zenshûshi kenkyû* 禅宗史研究, pp. 343-365.

- . "Chōon Dōkai no Rinzaï/Sōtō zen hihan" 潮音道海の臨濟／曹洞禪批判. In *Furuta Shōkin chosakushū* 古田紹欽著作集, vol. 2 *Zenshūshi kenkyū* 禪宗史研究, pp. 412-424.
- . *Furuta Shōkin chosakushū* 古田紹欽著作集, 14 vols. Kodansha, 1981.
- . *Kinsei no zensha-tachi* 近世の禪者達. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1981.
- . "Tetsugen Dōkō o shinobu" 鉄眼道光を偲ぶ. In *Daihōrin* 大法輪, 53/5 (May, 1986), pp. 62-67.
- Gregory, Peter, ed. *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*. The Kuroda Institute for the Study of Buddhism and Human Values, Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 4. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- Groner, Paul. *Saichō and the Bodhisattva Precepts*, 2 vols. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1979.
- . *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School*. Berkeley Buddhist Studies series, vol. 7. Berkeley: Institute of Buddhist Studies, 1984.
- Hakeda, Yoshito S., trans. *The Awakening of Faith*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Hasabe Yūkei 長谷部幽蹊. "Min Shin jidai ni okeru zenritsu ryōshū kōka no dōkō" 明清時代における禪律兩宗弘化の動向. In *Zen kenkyūsho kiyō* 禪研究所紀要, 20 (1991), pp. 183-203.
- Hashimoto Hiroshi 橋本博. *Kaitei zōho Daibukan* 改訂増補大武鑑, 3 vols. (Reprint of 1940 edition.) Tokyo: Meicho Kankokai, 1965.
- Haskel, Peter. *Bankei Zen: Translations from the Record of Bankei*. Yoshita Hakeda, ed. New York: Grove Press, 1984.
- Hattori Eijun 服部英淳. "Zenjō yūgō shisō ni okeru jōdo no kaimei" 禪淨融合思想における淨土の解明. In *Bukkyō daigaku* 仏教大学, 50 (Sept. 1966), pp. 83-91.
- Hattori Fumio 服部文雄. "Ingen to Obaku jīn" 隠元と黄檗寺院. In *Gekkan bunka zai* 月刊文化財, 163 (1977), pp. 4-13.
- Hawley, John Stratton, ed. *Saints and Virtues*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Hayashi Bunshō 林文照. "Obaku o kataru" 黄檗を語る. In *Obaku kenkyū shiryō* 黄檗研究資料, no. 2, pp. 1-23. Kyoto: Obakushū shūmu hōin, no date.
- Heng-ching Shih. "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism". In *Buddhist Thought and Ritual*, Kalupahana, David, ed., pp. 69-84.

- Hirada Hiromichi 原田弘道. "Chûsei zenshû to nembutsuzen" 中世禪宗と念仏 禪. In IBK, 31/2 (1983), pp. 61-65.
- Hirakubo Akira 平久保章. *Ingen 隠元*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kôbunkan, 1962.
- . "Edo jidai ni okeru Mampukuji no shûrihi ni tsuite" 江戸時代における万福寺の修理費について. In *Kinsei bukkyô; shiryô to kenkyû* 近世仏教、史料と研究, 3/1 (Nov., 1963), pp. 1-11.
- . *Ingen zenshû 隠元全集*, 12 vols. Tokyo: Kaimyô shoin, 1979.
- . "Mokuan zenshû no henshû ni tsuite" 木庵全集の編集について. In *Ôbaku bunka* 黄檗文華, no. 67 (Jan. 1983), pp. 1-2.
- Hirano Sôjô 平野宗浄. *Ungo oshô nempû* 雲居和尚の年譜. Kinsei zensôden 近世禪僧伝, no. 3. Kyoto: Shibunkaku shuppan, 1983.
- . "Rinzai zen to nembutsu" 臨濟禪と念仏. In *Zen to nembutsu: Sono gendaiteki igi* 禪と念仏その現代的意義, pp. 77-94. Tokyo: Daizô shuppan, 1983.
- Hsu, Sung-peng. *A Buddhist Leader in Ming China; The Life and Thought of Han-shan Te-ch'ing*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1979.
- Hurvitz, Leon. *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of Fine Dharma (The Lotus Sûtra)*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Iida Rigyô 飯田利行. *Gakushô Mujaku Dôchû* 学聖無著道忠. Kyoto: Zen bunka kenkyûsho, 1986.
- "Ingen zenji no yuisho mokuroku" 隠元禪師の遺書目録. In *Zenshû* 禪宗, 264 (1917), pp. 21-25.
- Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高. *Rinzairoku* 臨濟録. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1989.
- Ishida Seisai 石田誠齋. *Tetsugen to Hôshû* 鐵眼と寶洲. Osaka: Ishida bunkô, 1922.
- Itô Kokan 伊藤古鑑. "Gudô Kokushi no zen" 愚堂国師の禪. In *Zengaku kenkyû* 禪学研究, 49 (Feb. 20, 1959), pp. 1-22.
- . *Nihon zen no shôtô Gudô* 日本禪の正燈愚堂. Tokyo: Shunjûsha, 1969.
- Jansen, Marius B. *China in the Tokugawa World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- , and Gilbert Rozman, eds. *Japan in Transition from Tokugawa to Meiji*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Japanese Religion; A Survey by the Agency for Cultural Affairs*. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1972.

- Jôetsu Kyôiku Daigaku shozô Obaku Tetsugenban Issaikyô Mokuroku* 上越教育大学所蔵黄檗鐵眼版一切經目錄 Jôetsu-shi, Japan: Jôetsu kyôiku daigaku fuzoku toshokan, 1988.
- Kagamishima Genryû 鏡島元隆. *Manzan/Menzan* 叡山/面山. *Nihon no zen goroku* 18 日本の禪語録. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1978.
- Kagamishima Genryû, Satô Tatsugen 佐藤達玄, and Kosaka Kiyû 小坂機融. *Yakuchû Zen'en shingi* 訳註禪苑清規. Tokyo: Sôtôshû shûmuchô, 1972.
- Kalupahana, David, ed. *Buddhist Thought and Ritual*. New York: Paragon House Publishers, 1991.
- Kasahara Kazuo 笠原一男. *Ikkô ikki no kenkyû* 一向一揆の研究. Tokyo: Yamakawa shuppan, 1962.
- . *Ikkô ikki—sono kôdô to shisô* 一向一揆—その行動と思想. *Nihonjin no kôdô to shisô* 日本人の行動と思想 series, no. 5. Tokyo: Hyôronsha, 1970.
- Kawakami Kozan 川上孤山. *Myôshinjishi* 妙心寺史. Kyoto: Shinbunkaku, 1984.
- Keene, Donald. *The Battles of Coxinga*. Cambridge Oriental Series, no. 4. London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951.
- Ketelaar, James Edward. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and its Persecution*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.
- King, Winston L. *Death Was His Koan: The Samurai Zen of Suzuki Shôsan*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1986.
- Kishimoto Hideo. *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*. John F. Howes, trans and ed. Tokyo: Obunsha, 1956.
- Kitagawa, Joseph M. *Religion in Japanese History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Kôchi Eigaku 光地英学. "Chûgoku ni okeru zenjô kankei" 中国における禪淨関係. In *Komazawa daigaku bukkkyô gakubu kenkyû kiyô* 駒沢大学仏教学部研究器具, 30 (March, 1972), pp. 1-6.
- Kumakura Isao 熊倉功夫. *Gomizunoon* 御水尾院. Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha, 1982.
- Kurabayashi Kando 榎林皓堂. "Gesshu no Undô jôki to Obaku shingi" 月舟の雲堂常規と黄檗清規. In *IBK* 5/1 (1957), pp. 108-109.
- Luk, Charles. *The Sûrangama Sûtra (Leng Yen Ching)*. London: Rider & Company, 1966.
- Maruyama Masao. *Studies in the Intellectual History of Tokugawa Japan*. Mikiso Hane, trans. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press and Princeton University Press, 1974.

- Matsui Shōten 松井昭典. "Sôtōshū to shoki Ōbaku to no kōshō" 曹洞と初期黄 檗との交渉. In IBK 15/1 (1966), pp. 324-326.
- Matsunaga Chikai 松永知海. "Obakuban daizōkyō no saihyōka" 黄檗版大蔵経の再評価. In *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 仏教史学研究 34/2 (October 1991), pp. 132-162.
- Matsunaga, Daigan and Alicia Matsunaga. *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism, vols. I and II*. Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International, 1974 and 1976.
- McMullin, Neil. *Buddhism and the State in Sixteenth-Century Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- McRae, John R. *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*. Kuroda Institute Studies in East Asian Buddhism, no. 3. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.
- Miura, Isshu and Ruth Fuller Sasaki. *Zen Dust*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1966.
- Minamoto Ryōen 源了圓. *Tetsugen* 鉄眼. *Nihon no zen goroku* 日本の禅語録, vol. 17. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1979.
- . *Tetsugen kanaji hōgo* 鉄眼仮名法語. *Zen no koten* 禅の古典, vol. 9. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1982.
- Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信享. *Chūgoku jōdo kyōrishi* 中国浄土教理史. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1964.
- Morimoto Sangai 森本三鎧. "Ryōō" 了翁. In *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 45-50.
- . "Ōbaku no nembutsu zen" 黄檗の念佛禅. In *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 76-78.
- Moriya Katsuhisa. "Urban Networks and Information Networks". In *Tokugawa Japan: The Social and Economic Antecedents of Modern Japan*, Chie Nakane and Shinzaburō Oishi, eds, pp. 97-123.
- Mote, Frederick W. and Denis Twitchett, eds. *The Cambridge History of China, Volume 7 The Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644, Part I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Mujaku Dōchū 無著道忠. *Obaku geki* 黄檗外記. MS, no date.
- Murai Sanae 村井早苗. "Shie jikengo no chōbaku kankei" 紫衣事件後の朝幕関係. In *Kinsei bukkyō; shiryō to kenkyū* 近世仏教；史料と研究, 6/1 (March, 1983), pp. 1-11.
- Nagai Masano 永井政之. "Minmatsu ni ikita zenshatachi—Hiin Tsūyō ni yoru Gotōgentō no seiritsu" 明末に生きた禅者達—費隱通容による五灯嚴統の成立. In *Shūkyōgaku ronshū* 宗教学論集, 9 (1978-79), pp. 329-343.
- Nakai, Kate Wildman. *Shogunal Politics: Arai Hakuseki and the Premises of Tokugawa Rule*.

Cambridge, Massachusetts: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University, 1988.

Nakajima Shigeo 中嶋繁雄. *Nihon meisô 100 hanashi* 日本名僧 100 話. Tokyo: Rippû shobô, 1980.

Nakamura Hidemitsu 中村秀光. *Tetsugenji kiroku* 鉄眼寺記録. Osaka: Zuiryû-ji, 1964.

Nakamura, Kyoko Motomachi, trans. *Miraculous Stories from the Japanese Buddhist Tradition: The Nihon Ryôiki of the Monk Kyôkai*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Nakamura Shû sei 中村秀晴. "Mokuan zenji to sono wasô shihôsha" 木庵禪師とその和僧嗣法者. In *Obaku bunka* 黄檗文華, no. 67 (Jan. 1983), pp. 11-13.

Nakane, Chie and Shinzaburô Oishi. *Tokugawa Japan: The Social and Economic Antecedents of Modern Japan*. Conrad Totman, ed.. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press, 1990.

Nakao Fumio 中尾文雄. "Obakushu to wa" 黄檗とは. In *Obaku kenkyû shiryô* 黄檗研究資料, no. 2, pp. 30-33. Kyoto: Obakushu shûmu hôin, no date.

———. *Gomizunoo hôô to Obakushû* 御水尾法皇と黄檗宗. Uji, Japan: Obaku-san Mampuku-ji, 1979.

Nihon kyôkasho taiei, kindaihen, vol. 7 and 8 kokugo 日本教科書大系、近代編、国語. Kaigo Muneomi 海後宗臣, ed. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1963.

Nishio Kenryû 西尾賢隆. "Obaku kankei zasshi ronbun mokuroku" 黄檗関係雑誌論文目録. In *Zengaku kenkyû* 禅学研究, 61 (1982), pp. 10-12.

Nosco, Peter, ed. *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Obaku Mokuan oshô nempu 黄檗木菴和尚年譜. Wood block edition, 2 fasc. Kyoto: I Inbôsho, 1695.

Ogisu Jundô 荻須純道. "Ingen zenji to Obakusan" 隠元禪師と黄檗山. In *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 9-21.

———. *Myôshinji* 妙心寺. Jisha shirizu 2 寺社シリーズ 2. Kyoto: Tôyôbunkasha, 1977.

———. *Zenshûshi no sansaku* 禅宗史の散策. Kyoto: Shibunkaku shuppan, 1981.

Oishi Morio 大石守雄. "Obaku shingino kenkyû" 黄檗清規の研究. In *Zengaku kenkyû* 学研究, 41 (1959), pp. 142-149.

Onda Akira 恩田彰. "Zen to nembutsu no shinrigakuteki hikaku kôsatsum" 禅と念仏の心理学的比較考察. In IBK, 23/1 (1974), pp. 1-7.

Ooms, Herman. *Tokugawa Ideology: Early Constructs, 1570-1680*. Princeton: Princeton

University Press, 1985.

Otsuki Mikio 木槻幹郎. "Obakushû" 黄檗宗. In *Obaku kenkyû shiryô* 黄檗研究資料, no. 2, pp. 34-41. Kyoto: Obakushu shûmu hôin, no date.

——, Katô Shôshun and Hayashi Yukimitsu 加藤正俊, 林雪光. *Obaku bunka jinmei jiten* 黄檗文化人名辞典. Kyoto: Shinbunkaku Shuppan, 1988.

Ri Kenshō 李猷璋. "Nagasaki santôji no seiritsu" 長崎三唐寺の成立. In *Kinsei bukkyô: shiryô to kenkyû* 近世仏教: 史料と研究, 3/1 (Oct. 1963), pp. 73-90.

Rinoie Masafumi 李家正文. *Obaku sanketsu Egoku Dômyô zenji den* 黄檗三傑慧極道明禪師伝. Tokyo: Daizô shuppan, 1981.

Robinson, Richard H., and Willard L. Johnson. *The Buddhist Religion: A Historical Introduction*, third edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1982.

Sasaki Gôzo 佐々木剛三. *Mampukuji* 万福寺. Tokyo: Chûô koron bijutsu shuppan, 1964.

Satô Fumitsugu 佐藤文承. *Tetsugen zenji monogatari* 鐵眼禪師物語. Kyoto: Shimeisha, 1927.

Satô Tatsugen 佐藤達玄. "Obakushû" 黄檗宗. In *Nihon no shûkyô* 日本の宗教, vol. 3, Takachiho Tetsujô 高千穂徹乗, ed, pp. 121-162. Tokyo: Hôbunkan shuppan, 1962.

Schwaller, Dieter. *Der japanische Obaku-Mönch Tetsugen Dôkô; Leben, Denken, Schriften*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1989.

Sekida, Katsuki. *Two Zen Classics: Mumonkan and Hekiganroku*. A.V. Grimstone, ed. New York: Weatherhill, 1977.

Shibata Masumi 柴田増實. "Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo no furansugoyaku ni tsuite" 鐵眼禪師假名法語のフランス語譯について. In *Zen bunka* 禅文化 no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 78-80.

Shih, Heng-ching. "Yung-ming's Syncretism of Pure Land and Ch'an". In *The Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*, 10/1 (1987), pp. 117-135.

——. "The Syncretism of Chinese Ch'an and Pure Land Buddhism". In *Buddhist Thought and Ritual*, David Kalupahana, ed., pp. 69-84.

Shimoda Kyokusui 下田曲水, ed. *Kokutei kyôkasho ni arawaretaru meisô Tetsugen* 国定教科書に現はれたる名僧鐵眼. Kumamoto: Kumamoto-ken kyôikukai, 1928.

Sôtôshû zensho, Kaidai sakuin 曹洞宗全書、解題索引, vol. 5. Tokyo: Sôtôshû Zensho Kankokai, 1978.

Stevenson, Daniel B. "The Four Kinds of Samadhi in Early T'ien-t'ai Buddhism". In *Buddhist Thought and Ritual*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., pp. 45-97.

- Suzuki Daisetz Teitaro. "Zen and Jôdo, Two Types of Buddhist Experience." In *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. 4, no. 2 (July, August, September, 1927), pp. 89-121.
- , trans. *The Lankavatara Sutra*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1932.
- . *Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series)*. Christopher Humphreys, ed. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1970.
- Suzuki Ryûshu 鈴木竜珠, ed. *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* 鉄眼禅師假名字法語. Uji-shi, Japan: Obaku-san Hôzô-in, 1981.
- Takahashi Chikumei 高橋竹迷. *Ingen, Mokuan, Sokuhi* 隠元、木庵、即非. Tokyo: Kokushorî kôkai, 1978 (Reprint from 1916).
- Takahashi Ryôwa 高橋良和. *Obakusan Mampukuji* 黄檗山萬福寺. Kyoto: Tankyûsha, 1976.
- Takemura Shin'ichi 竹村真一. *Minchôtai no genryû* 明朝体の源流. Kyoto: Shibunkaku shuppan, 1986.
- Takenuki Genshō 竹貫元勝. *Nihon zenshûshi* 日本禅宗史. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan, 1989.
- . *Kinsei Obakushû matsujichō shûsei* 近世黄檗宗末寺帳集成. Tokyo: Yuzankan, 1990.
- Tamamura Takeji 玉村竹二. *Rinzaishûshi* 臨濟宗史. Tokyo: Shunjûsha, 1991.
- Tetsugen Dôkô 鉄眼道光. *Tetsugen zenji yuiroku* 鐵眼禅師遺録. Wood block edition, 2 fasc.. Pub. 1691.
- Toby, Ronald P. *State and Diplomacy in Early Modern Japan: Asia in the Development of the Tokugawa Bakufu*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Torigoe Fumikuni 鳥越文邦. *Hiin zenji to sono cho, Gotôgentô* 費隠禅師と其の著、五燈嚴統. Oomuta-shi: Daijisan Enichizenji, 1986.
- Toyama Mikio 外山幹夫. *Nagasaki rekishi no tabi* 長崎歴史の旅. Tokyo: Asahi shimbunsha, 1990.
- Toyoda Takeshi 豊田武. *Nihon shûkyô seido shi no kenkyû* 日本宗教制度史の研究. Tokyo: Daiichi shôbô, 1973.
- Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助. *Nihon bukkyôshi, Kinseihen*, vol. 3 日本仏教史、近世編. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1970.
- Tyler, Royall, trans. *Selected Writings of Suzuki Shôsan*. Cornell University East Asian Papers, Number 13. Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Ueda, Yoshifumi and Dennis Hirota. *Shinran: An Introduction to His Thought*. Kyoto: Hongwanji International Center, 1989.

- Ury, Marian. *Tales of Times Now Past*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Waddell, Norman. *The Unborn; The Life and Teaching of Zen Master Bankei*. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984.
- Washio Junkei 鷲尾順敬. *Nihon zenshûshi no kenkyû* 日本禪宗史の研究. Tokyo: Kyoden shuppan kakushiki kaisha, 1945.
- Watt, Paul B. "Jiun Sonja (1718-1804): A Response to Confucianism within the Context of Buddhist Reform". In *Confucianism and Tokugawa Culture*, Peter Nosco, ed., pp. 188-214.
- Webb, Herschel. *The Japanese Imperial Institution in the Tokugawa Period*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1968.
- Wijayaratna, Mohan. *Buddhist Monastic Life: according to the texts of the Theravada tradition*. Claude Grangier and Steven Collins, trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Yampolsky, Philip. *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- . *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971.
- Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. "Mujaku Dôchû no gakumon" 無著道忠の学問. In *Zengaku kenkyû* 禅学研究, 55 (Feb. 1966), pp. 14-55.
- . *Shoki zenshû shisho no kenkyû* 初期禪宗史書の研究. Kyoto: Hôzôkan, 1967.
- . *Rinzai nôto* 臨濟ノ一ト. Tokyo: Shunjûsha, 1971.
- Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i 隱元隆. *Huang-po shan ssu chih* 黃檗山寺志. Chung-kuo fo ssu chih 中國佛寺史志彙刊, vol. 4. T'ai-pei: Tan ch'ing t'u shu kung ssu, 1985 (Reprint of 1922).
- Yokoyama Hideya 横山秀哉. "Zenshû kenchiku zuisô (9)—Obaku no Tennôden" 禪宗建築隨想 (9) —黃檗の天王殿. In *Zen bunka* 禅文化, no. 18 (March, 1960), pp. 51-55.
- Yoshikawa Kôjirô. *Jinsai, Sorai, Norinaga; Three Classical Philologists of Mid-Tokugawa Japan*. Tokyo: The Institute of Eastern Culture, 1983.
- Yoshinaga Utarô 吉永卯太郎. *Obaku no hanashi 3: Tetsugen oshô no kuchi to ashi* 黃檗の話 鐵眼和尚の口と脚. Uji: Obaku shûmon hon'in, 1941.
- . *Tetsugen zenji* 鐵眼禪師. Uji: Obakushû monhon'in, 1942.
- Yu, Chun-fang. *The Renewal of Buddhism in China; Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Zen bunka kenkyûsho 禅文化研究所, eds. *Zenmon itsuwa sen* 禅門逸話選, 3 vols. Kyôto: Zen bunka kenkyûsho, 1987.

Zengaku taikei, vol. 7, *kaihôbu* 禅学大系戒法部. Zengaku taikei hensankyoku, ed. Tokyo: Kokusho kankôkai, 1977 (reprint of 1913 edition).

Zenrin shûheishû 禅林執弊集. Woodblock edition in 2 fascicles, 1700.

Appendix One

The Obaku Geki of Mujaku Dôchû¹

Perhaps a year after Yin-yüan came to Japan [in the seventh month of 1654], Lord Omura 大村殿, the *daimyô* of the Nagasaki area², gave him one hundred pieces of silver, sent by messenger. Yin-yüan used this money to buy live fish and released them into the Chinju Suwanomyôjin lake 鎮守周防の明神の池 in Nagasaki. Somehow all the fish died and floated up to the surface. His interpreter Nihei 仁兵衛 scoffed and said, "The Japanese will never believe in you if you do this sort of thing. Isn't there some other way to spread the Dharma?" Yin-yüan was ashamed and said, "I have no connections with Japan. I should return to China." All the same, it has been a long time and he is still here.

On the ninth day of the ninth month, when Master Jikuin was living at his retreat at Zenrin-ji 禅林寺, Yin-yüan came there one morning, accompanied by seven or eight disciples, arriving while [Jikuin] was still asleep. He pushed open the door, entered, and stroked Jikuin's head to awaken him. When Jikuin started to get up, to his surprise, Yin-yüan patted the mattress with his hand, meaning "You are fine just as you are," and so restrained him. Jikuin sat up in bed and said, "Why have you come so early in the morning?" Yin-yüan replied, "Although I thought I should return to China, the Ch'ing Dynasty has not yet sufficiently quelled the disorders.³ Since Japan is a country where the Buddhist Dharma flourishes, I think that I should

¹ This translation is based upon a photostat copy of the original handwritten copy preserved at Shunkô-in 春光院 at Myôshin-ji. The handwriting on the original has been identified by Yanagida Seizan, the leading expert on Mujaku's writings, as Mujaku's own.

² Omura Suminaga 大村純長 (1636-1706) was *daimyô* from 1651 until his death in 1706, a period which encompasses Yin-yüan's entire stay in Nagasaki.

³ This remark refers to the military resistance waged by Ming loyalists against Ch'ing forces, which continued for nearly twenty years after the suicide of the Ch'ung-chen emperor in 1644. At the time of Yin-yüan's emigration to Japan, Cheng Ch'eng-kung, better known to the West as Coxinga, was successfully extending his military authority over south-eastern China. See *The Cambridge History of*

stay here if I can. Since you know many of the *daimyô*, perhaps you would act as my intermediary and I could build a two-mat hut and raise my Dharma banner⁴."

Jikuin said, "I understand. While I am still alive, there will be no need for you to go back to China. If I were to die, then you would have to return to China." The following day, [Jikuin] wrapped things up in Nagasaki in a single day and then set out for Kamigata [the Kyoto area] the day after that. Master Jikuin was a native of Nagato, and he stopped there [on his way]. While he was there, Yin-yüan sent ahead a letter of about twenty pages, written on what is called *hanshi* 半紙, which was to reach him in Nagato.

A person named Takaya Shintarô 鷹屋新太郎 of Katawara village in Hagi in Nagato province was a lay disciple of Master Jikuin. When I went there, he told me about this letter. Master Jikuin had left it there in his home, and he had it in his care. In it, [Yin-yüan] said, "I would like to publish the *Gotô gentô* 五燈嚴統⁵ soon. I intended to present the scroll to you, but although I have searched for the scroll box, I have not found it."⁶

Master Jikuin went up to Kyoto and consulted with Master Senzan 千山 of Taizô-in 退蔵院,⁷ seeking for like-minded people. There were none, so he went down to Osaka and sought out Master Tangetsu 湛月.⁸ Later, he withdrew. He also sought out Ryôkei 龍溪 and Tokuô China, Volume 7, *The Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644, Part 1*, Frederick W. Mote and Denis Twitchett, eds., pp. 710-721.

⁴ *Hôdô* 法幢, a banner used to announce a sermon or, in the Sôtô sect, to announce a summer or winter retreat. The practice of raising a Dharma banner to announce the location of a sermon is said to have originated in India.

⁵ The *Gotô gentô*, or *Wu-têng yen-t'ung*, was a compilation of Zen lineages written by Yin-yüan's master Fei-yin Tung-yung and Pai-chi Yüan-kung 百癡願公 (n.d.), first published in China in 1653. The original wood blocks were destroyed by government order in 1654. The text was later published in Japan by Yin-yüan in 1657. For further information, see p. 22, note 19.

⁶ Mujaku used indentations to indicate his own insertions into the narrative. Here and elsewhere I have followed the same convention.

⁷ Senzan Genshō (n.d.) was the fifth head monk of Taizô-in, one of the sub-temples at Myōshin-ji. He was Jikuin's Dharma master. See Kawakami, *Myōshinjiishi*, p. 481.

⁸ Tangetsu Shōen 湛月紹円 (1607-1672) was a Myōshin-ji line monk, born into the Nakagawa

禿翁.

Since Master Jikuin was a personal friend of Itakura Minamoto Shidemune Lord of Suo⁹ 板倉周防守源重宗 the *Shoshidai* of Kyoto at that time, he consulted with him. Jikuin said, "The thirty-second generation descendent of Lin-chi [Master Yin-yüan], a worthy teacher, has come to Nagasaki from China and says that he must soon return to China. He is an honored guest of the Rinzai sect in Japan, so I would like to show him some hospitality. By this, I don't just mean to offer him food. I would like to show him the Kyoto area. I would like to go to the Edo *bakufu* with this petition. How should I go about submitting it? I would appreciate your suggestions."

Lord Suo was grinding the tea himself. At first he tried to put Jikuin off by saying that there was nothing he could do. Jikuin said, "Even were I banished [for trying to arrange this], I would regret nothing."

During these frequent visits for consultation, Lord Suo would sometimes invite Jikuin into his private quarters and grind tea. After they had conversed, Lord Suo was favorably impressed and said, "My advice is that you should do such and such in Edo. When you do go to Edo, stop by here the day before you leave." When Jikuin did so, Lord Suo gave him [the equivalent of] ten pieces of silver in small coins wrapped up in two packets. One packet was for his carriage expenses and the other for his lodging. (Master Jikuin said that this was because small coins are easier to use on the road. They weigh less than one *momme*¹⁰.)

In perhaps the tenth month [of 1654], Jikuin went to Edo and made his application at family in Nara. His home temple was Daisen-ji 大仙寺 in Osaka, but he served in various capacities at sub-temples at Myōshin-ji, and twice became abbot, first in 1654 and then again in 1661. He corresponded with Yin-yüan while he was in Nagasaki, and sent at least one disciple to participate in Yin-yüan's first winter retreat in Nagasaki.

⁹ Itakura Shigemune (1586-1656) retired his post as *Shoshidai* of Kyoto in the final months of 1654, but remained in the immediate Kyoto area and continued to have influence until his death. See p. 41, note 64.

¹⁰ The units of measure used during the Tokugawa period were not fixed throughout the country. In the modern period, one *momme* weighs 3.75 g, or 0.1325 oz.

the *Hyôjôsho*¹¹ 評定所, entering it into register number eighteen. The counselors summoned him to their chambers. Matsudaira Lord of Izu¹² 松平伊豆殿, was particularly impressed. He said, "Although I have been in public office for many years, this is the first reasonable petition I have heard. I don't know Yin-yüan, but for a start this Jikuin is commendable."

Though the counselors conferred intently, they didn't make any headway. They knew Lord Izu's opinion because of his opening remark. Lord Izu said, "Since no one among the counselors will act as a leader and take some initiative, we are getting no where. Be that as it may, Sakai Lord of Sanuki¹³ 酒井讃岐殿 seems to have faith in Yin-yüan. It would be best to consult with him." Saying this, he withdrew and consulted with him in private. After that, the petition was settled in the fifth month of the following year [1655], as requested.

Based on a letter of Makino Lord of Oribe¹⁴ 牧野織部殿, it seems that Jikuin went to Edo alone to make the petition. It says that Ryôkei and Tokuô sent Jikuin to invite [Yin-yüan] to Fumon-ji.

At that time, Ryôge-in¹⁵ 龍華院 was built at a single word from Lord Izu. On one occasion, someone at the *Hyôjôsho* said, "Let us consider Yin-yüan second. First, let us consider whether this person Jikuin is from a good family."

¹¹ The *Hyôjôsho* was the highest judicial office of the Tokugawa bakufu. It was established in the 1630's to handle problems that involved more than one jurisdiction or were too complicated for one office to determine alone. For a description of its development, see Nakai, *Shogunal Politics*, pp. 152-153.

¹² Matsudaira Nobutsuna 松平信綱 (1596-1662) was a prominent and powerful member of the bakufu. He became Tokugawa Iemitsu's page at a very young age, in 1604. When Iemitsu became the third shôgun, Nobutsuna rose in power. He advanced to the position of Senior Counsellor, *rôjû* 老中, in 1635.

¹³ Sakai Tadakatsu 酒井忠勝 (1587-1662) became Iemitsu's attendant in 1620. After Iemitsu became shôgun, Tadakatsu advanced rapidly and became deeply involved in bakufu affairs. He retired from public office in 1660, and took the tonsure. His religious name was Kûin 空印.

¹⁴ Makino Chikashige (also read Chikanari) 牧野親成 (1607-1677) began service as page to the Shôgun Iemitsu. He was *daimyô* of various area, including Sekiyado and Settsu provinces, and succeeded Itakura Shigemune as Shoshidai of Kyoto in 1655.

¹⁵ Ryôge-in is one of the sub-temples at Myôshin-ji. Jikuin was the first head monk. Mujaku inherited that position from his master, and greatly expanded the temple.

Matsudaira Lord of Izu, said, "Certainly he is! Jikuin is said to have a large temple at Myôshin-ji, so doubtless he is." After Lord Izu returned home, he summoned Jikuin and said, "I said such and such at the *Hyôjôsho* today. I must build a temple at Myôshin-ji immediately. I will send a letter to Kyoto. Tsuda Michishige 津田道茂 will buy a piece of land and donate it. He will buy Sôchi's¹⁶ 宗知 former residence to be used as the temple." The present *hôte* 方丈 (abbot's hall) at Ryôge-in was a hall built long ago by Sôchi. The kitchen¹⁷, *shoin* 書院 (study hall), gate, library, retreat hut, and toilet were all renovated by myself.

Afterwards, Jikuin returned to Nagasaki and visited Yin-yüan. Yin-yüan then went to stay at Fumon-ji for a time. In the eleventh month of that year, Master Jikuin petitioned Lord Suo, saying, "It is a shame that Yin-yüan is confined in that way."¹⁸ There are people who would like to pay him their respects briefly. Wouldn't it be acceptable to allow them to do so?" Lord Suo replied, "So long as it does not become too obvious, it would be fine for those who wish to pay their respects to do so surreptitiously." Thus official permission was granted verbally. Although [Lord Suo] expected [people to come] one by one, a crowd of thousands gathered and it became widely known from Takatsuki [in Settsu province] to Edo.

Lord Suo summoned Jikuin and severely reprimanded him. When he had finished reprimanding him, Jikuin replied, "Although it may appear that way from your vantage, there is an explanation. There is a main temple of the Ikkô sect in that area, and the visitors who had come for the anniversary of Shinran's death in the eleventh month heard that there was a Chinese person at [Fumon-ji] temple. Although we asked them to enter one at a time, we could not

¹⁶ Unidentified.

¹⁷ Mujaku has used the term *kusu* 庫司, the title used for the six monks charged with administration of the temple, which makes no sense in this context. The sound and characters suggest that he may have meant *kujû* 庫頭, the kitchen, and I have tentatively translated the term as such.

¹⁸ For a description of limitations placed on Yin-yüan during his time at Fumon-ji, see pp. 41-42.

control them and they became disorderly." Lord Suo said, "In that case, I understand."

From time to time, Jikuin had disagreements with Ryôkei. Yin-yüan was a monk [who sought after] fame and wealth, and so he leaned toward Ryôkei's side.

In those days, there was a well-known tailor named Nihei 仁兵衛 (later called Sôkyû 宗休) of Yamagataya, a tailor shop on Sanjô Street [in Kyoto]. Other tailors couldn't make Chinese caps and robes, but this [tailor from] Yamagataya was skilled at making them after taking a single look at them. Therefore, he hung out a signboard saying "Chinese caps and robes" and made them exclusively. On one occasion, Jikuin walked into his shop and saw him sewing a Chinese robe out of purple. Jikuin was shocked and asked, "Who is that for?" Nihei answered, "For the Zen master Yin-yüan."

Then Jikuin went to [Fumon-ji in] Tonda to ask Ryôkei [about this]. Ryôkei said, "The Lady Enkôin 圓光院殿 in Hataeda (Emperor Gosai's foster mother ¹⁹) made a request to the Retired Emperor Gomizunoo and then gave it to Yin-yüan." Jikuin said, "In Zen monasteries in Japan, one only wears a purple robe if one has received an imperial order from the court. One cannot be allowed to wear a purple robe without both the knowledge of the military government and permission from the imperial court."²⁰

The monks on Ryôkei's side cried, "He will wear it!" Monks on Jikuin's side answered, "Just try it! We'll tear it off!"

In his heart, Yin-yüan did not approve of Jikuin at all. Some time later, someone gave Yin-yüan a Sendai paper garment that looked purple in color. Yin-yüan called Jikuin and showed him this paper garment and asked, "Would it be all right if I wore this?"

It says in the *Daizuiroku* 大隨錄²¹, "He would not accept the purple robe that

¹⁹ Mujaku identifies Gosai 後西 (reigned 1656-1663) by his reign name, Kambun-tei 寛文帝. Gosai was Gomizunoo's son. He ascended the throne after his brother Gokômyô 後光明 (reigned 1643-1654) abdicated in his favor.

²⁰ The Rinzai sect had been involved in a scandal involving unauthorized imperial distinctions, including purple robes, before Yin-yüan's arrival in Japan. See pp. 144-148.

²¹ Ta-sui Fa-ch'en ch'an-shih yü-lu 大隨法真禪師語錄 (J. *Daizui Hosshin zenji goroku*), one

the Szechuan king offered him. He refused all three times."²²

On the evening of the fifteenth day of the eighth month, an evening when they were moon viewing at Fumon-ji, Yin-yüan asked Jikuin, "Would it be better if I relied upon Ryôkei?" In his own mind, Jikuin was thinking that he should resign, so he answered, "You should do as you see fit."

In the end, when Ryôkei and Tokuô went to Edo to petition the bakufu for an audience, Jikuin said, "The illustrious monks of antiquity were sometimes summoned by the king or a minister, but they would not go. Still less would they themselves have desired an audience. It is entirely wrong for this bearded Chinese びげ唐人 to act as if he wants an audience. Yin-yüan has lost his morals." Although he tried to restrain [Ryôkei and Tokuô] with this remark, they did not agree with him. That evening, Jikuin went alone to consult with the Edo *bakufu* and told the counselors that he absolutely had to resign.

His official statement for that occasion said, "Since my superior Ryôkei will relieve me as mediator in Yin-yüan's case, hereafter, please consult with Ryôkei about Yin-yüan." Sakai Lord of Sanuki said, "Yin-yüan will soon be in attendance in Edo. Please wait until then and then it will be fine." Jikuin resigned without acknowledging him.

At the time, the counselors criticized Jikuin for not being a good and trustworthy person. Later on, when they criticized Yin-yüan for not being good, Lord Abe of Bungo 阿部豊後殿 said, "Jikuin is a man of deep understanding."

Nanzan²³ 南山 said that when Jikuin was returning to Kyoto, he encountered Yin-yüan, then on his way to Edo, at Mount Hakone. At the time, Nanzan was going to Edo as Yin-yüan's attendant. He said that they passed one another without either saying a single word to the other.

_____ fascicle, included in the *Kosonshuku goroku* 古尊宿語録, fascicle 35, ZZ 2: 23.4.

²² ZZ 2:23.4, p. 310a. The quotation appears in the biography of Ta-sui, the *Daizui kaizan shinshô zenji gyôjô* 大隨開山神照禪師行狀, which is appended to the *goroku*.

²³ Another name for Tao-che Ch'ao-yüan (1602-1662).

Someone said to me, "When you called Master Yin-yüan a monk [who seeks] fame and wealth, that was a slip of the tongue." I replied, "It's not as if I was speaking carelessly and without evidence, trying to manipulate someone. I knew from his first words that he was that kind of monk. When Yin-yüan first turned to my teacher Jikuin, he said, "Since you know many of the *daimyō*, if you were to act as intermediary in building me a two-mat grass hut, I could set up my Dharma banner." When he said that, I knew for certain that he was a monk [seeking] fame and fortune. In ancient times, truly worthy teachers would never have said such a thing even by mistake, because it wouldn't have entered their minds in the first place. As you might expect, his followers are fools taken in by his deceiving spirit. They fan the fire of decadence all the more. The nation is full of lawless and debauched men who add and subtract from the teachings and do not preserve the precepts at all. Although people say that he will rekindle Japanese Zen, one would better say that he will corrupt it."

In the *Jikusen oshō jōchiroku* ²⁴ 竺仙和尚淨智錄, the Tsai-sung commentary (裁松普說)²⁵ says, "Shen-hsiu²⁶ 神秀 told [the emperor], 'You should speak with the Sixth Patriarch and ask him about the Way.' The Sixth Patriarch firmly [refused] to go.... If something like this were to happen to someone today, they would shout for joy in their heart. If I were virtuous in

²⁴ The *Jikusen oshō goroku* 竺仙和尚語錄, the recorded sayings of Chu-hsien Fan-hsien 竺仙 梵僊 (1292-1348; J. Jikusen Bonsen). 7 fascicles, first published in 1702, contains a section called *Jōchiji goroku* 淨智寺語錄. T. 80, no. 2554.

²⁵ The *Jikusen oshō goroku* contains references to the teachings of the master Tsai-sung 裁松. Tsai-sung is an alternate name used for the Fifth Patriarch Hung-jen 弘忍 (601-674; J. Gunin). It is unclear what relation he bears to the passage quoted here by Mujaku.

²⁶ Shen-hsiu (605?-706), a Dharma heir of the Fifth Patriarch Hung-jen, was the founder of the Northern school of Zen. His Zen style was to be known as the gradual teaching, in contrast to the sudden teaching of Hui-neng's Southern School.

the Way and the emperor summoned me, then I would visit and be made a National Teacher. If necessary, I would make some connections and go to the imperial audience myself. Why would such a summons come? There are those who pile up empty reputation. Ridiculous! Let the person go and ask an acquaintance to visit the teacher..."²⁷

I (Hôu 葆雨) say that Yin-yüan's seeking out an official audience would be hateful to Jikusen. How shameful! How shameful!

Sometime later, when Egoku²⁸ 會極 was at Kenju-ji 猷珠寺 in Kaga province, he asked the *daimyô* to admit him to the hall to preach the Dharma. The governor was well versed in matters past and present. He said, "Illustrious monks of the ancient past refused to go even when they had been invited by officials. Egoku seeking an audience now without my even inviting him is at odds with the illustrious monks of the past." At these words, the group of officials grew jocular. Egoku became ill at ease and eventually left the province. This is also evidence of the lingering style of Yin-yüan.

When I asked him, Tôshuku²⁹ said, "Jikuin took charge of Yin-yüan's [case] and went up to Kyoto from Nagasaki. He asked Senzan about bringing Yin-yüan's case before the bakufu and allowing him to take up [teaching] the Way. Senzan gave his permission. Jikuin consulted with Lord Suo and then went on to Edo. However, I don't know when Ryôkei and Tokuô joined him. I never had the chance to ask Jikuin."

Tôshuku said that in the beginning, a book dealer in Kyoto had twenty to thirty volumes

²⁷ Unidentified.

²⁸ Egoku Dômyô (1632-1721) had been a Myôshin-ji line monk in his youth, and had practiced for a time with Tao-che before becoming Mu-an's disciple. He received *inka* from Mu-an in 1671. See Rinoie, *Obaku sanketsu Egoku Dômyô zenji den*.

²⁹ Tôshuku Shôha 東叔紹坡 (n.d.), a Myôshin-ji line monk from lineage of Gyokuho 玉浦. Little is known of him. He inherited the Dharma from Master Dairin Shôji 大林紹偉 (n.d.), and himself had no Dharma heirs. He attained the monastic rank of *Zendô shuso* 前堂首座 in 1722.

tied together. He came to Senju-in³⁰ 仙寿院 and said, "You can buy all of these together. If you buy them all, I can give you a good price. I won't sell them if you want to sort through them and take [just the ones you want]." Tokuô bought them all and among them were two volumes of Yin-yüan's writings. He read them and found them wonderful.

At that time, [Ryôkei] generously allowed [Tokuô who was living at] Senju-in to bathe in the bathhouse at Ryôan-ji 龍安寺.³¹ One time Tokuô met Ryôkei in the bathhouse and talked about Yin-yüan's recorded sayings. Ryôkei borrowed them, read them and also found them marvelous.

Three years later, when Yin-yüan was coming to Japan, Ryôkei and Tokuô awaited this with great pleasure. They wondered whom they could send to Nagasaki to invite him [to visit Myôshin-ji] and decided that there was no one better than Jikuin. The two of them encouraged him [to go], so he went down to Nagasaki. Soon many people such as Kyorei³² 虚 from Hiroshima, Teishû³³ 鼎宗 from Inaba, and Bansetsu³⁴ 万拙 from Daiyû-in 大雄院 at Myôshin-ji, gathered in Nagasaki.

I have reasoned it out based on this, that since this was the situation originally, Master Jikuin went up to Kyoto, reported directly to Ryôkei and Tokuô, and then the three of them seem to have gone to Edo.

Tôshuku said that according to the records of the monks from Konchi-in 金地院 in

³⁰ Senju-in is one of the sub-temples at Myôshin-ji.

³¹ Ryôkei became head monk at Ryôan-ji in 1629, inheriting that position from his Dharma master Hakubo 伯蒲, who died that year.

³² Kyorei Ryôkaku 虚 了廓 (1600-1691) visited Yin-yüan at Kôfuku-ji and wrote a long report of conditions there. See pp. 97-98 for a full translation of that letter.

³³ Unidentified.

³⁴ Bansetsu Chizen 万拙知善 (d. 1697) was the third generation head monk at Daiyû-in, a sub-temple at Myôshin-ji, at the time of Yin-yüan's arrival in Nagasaki. At Tangetsu's urging, he went to Nagasaki and joined Yin-yüan's assembly. His initial enthusiasm for Obaku waned, and he returned to Myôshin-ji in 1659.

Edo³⁵, there was no need for Yin-yüan to remain in secret. Therefore, one time when Tokuô met with Lord Kuze, the *daimyô* of Yamato 久世大和守殿³⁶. Lord Kuze was also entertaining the magistrate of Christian affairs. Lord Kuze said, "It is most uncouth of you [to ask that] Yin-yüan be allowed to stay. I say this because even if you associate with a person for three to five years, it is still difficult to fathom what is in their hearts. The idea that I could just hear about Yin-yüan and then mediate for him is most uncouth." Tokuô replied, "Although that may be, you can understand and believe in someone like Yüan-wu³⁷ 円悟 or Ta-hui³⁸ 大惠 of the distant past based on just three to five lines of their writings. Certainly in this case, when you have writings such as these of Yin-yüan's, you can believe in him. What is more, Yin-yüan's writings came three years before he arrived. He definitely possesses the rightful transmission from Wu-chun³⁹ 無準, so there is no reason not to trust him." Lord Kuze turned to the magistrate of Christian affairs and said, "What he says is reasonable."

This is a false story. It says in the *Ingen fusôroku* 隠元扶桑録 that Jikuin took the letter from Ryôkei and Tokuô and brought it [to Edo].

Tokuô also said that when Yin-yüan went to Tonda, his petition to the Edo [bakufu] had not yet been decided. At that time, the government generously [allowed] him to go and stay in Tonda while his petition was being decided in Edo.

I say that this is conjecture and not the case.

³⁵ Konchi-in, located in Musashi province, was one of the temples designated by the Tokugawa bakufu to keep an official registry of Japanese monks, in this case, monks from the Gozan temples.

³⁶ Kuze Hiroyuki 久世廣之 (1609-1679) became *daimyô* after his father in 1632 and served until his death.

³⁷ Yüan-wu K'o-ch'in 圓悟克勤 (1063-1135; J. Engo Kokugon) was the fourth generation of the Yang-ch'i line 楊岐 of the Lin-ch'i school. He compiled the *Hekigan roku*.

³⁸ Ta-hui Tsung-kao 大慧宗杲 (1089-1163; J. Daie Sôkô) was one of Yüan-wu's Dharma heirs. He is best known for his harsh criticism of "silent illumination Zen", the style preferred by the Ts'ao-tung (Sôtô) school.

³⁹ Wu-chun Shih-fan 無準師範 (1177-1249; J. Bujun or Mujun Shihan) was a descendent of the Yang-ch'i line. His line was transmitted to Japan in the thirteenth century by Enni Ben'en 圓爾辯圓 (1201-1280).

I say that there is a letter at this temple [Ryôge-in] addressed to the counselors with the three seals of Ryôkei, Tokuô, and Jikuin. Under the circumstances, it seems that they never sent it. In the letter, they explain that Yin-yüan wanted to return to China. How can that be?

According to Tôshuku, Yin-yüan thought that he should return to China because he had been told that it would be difficult for them to decide on his petition to the Edo government while he was staying in Tonda. It was probably a note from that period. (This is false.) However, he was granted thirty thousand *tsubo* in Owada for temple lands and built a temple there.

It seems that this petition was written in the first month. After spending the winter retreat [at Fumon-ji] in Tonda, Yin-yüan asked to return to China. It was written by Tokuô and Ryôkei.

At that time, Tokuô [sent] his apologies to Lord Sado⁴⁰, the *Shoshidai* of Kyoto at the time. He said, "I was originally a monk from the Myôshin-ji line. The three hundred year anniversary of [Kanzan Egen,] the founder of Myôshin-ji, is coming up soon. Since there are many things going on at the temple, I will no longer be mediating for Yin-yüan." With this notification, he resigned. His notice never reached Edo; it was stopped by the *Shoshidai*.

When Yin-yüan went to Edo to request an audience with the shôgun, Jikuin gave his notice to the counselors. He resigned, saying, "Hereafter, please consult with Ryôkei about Yin-yüan." For that reason, Ryôkei and Tokuô accompanied Yin-yüan to Edo. Lord Matsudaira of Izu summoned Ryôkei and Tokuô and ordered that at the time of Yin-yüan's audience, he should bow three times. Tokuô told him that, generally speaking, monks do not bow to kings and high ranking officials according to the rules of Buddhist etiquette, and so they begged his lenience. Lord Izu said that since this was Buddhist etiquette, he would exempt [Yin-yüan] from bowing.

I say that this is quite strange. Lord Izu could not change a decision of the

⁴⁰ Makino Chikashige. See note 12 above.

counselors so easily.

I heard from my Dharma brother Sekkan⁴¹ 雪閑 that at that time the counselors said in council that when the Zen master Ming-chi⁴² 明極 came to Japan, he was made to bow three times to Emperor Godaigo 後醍醐. This was to show the dignity of Japan. This time as well, Yin-yüan should bow three times in like manner.

Ryôkei and Tokuô were troubled. Although they made various apologies, none were accepted. They asked if Yin-yüan could bow once and they each perform one of the other two bows. Finally that was accepted.

Yin-yüan appeared extremely angry with the lords and went on and on about it. (The *Gyôzan*⁴³ section 99/2 says that he clucked his tongue constantly.) They say that this is generally kept secret by the Obaku line.

Tôshuku's story is that this matter of not bowing to the *shogun* was at first kept as a deep secret by Tokuô and that his followers still don't know about it.

Tôshuku said that when Yin-yüan went for his audience with the shogun [Tokugawa Iemitsu at his residence] Ganyû-in, Ryôkei was a former abbot [of Myôshin-ji], so Tokuô went as his attendant. At that time, Tokuô only had the rank of *zendo* 前堂, so he could not go before the *shogun*, and waited outside in another room.

It is said that Yin-yüan sat down in front of the *shogun* without hesitation. Then he stood up and boldly headed directly towards him. Ryôkei said [in Chinese], "Master, come back!"⁴⁴ Yin-yüan withdrew.

⁴¹ Unidentified.

⁴² Ming-chi Ch'u-chün 明極楚俊 (1261-1336; J. Minkî Soshun), a Chinese master from the Lin-chi school, who came to Japan in 1300 and became abbot at Nanzen-ji under the patronage of Emperor Godaigo.

⁴³ *Gyôzandô geki* 堯山堂外紀, a Ming period text of 100 fascicles, composed by Chin-lung 晉陵 and Chiang I-k'ui 蔣一葵, and edited by Chung Shu-fu 仲舒甫.

⁴⁴ The text indicates that Ryôkei spoke in Chinese by giving the pronunciation ホジャンポイキ

Tôshuku said that when Yin-yüan returned to Kyoto, he first came to Senju-in. He came unattended from the center of the city through the *torii* and across the field in front of Tôji-in 等持院. He drew a crowd of spectators as if he were leading them with a hand chime. He stayed two nights at Senju-in and then entered Myôshin-ji. He stopped in at Taizô-in and composed a verse when he viewed the founder's pagoda. (There is a specimen of his handwriting in the storehouse.) Then he came to Ryôge-in and stayed three nights before returning to Tonda.

The twelfth day of the eighth month of Kyôhō 5 (1720).

Written by Dôchû of Ryôge-in.

Gudô Criticizes Yin-yüan

While Daien Hôkan Kokushi⁴⁵ 大円宝鑑国師 [Gudô Tôshoku] was at Kazan⁴⁶ 花山, Gentei (Daishun)⁴⁷ 元貞大春 returned home. It was cold, and Gudô faced the fire and asked him, "Where have you come from?" Gentei replied, "Recently I have been staying at Fumon-ji in Tonda and passed the summer there." Gudô said, "Ever since the Chinese monk Yin-yüan came to Japan, the whole country has been in an uproar. I have not crossed the threshold of his gate. How do the monks at Tonda feel about him?" Gentei said, "Some slander him, and others think that he is wonderful."

Gudô drew in the ashes with the fire tongs and said, "To begin with, Yin-yüan does not understand courtesy. I am the highest ranking monk in the Zen monasteries of Japan. If he wants to spread his Dharma in Japan, then he should first come and consult with me. After that, it would be time enough to save sentient beings according to their ability. If I went to Ch'ing (hojan poiki) with the characters 和尚廻去.

⁴⁵ The honorific title Daien Hôkan Kokushi was bestowed on Gudô in 1662, one year after his death.

⁴⁶ Kazan, often referred to as Kazan-ji, is a hill near the city of Uji, southeast from Kyoto. The reference here is to Gudô's temple Jitoku-ji 慈徳寺, which he built in 1658. The hill was originally the site of Gankei-ji 元慶寺, a Heian period temple of the Tendai sect, founded by the Fujiwara family.

⁴⁷ Daishun Gentei (n.d.) was from the Daiga 大雅 line at Myôshin-ji. He attained the rank of *zendô* in 1669.

China, then I would do as much. And as for that Ryōkei, he's bald and wrinkled. He's old enough to know better. But when he encounters something new he gets himself turned upside down and loses his head. He really should be pitied."

I say that during the Yüan dynasty, monks from India and other central Asian nations were revered and were quite successful as a group. They came and went on horseback like lords and princes. They received the red fur headdresses and were solemn and proud. Famous and virtuous monks throughout the country would always tuck up their robes and rush to meet them to ask them for their blessing. Hsing Hung-chiao 性弘教 made a small bow, turned around and said, "I myself follow the Way. Why would I seek for it from them." (From the *Daimin kôshô den* 大明高僧傳⁴⁸.) Oh! Yin-yüan came to Japan and received respect no less than that of the great Yüan. The words of Gudô surpass those of Lord Hsing. How noble!

Did the Bottom of the Bucket Drop Out?⁴⁹

Master Daishun Gentei [said] that some days when Master Yin-yüan was at Fumon-ji in Tonda, he hung up his staff and mingled with the monks. At lunch time one day, Gentei was serving the others. He lost his grip and dropped the rice bucket. The rice scattered all over the floor. Yin-yüan saw this from a distance, laughed and said, "Did the bottom drop out of the bucket? Did the bottom drop out of the bucket?"

I say that frivolity of this sort shows the vacuity of Yin-yüan's Zen style.

⁴⁸ *Ta-ming kao-seng ch'uan* (J. *Daimin kôshôden*), eight fascicles, a compendium of biographies of Buddhist masters from the Ming period in China. Compiled by Ju-hsing 如惺, published 1617. T. 50, no. 2062. The name Hung-chiao appears twice, p. 906b and 907b. The passage is unidentified.

⁴⁹ The expression 桶底脱 *tôtei datsu* alludes to a passage from the recorded sayings of Hsueh-feng I-ts'un's 雪峰義存 (822-908; J. Seppô Gison), in which the experience of enlightenment is compared to the bottom falling out of a bucket. *Hsueh-feng I-ts'un ch'an-shih yu-lu* 雪峰義存禪師語錄 (J. *Seppo Gison Zenji goro*ku), in the ZZ 2.25.5, p. 473a.

Yin-yüan Speaks Japanese Well

My master Jikūin told Fukuma Takayasa 福間隆廉 that after Yin-yüan had been in Japan a long time, he could speak Japanese well. His servants were mostly Japanese, and he managed to answer them in Japanese. However, he acted as if he didn't know Japanese with all his important guests. Our monks saw this and despised it. Would a truly great teacher be like this? In the long run, his intention was to belittle others.

I say that in his dying instructions, Yin-yüan said that from age to age, Ōbaku-san [Mampuku-ji] should invite Chinese monks to become abbot.[#] As a result of acting as if he didn't know Japanese in dealing with honored guests, his intentions created a single rut [in which his line is trapped]. His group deceives the people, and all of this comes from their founder.

Ryōkei Offers His Whisk⁵⁰

The Retired Emperor Gomizunoo first asked Daien Hōkan Kokushi [Gudō] about the essentials of Zen. After Gudō had passed away, the emperor summoned Ryōkei. After a time, Ryōkei offered the retired emperor one of his whisks. This meant that he wanted to place the emperor's name exclusively on his list of Dharma heirs. The emperor looked upon [the whisk] as a worldly implement. Later, Ryōkei drowned to death in a high flood tide in Naniwa. When the emperor himself was facing death, he sent the whisk along with a message to Akenomiya⁵¹ 明宮 (the emperor's daughter who later became a nun and resided at Pinkyū-ji⁵² 林丘寺). [The

⁵⁰ See pp. 152-157.

⁵¹ Akenomiya, also written 朱宮, is another name for Mitsuko Naishinnō 光子内親王 (1624-1727), fifth child of Emperor Gomizunoo. Her Dharma name was Shōzan Genyō 照山元瑤. She received the precepts from Ryōkei at the same time as her father, in 1665. Kao-ch'üan gave her the name Shōzan in 1681.

⁵² Pinkyū-ji was originally built for Emperor Gomizunoo by the Tokugawa bakufu. He then willed it to his daughter, and she resided there after her death. It is now a Rinzaï Daitoku-ji line temple.

message] said, "This is something for a monk to use; it is useless at the palace. It was originally Ryôkei's religious implement. Please have Kao-ch'üan return it to one of Ryôkei's disciples."

After the emperor passed away, his daughter did exactly what he had requested. Kao-ch'üan accepted the whisk, but told a lie. He said that the emperor wanted to be Ryôkei's Dharma heir. (The emperor merely wanted to return the whisk to Ryôkei's disciples.) Kao-ch'üan did not complete the task of returning it for a long time, so someone slandered him. That person said, "Kao-ch'üan wanted to sever Ryôkei's line. Probably Ryôkei died suddenly in the flood tide without having any Dharma heirs in the capital." Kao-ch'üan said, "That is not the case. Ryôkei had two high ranking disciples. I wanted to see which of them was more advanced and give [the whisk] to him." It happened that one [of Ryôkei's two disciples] died, so Kao-ch'üan planned to give the whisk to the other man. Kao-ch'üan gave him the name Kaiô 晦翁⁵³. Tu-chan 独湛, then the abbot of Obaku-san [Mampuku-ji], said, "Our patriarch Fei-yin 費隱 sternly expelled someone who had received something in another's stead. His descendent [Kao-ch'üan] has dared to violate this [rule], has he not?" (Fei-yin debated with Yung-chüeh 永覺⁵⁴ before the Ming court. Fei-yin was defeated, and so the court destroyed the wood blocks for his [book], the *Gotô gentô*.⁵⁵) Kao-ch'üan replied, "I only know that I received a dying wish of the emperor. I don't know anything else."

The internal squabbling did not cease, and Master Dokushô 独照 of Jikishi-in 直指院 lamented this.⁵⁶ As a peace settlement, he suggested, "Someone from either Kao-ch'üan's or Tu-chan's disciples should be selected and then [the whisk] should be given to him."

⁵³ Kaiô Hôkô 晦翁室 (1635-1712), was officially named as Gomizunoo's successor in 1685. Kaiô received Ryôkei's whisk and the emperor's monastic robe and was appointed abbot at Shômyô-ji.

⁵⁴ Yung-chüeh Yüan-hsien 永覺元賢 (1578-1657; J. Eigaku Genken)

⁵⁵ See p. 22, note 18 and p. 119.

⁵⁶ Dokushô Shôen 独照性円 (1617-1694) was a disciple first of Takuan and later Isshi Monju. He inherited the temple Jikishi-an 直指庵 upon Isshi's death in 1646. Dokushô went to Nagasaki while Yin-yüan was still at Kôfuku-ji and became one of his attendants. He later attained enlightenment and received Yin-yüan's *inka* in 1670. See p. 47, note 76.

Kao-ch'üan wrongly said, "It was the emperor's intention to be Ryôkei's Dharma heir. If he were not recognized as Ryôkei's Dharma heir, that would be wrong." This is Kao-ch'üan's lie. The emperor merely wanted to return the whisk to Ryôkei's disciples. It had nothing to do with Dharma transmission. Ultimately there was a petition [to the government]. The Superintendent of Temples and Shrines⁵⁷ in Edo made the determination. He said, "As a rule, Chinese monks living in Japan must honor the commands of the Japanese emperor. Kao-ch'üan has single-mindedly honored the retired emperor's dying wish. He should receive it."

Tu-chan was defeated and all those who had supported him, such as Kôkoku 江谷⁵⁸ and Enzû 円通⁵⁹, were driven out. Finally, Kao-ch'üan received the whisk and gave it to Kaiô, making him Ryôkei's Dharma heir. Kaiô was abbot of Shômyô-ji in Hino, in Omi province.

Someone said that a person named Sekisô 石窓⁶⁰, who was abbot at Shosan 初山 [Hôrin-ji 宝林寺] (founded by Tu-chan) in Totomi province⁶¹, visited Master Daishun at Jikei-ji 慈溪寺 in Mino province. Daishun said, "I saw in a letter that Kao-ch'üan sent to Tu-chan, in which he quoted the emperor as saying, 'We take Yin-yüan to be Bodhidharma, Ryôkei to be the second Patriarch, and ourself to be the third Patriarch.' Within which imperial letter does one find such words as these?" Sekisô said that Kao-ch'üan had only heard the emperor's words second-hand. There was absolutely no proof. Daishun said that in Empô 3 (1675), the emperor conferred an honorary title on Master Isshi 一絲. In his letter, the emperor said, "Our debt of gratitude

⁵⁷ 宣政院 *senseiin* was the name for the Yüan dynasty office governing Buddhist monks. Mujaku uses it as an alternate term for *jisha bugyô* 寺社奉行.

⁵⁸ Unidentified.

⁵⁹ Enzû Dôjô 円通道成 (1643-1726), born in Kumano in Kii province, met Tu-chan and became his disciple sometime around 1667. He became Tu-chan's Dharma heir in 1675, at the age of 33. He had seventeen Dharma heirs, and was regarded as one of the leading Japanese disciples responsible for spreading the Ôbaku sect.

⁶⁰ Sekisô Dôkô 石窓道鏗 (1638-1704) became Tu-chan's Dharma heir in 1676. He practiced under Tu-chan at Hôrin-ji and became abbot there later. He followed Tu-chan to Mampuku-ji when Tu-chan served as abbot, and held various high offices at the temple.

⁶¹ Shosan Hôrin-ji was founded by Tu-chan in 1664 at the order of the bakufu and with its funding.

toward this teacher is very deep." It is as clear as that! How can it be that the emperor said, "Ryôkei is the second patriarch and we are the third?" It makes me think that Kao-ch'üan's lie brings slander on the emperor and makes a mockery of the Japanese people. Kao-ch'üan hopes to take in later generations with all of his writings. A poem by Po-tzu T'ing 柏子底 says, "What in this world is more hateful than fleas, lice, mosquitoes, flies, rats, thieves and monks?"⁶² [The answer] is Kao-ch'üan.

Yin-yüan Gave a Verse to Jikuin

(This piece of calligraphy is at Ryôge-in.)

The space is narrow, but the heart is large.
 It encompasses all the ten directions.
 It feels sincere compassion for the impoverished
 And skillfully protects the king of the Dharma.
 I heard that the Way flourishes in the East.
 First I came and faced the jeweled vessel.
 The correct mind is always devoid of darkness.
 It purifies the self whiter than the frost.
 The original thought fulfills beginning and end.
 Why should it be forgotten even in one thousand years.
 [In China] the Way has dwindled to a single petal,
 but the Great Way comes to full bloom in Japan.

Written by the Obaku monk Yin-yüan Lung-ch'i and given to Master Jikuin.

The [Obaku] Assembly Supports Insincere People

Jikuin said to Yin-yüan, "It is said that if [a monk] wishes to reside at a temple, then he

⁶² Unidentified.

must have someone pay for all his food and expenses. This is the rule of Zen temples in Japan. If this were not the case, then evil monks wanting to sponge off [the temple] would be numerous, and the assembly would not comprise true practitioners. One who truly wishes to follow a virtuous teacher would sell his belongings to pay for his food and would not shun hardship."

Yin-yüan said, "It's no good! If that's the way it's done, then cart drivers and ship hands will join the order. Yesterday [a cart driver or a ship hand] and today a monk! Hundreds will flock to join the group."

I say that (in the fifty-fourth section of the *San'an* 山菴),⁶³ Jochû 恕中 said, "The master's own eyes are not yet open. He strives to seize the joy from others using sugar and honey.... Master Chôro Fuku's 長蘆福 Dharma eye was not open. He always used the alms he received on the Upper Yangtze to feed himself as if he were a monk."⁶⁴ This is the intention of the Obaku sect.

I say that the Zen Master Daie 大慧⁶⁵ said, "Everyone has food in the back of their mind."⁶⁶

The commentary 普說 says (Thirty-fourth section, fourth page, on the right), "The true teacher is the model of the true teaching."⁶⁷

Those Without the Way and Without Learning Transmit the Dharma

Today in the Obaku line there are some who claim to transmit the Dharma but have no temple in which to reside. They are all over the city, in front of shops and behind them. They

⁶³ *Shan-an tsa-lu* 山菴雜錄 (J. *San'an zatsuroku*), composed by the Rinzai monk Shu-chung Wu-yün 恕中無愠 (1309-1386), first appeared in 1390. Isshi Monju published an edition in 1643. ZZ 2B:21.2.

⁶⁴ ZZ 2B:21.2, p. 170b.

⁶⁵ Probably Ta-hui Taung-kao 大慧宗昊 (1089-1163; J. Daie Sôkô), the Sung monk who destroyed the woodblocks of the *Hekigan roku*, known for his strong emphasis on kôan practice.

⁶⁶ Unidentified.

⁶⁷ Unidentified.

are the so-called Senior Guardian [who protects] the heavens and the Minister of Works [who protects] all the earth.⁶⁸

In a swampy arbor of weeping willows...

Examining the water and the land, I encountered mist. Inside appears the spirit of the dead.

To a whetstone of saltpeter and sulfur, add herbs. (*I-chiang* 夷堅 4/10)⁶⁹

Ingen Fusôroku 隱元扶桑錄

In the third fascicle, the *Settsu Jiun-san Fumon Fukugen-ji roku* 撰州慈雲山普門福元寺錄 says:

During the first four days of the eleventh month of Meireki 1 (1655), the great lay patron Minamoto Shigemune, the Second in Command of Hamura 羽村次將源重宗,⁷⁰ the abbot of this temple [Ryôkei] Shôsen, Kaishû 戒周, [Jikuin] Somon, Chôso 澄祖, Danhō 団法 and a host of other Zen worthies invited the master to settle at Jiun-san Fumon Fukugen-ji and hold the opening ceremony [as the new abbot].⁷¹

In the eighth fascicle (section 34): "Lord Itakura, *Daimyô* of Suô, asked me [Yin-yüan] the reason.... I do not think that Jikuin criticizes the two masters Ryôkei and Tokuô for writing extensively to invite me to be abbot at Fumon-ji. His intentions for resigning were sincere.... Jikuin also agreed to it [the invitation]."⁷²

⁶⁸The reference is obscure. The author has been unable to identify the expression *manten taiho manchi shikû* 滿天滿地司空. The terms *taiho* and *shikû* refer to government posts during the Chou dynasty. The former was the senior guardian of the heir apparent and the latter the minister of works, responsible to oversee the land and the people.

⁶⁹ The *I-chiang chih* was a Sung dynasty novel about spirits and other mysterious matters, in fifty fascicles, written by Hung-mai 洪邁. This fragment, which appears to be verse, is nearly illegible and the terms used obscure. The translation is tentative at best.

⁷⁰ Unidentified.

⁷¹ *Ingen zenshû*, vol. 4, p. 1749. The monks Kaishû, Chôso, and Danhō are unidentified.

⁷² *Ibid.*, vol. 5, pp. 2421, and 2422-2423.

In the sixteenth fascicle (verses):

" Given to Jikuin when passing by Ryôge-an

Behind the single hut, there waits

A phoenix singing to [greet] the dawn.

Everyone dances and sings, wanting to perfect the woods.

Going and coming on strange paths,

They beckon to the wind, the rain and the snow.

Afterwards they will know the season (learn true morality)

and control their minds."

Next a verse [titled] "Passing by Myôshin-ji...." and another, "In response to Masters Senzan,

Saie 齋会, and all the other worthies...."⁷³

Kao-ch'üan Returns to the Pure Land

Master Tenryô 天嶺 (n.d.) was in Owada studying, [he observed that] Kao-ch'üan commonly used Japanese characters with facility in all five fascicles [of his work]. [Tenryô] arranged them on his desk and read them. (*En'nan kidan kôshû* 燕南紀談后集, first section)⁷⁴

Many of the [Obaku] Sect's Monks Are Thieves and Have Been Expelled

In Fushimi, there was a monk from the Obaku line who lived in a small retreat with his younger sister, a nun. Once when the monk went up to Kyoto, a thief came in and stole all the household wares. The nun raised [her fist] to strike the thief. The thief killed her and left. When the monk returned, he said, "I have always said that if a thief comes, then it would be best to let him do as he pleases with our things. One must never fight. She did not follow my advice, and so suffered this fate."

⁷³ Ibid., vol. 6, p. 2894-2895. Mujaku gives only the title for the latter two verses.

⁷⁴ *En'nan kidan*, six fascicles, written by Tenryô Shôkû 天嶺性空, published in 1725.

The magistrate of Fushimi looked for the thief and conducted a long investigation. In order to fathom the monk's thoughts, the magistrate grilled him. As a result, he submitted and confessed.

Someone said that the signboard read, "This monk from Yin-yüan's line killed a person and stole everything from her. " [The monks at] Obaku-san often complained to the authorities that they wanted Yin-yüan's name removed, but that was not possible.

In 1739, in the Kitano pleasure quarters, there was an Obaku monk who was in love with a prostitute. For a long time he harbored a grudge against her and finally came at the woman with a knife. She screamed aloud, went down the stairs and ran away. The monk turned the knife on himself and died.

The authorities purified the monk's corpse with salt and buried him. The woman suffered from her wounds and after a month or two finally died.

The authorities exhumed the monk's body and crucified it at Awataguchi.

Appendix Two

The Kana hôgo of Tetsugen Zenji from Zuiryû-ji¹

Section 1: Introduction²

The *Heart Sutra* says, "When he realized that the five *skandhas*³ are all empty, he escaped from all pain and distress."⁴ This means that the five *skandhas* are fundamentally empty, and when you realize that they have no abiding reality and grasp this truth clearly, then you will transcend all the suffering and misfortune of birth and death, and you will recognize yourself as the *Dharmakāya*, the body of *prajñā*.⁵

The five *skandhas* are form, sensation, perception, psychic construction, and consciousness. Although there are five items, they come down to just [two], "body" and "mind".

Section 2: Form

First of all, "form" is the body, and the other four [*skandhas*] are mind. Although all sentient beings are themselves fundamentally the eternal bliss of nirvana and embody the

¹ I have used Minamoto Ryôen's edition of the *Tetsugen zenji kana hôgo* 鐵眼禪師假名法語 found in *Tetsugen*, pp. 177-269, for this translation. Although Minamoto's edition gives the reading "kanaji hôgo", I have followed the original text, which provides the reading *kana hôgo*.

² The original text has no section headings. Those included here are the author's own, based upon the natural breaks in the original. Tetsugen began each of the sections related to the five *skandhas* with parallel phrases: "Dai ichi ni, shiki to iu wa... 第一に色といふは", etc.

³ The Sanskrit term *skandha* is often translated as aggregate, and more literally means "pile" or "heap". The five *skandhas* refer to form (*shiki* 色, Sk. *rûpa*), sensation (*ju* 受, Sk. *vedanā*), perception (*sô* 想, Sk. *samjñā*), psychic construction (*gyô* 行, Sk. *samskāra*), and consciousness (*shiki* 識, Sk. *viññāna*). These are the constituent parts of existing things beyond which they have no "self".

⁴ The *Heart Sutra* (*Hannya shingyô* 般若心經; Sk. *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya-sūtra*) is under 300 characters long in Chinese, but is regarded as representing the gist of the Buddhist teaching on emptiness. In the context of the original text, the subject of the passage is Avalokitesvara. T. 8, p. 848.

⁵ *Hosshin* 法身. Buddhism speaks of three bodies of the Buddha, the "Body of Truth" (*Dharmākaya*), "the apparition body" (*Nirmānakāya*), and "the Body of Recompense" (*Sambhogakāya*).

Dharmakāya, the body of *prajña*, they are deluded by the "form" and "mind" of these five *skandhas*, and so become ordinary people and wander aimlessly through the Three Worlds⁶ [the realms of desire, form and no-form].

To begin with, "form" is your body. Everything in the world with shape and color, the sky, the earth, the trees and the grasses, are included in "form". The *Śūramgama Sutra* says, "Since time without beginning, all sentient beings have deluded themselves with things, and lost their original mind. They are turned by things."⁷

This means that since we don't realize that the ten thousand *dharma*s⁸ are all the *Dharmakāya*, Ultimate Reality itself, and instead, think of them as the ten thousand *dharma*s [that have an abiding reality of their own], we become deluded by the perception of these *dharma*s. We exchange our [original] mind for the sake of things, and give rise to all sorts of illusory ideas.

In the past, people said that the *Dharmakāya* was concealed within the physical shell (*gyōkoku* 形穀). The physical shell is your body. Although your body is fundamentally the *Dharmakāya* itself, you don't realize this and think of it as the self. [This] means you look at the *Dharmakāya*, think of it as yourself, and then become deluded by this self, and so you create the afflictions such as greed and anger, and fall into the evil paths.⁹

People are deluded and take the *tathagata*¹⁰ which is fundamentally the *Dharmakāya* to

⁶ *Sangai* 三界. The three realms or worlds are, the realm of desire (*yokkai* 欲界), the realm of form (*shikikai* 色界) and the realm of no form (*mushikikai* 無色界). These represent all levels of existence for sentient beings, from the lowest suffering in hell to the highest existence in heaven or meditative states of bliss.

⁷ *Śūramgama-samādhi-sūtra* (*Shuryōgongyō*, 首楞嚴經) held special importance for many in the Zen schools, including Tetsugen who often lectured on it numerous times. Portions of the Chinese text are apocryphal. T. 19, p. 111c.

⁸ *Manbō* 万法, sometimes translated as the myriad things, indicates all things.

⁹ *Akudō* 惡道 refers to the lower three of the six paths or levels of existence: hell, hungry ghosts, animals, *asuras*, human beings, and divine beings. There are in addition four higher levels, *srāvakas*, *pratyekabuddhas*, bodhisattvas and Buddhas which along with the six others are called the ten worlds (*jikkai* 十界).

¹⁰ "Thus Come One" (*Nyorai* 如来) is an epithet for a Buddha.

be either the ten thousand *dharma*s or the self, and so have a twofold delusion.

The first kind of delusion [is as follows.] This body is created by a temporary configuration of the four great elements, earth, water, fire, and wind. Various parts of the body, such as skin, flesh, bones, and sinews are earth. Tears, saliva, and blood are water. The movement and workings of breathing in and out are wind. Apart from these [elements of] earth, water, fire, and wind, there is nothing one could call the self. It is only momentary, and when your life ends and returns to its original earth, wind, fire and wind, you will become bleached bones, so there is nothing that one could rely on as the self even for the duration of dew.

Isn't it a pity that we think of these wretched white bones as the self, and for a thousand lifetimes and ten thousand kalpas are controlled by this skull. All we do is generate the karma [that leads to falling into] hell, and sink into the three paths [of hell, hungry ghosts, and animals].

Without realizing that the body is a temporary [configuration] of earth, water, fire and wind, we take it to be the self, and believe it will not die even in ten million years. We are firmly attached to this self. This is the first kind of delusion.

Those in the two vehicles¹¹ [*śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas*], are wiser than ordinary people, and so they clearly recognize this body as a temporary configuration of earth, water, fire, and wind, and regard it in fact as white bones. They have no thoughts of attachment to their body in the least. Nor do they give rise to attachment to self or self-pride. They neither lie nor flatter, envy nor slander.

Although they have achieved enlightenment of this kind, they still have not realized that they are themselves the *Dharmakāya*, the *Tathagata*. For this reason, the World Honored One generally despised them as the Lesser Vehicle. Since they do not realize that they are the *Dharmakāya* itself, with their two vehicle wisdom they have not yet seen the inner realization of

¹¹ *Nijō* 二乗 refers to the paths of *śrāvakas* (*shōmon* 声聞) and *pratyekabuddhas* (*engaku* 縁覚), and are used in Mahayana to describe Theravada practitioners. *Śrāvakas*, "those who hear the voice" originally meant direct disciples of the Buddha, but later came to also mean anyone who attains nirvana through Theravada Buddhism. *Pratyekabuddhas* refers to those who attain enlightenment for themselves without hearing a Buddha teach.

the Buddha nor the realm of the bodhisattva, even in their dreams.

This is the kind of delusion characteristic of the two vehicles. Along with the delusion of ordinary people, we get two kinds of delusion. The delusion of those in the two vehicles concerning the *Dharmakāya* is one kind. Ordinary people are deluded about the *Dharmakāya* and are also deluded about what those in the two vehicles have understood, and so have a two-fold [delusion].

Bodhisattvas transcend the two-fold delusion of ordinary people, and see that this very body is the *Tathagata*, the *Dharmakāya*. [The Buddha ¹²] teaches this in the *Heart Sutra* [saying], "Form is emptiness, and emptiness is form."¹³ "Form" means this body. "Emptiness" means the absolute void; the absolute void is the *Dharmakāya*, and the *Dharmakāya* is the *Tathagata*. This means that this body is itself the *Dharmakāya*, and the *Dharmakāya* is itself this body.

Not realizing that the four great elements are originally the *Dharmakāya* itself, those in the two vehicles believe that the [four elements] are insentient beings.

When you see with the eyes of a bodhisattva, the four great elements are all the true body of the *Dharmakāya*. Therefore, it explains in the *Śūramgama Sutra*, "The nature of form is emptiness, and emptiness is the nature of form."¹⁴ "Form" is the [element] earth. "Nature" refers to "the nature of form" because earth is fundamentally the *Dharmakāya* itself. Since it is the nature of form, it is empty.

Again, in the same sutra it says of water that "the nature of water is emptiness and emptiness is the nature of water"; of fire that "the nature of fire is emptiness and emptiness is the nature of fire"; and of wind that "the nature of wind is emptiness and emptiness is the nature

¹² When Tetsugen quotes from sutras, he consistently uses active verbs with the Buddha as the implied subject. In most cases, I have avoided inserting a definite subject, but in this and similar circumstances, it seems more natural to add it.

¹³ T. 8, p. 848.

¹⁴ T. 19, p. 117.

of wind".¹⁵ This means that just as with earth, water is itself the *Dharmakāya*, and the *Dharmakāya* is itself water, [and so forth for fire and wind].¹⁶ Since this is the case, the four great elements are not essentially the four great elements, but are the Mysterious Body of the *Tathagata*, the *Dharmakāya*. Ordinary people and those in the two vehicles are deluded and so think that they are the four great elements.

If you understand that the four great elements are fundamentally the Buddha, then not only will you see that your own body is from the start the *Dharmakāya*, but that everything even down to the heavens, the earth, the sky and all of the universe is the mysterious body of the *Dharmakāya*. We say of the time when this enlightenment is achieved that "all dharmas are ultimate reality"¹⁷ and "the grass, the trees, the nations, and the earth all without exception attain Buddhahood."¹⁸

Not only the grass, trees, nations and earth, but even the sky is the body of the *Dharmakāya*, but because we are deluded we think it is [just] the sky. When you achieve enlightenment, you will transcend the delusion of thinking it is [just] the sky and attain the enlightenment that all *dharmas* are one thusness.¹⁹ Therefore, the *Sūramgama Sutra* says, "When a person gives rise to the truth and returns to the source, the sky in all ten directions temporarily disappears."²⁰ The *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* says, "The infinite sky is illuminated

¹⁵ T. 19, p. 117 and 118.

¹⁶ Tetsugen repeats parallel passages for all three elements which I have cut for the sake of a smooth translation.

¹⁷ *Shohō jissō* 諸法実相. This expression appears in several sutras, among them the *Lotus Sutra* (T. 9, p. 5c 11). It is interpreted somewhat differently by various sects.

¹⁸ *Sōmoku kokuji shikkai jōbutsu* 草木国土、悉皆成仏. Found in the *Nirvana Sutra* and explained in others, this line is not unlike others found in the *Lotus Sutra*, such as *sōmoku jōbutsu* 草木成仏.

¹⁹ *Manbō ichinyō* 万法一如 is a verse from the *Hsin-hsin-ming* 信心銘 (J. *Shinjinmei*) T. 48, p. 376c. This text is a poem of 146 verses attributed to the Third Patriarch of Zen, Seng-tsang 僧粲 (J. *Sōsan*; d. 606). Blyth translates the verse "All things are as they really are," in *Zen and Zen Classics*, vol. 1, (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1966), p. 102.

²⁰ T. 19, p. 147b 10-11. Tetsugen's text is slightly at variance with the Taishō edition. His uses *ichiji* 一時 where the Taishō uses *shitsu* 悉. There is no significant change in meaning.

by enlightenment."²¹ In the Zen school we say, "the universe sinks and the sky crumbles."²² Even those that teach that ultimate bliss is a land of gold²³ have changed the name for the sake of ordinary people.

If you open up and see this enlightenment, while the self is [still] the self, it is fundamentally the *Dharmakāya* itself, and so is not born. Since it is not born, nor does it die. This is called "non-arising and non-perishing",²⁴ and also "the Buddha of Immeasurable Light".²⁵ Seeing it as born and dying is referred to as the dream of delusion.

Since I am already like this, other people are as well. Since human beings are like this, even birds and beasts, grass, trees, earth and stones are this way. The *Amida Sutra*²⁶ says, "Water, birds, trees and forests call out 'contemplate the Buddha, contemplate the Dharma, contemplate the Sangha.'"²⁷ When it says, "The Buddhas in all ten directions speak with the Buddha's broad tongue to the three thousand great one thousand worlds, and teach the Dharma,"²⁸ it is also speaking of the time [of enlightenment]. The *Lotus Sutra* says, "All *dharma*s

²¹ *Daihōkōengaku shutara ryōgi kyō* 大方広円覚修多羅了義經 T.17, p. 914c. This sutra is generally regarded as apocryphal in its entirety. It was, however, very popular among Zen practitioners including Tetsugen who used it, along with the *Sūramgama Sutra*, as the basis for the position that the teaching and meditation are one (*kyōzen itchi* 教禪一致).

²² *Ingen zenshū* vol. 1, p. 409.

²³ Tetsugen alludes here to the Pure Land Sutras without actually quoting from them.

²⁴ *Fushō, fumetsu* 不生不滅. Often translated as unborn and undying, this expression is found in several sutras, including the *Heart Sutra*, T. 8, p. 848. It was popularized by Tetsugen's contemporary Bankei 盤珪 (1622-1693) who also had some connections with Obaku Zen. See Haskell, p. xxxff.

²⁵ *Muryō jubutsu* 無量寿仏, Sk. Amitayus. Another name for the Buddha Amida.

²⁶ *Amidakyō* 阿彌陀經, Sk. *Sukhāvatīvyūha*, T. 12, pp. 346-348. This sutra was translated by Kumārajīva circa 402, and is one of the three basic texts for Pure Land Buddhism (*Sanbu kyō* 三部經). It describes the pleasures of Amida's Pure Land, and depicts various Buddhas praising Amida.

²⁷ Tetsugen paraphrases from the sutra here. The sutra describes the water in the Pure Land which has eight good qualities. The birds' songs proclaim "the five virtues, the five powers and the seven steps leading towards the highest knowledge" (Cowell, pp. 95-6) which on hearing, causes human beings to recall the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Sangha. Likewise, the sound of the wind in the trees has the same effect. For full English translation, see E.B. Cowell, *Buddhist Mahayana Texts*, pp. 89-103.

²⁸ Again, Tetsugen is paraphrasing; the original has parallel lines for the Buddhas in each direction. *Kōchō no zessō* 広長の舌相 is one of the thirty-two marks of the Buddha, and alludes to the Buddha's

from their very origin are themselves eternally characterized by the marks of quiet and extinction,"²⁹ and "The endurance of the dharma, the secure position of the dharma, in the world ever abiding."³⁰ These are all places that express the attainment of enlightenment.

By practicing zazen and kôans very diligently, you will attain this kind of enlightenment, and by transcending the delusion of the *skandha* of form you will awaken to the *Dharmakâya*, Ultimate Reality itself.

Section 3: Sensation

Second, "sensation" is a word for "reception", and means to take something in. This means that we take in the external objects of the "six dusts"³¹ [that is form, sound, scent, taste, texture, and thought] with the "five roots"³², the eyes, ears, nose, tongue and body. We take in form with the eyes, sound with the ears, scent with the nose, taste with the tongue, and texture with the body.

Within sensation there are three types: pain, pleasure, and indifference. First, pain means to take in something unpleasant and painful with your eyes, ears, nose, tongue or body. Pleasure means taking in something you enjoy very much with your eyes, ears, nose, tongue or body. Indifference means to take in something that is neither pain nor pleasure. For example, waving good-bye when you are leaving is neither painful nor pleasurable. Seeing when nothing is the matter, hearing and tasting without anything being wrong, in the same way, is indifference.

Sentient beings are deluded by pleasure and pain, and think that they won't see or eloquence.

²⁹ T. 9, p. 8b. This and all other translations from the *Lotus Sutra* have been adapted from Hurvitz, *Scripture of the Lotus Blossom of the Fine Dharma*, p. 37.

³⁰ T. 9, p. 9b 10. Hurvitz, p. 41.

³¹ *Rokujin* 六塵, the six objects corresponding to the six senses. They are forms, sounds, scents, tastes, textures, and thoughts. Because sentient beings give rise to desires when they encounter these objects, they are called "dusts" to suggest their potential to taint or sully the mind.

³² *Gokon* 五根, the five senses that correspond to the first five of the six dusts. It is a little odd that Tetsugen did not use the term "six roots" (*rokkon* 六根), the natural complement for the six dusts.

hear³³ painful things. They think that they will see, hear, smell, taste, and touch only pleasant things. Therefore, they trouble others, torment themselves, burn with the desire to steal, tell lies, covet things, sever the lives of fish and birds, and take into account only outward appearances in the world, so that day and night they generate only the karma [that leads to falling into] hell.

From a single moment of delusion about enjoying pleasure you give rise to immeasurable suffering. The [sort of people] in society who steal will also want to drink sake, eat fish, indulge in lust, love prostitutes, and even be extravagant in their clothing. From just a small desire for pleasure, they end up stealing, telling lies, and eventually their wickedness is discovered. They go to jail, are tortured, and lose their lives. [All of this] arises from a few thoughts of seeking out pleasure.

This is what the old saying, "All craving is painful" means.³⁴ It is like a summer insect leaping into the fire or a fish in a pool craving the bait. For the sake of a fleeting covetous thought, they lose their precious lives.

The suffering of the one hundred thirty hells³⁵, the hunger of the three grades and nine types of hungry ghosts³⁶, the form of animals covered with fur and sprouting horns, the aspect of *asuras* bearing bow, arrows, swords and staves,³⁷ all of these sufferings arise from covetous thoughts. Isn't it a wretched delusion to expect to get a drop of sweet pleasure and

³³ Tetsugen literally says "see with the eyes, hear with the ears", perhaps for emphasis. Here and elsewhere I have opted for more natural sounding English.

³⁴ This saying can be found in the *Rinzai roku* 臨濟錄 (Ch. *Lin-ch'i-lu*), T. 47, p. 499c. In this passage, Lin-ch'i is exhorting his followers not to seek for the Buddha and the Patriarchs, because they will then become fetters. See Iriya Yoshitaka, *Rinzairoku*, pp. 82-85 for an interpretation of the passage and a modern Japanese translation.

³⁵ There are, in fact, 136 hot hells, not 130 as mentioned here.

³⁶ *Sanbon kurui gaki* 三品九類餓鬼. *Sanbon* refers to upper, middle, and lower grades, and *kurui* to the nine kinds of *gaki*. *Gaki* (Sk. *preta*) refers to the second lowest of the six paths in which one suffers perpetual hunger that cannot be satisfied.

³⁷ *Ashura* 阿修羅 are non-human beings characterized by their fierceness and constant fighting. They represent the level just below the human in the six paths. Although there can be good *asura* who protect Buddhism, and this is not universally interpreted as one of the so-called evil paths, in this context Tetsugen is stressing the quality of suffering inherent in it.

instead receive ten thousand *kalpas* of bitter suffering.

Even though what we think of as painful or pleasant aren't really pain and pleasure, because we are deluded, we end up thinking they are. The reason for this is that when a crow, a dog, or a fox sees a dead cow or horse rotting or a human corpse festering, they think it is a rare treat. First they enjoy looking at it, then their enjoyment increases as they smell it and grasp it. They think this is the greatest of pleasures. Seen from the human perspective, this seems immeasurably impure and repulsive. If we were forced by others to eat such putrid things, it would be incomparable suffering. What is worse than being forced to eat them is that crows devour such things greedily, and think it is pleasant. Although it isn't [truly] pleasant, their minds are foolish and base, and so they think that pain is pleasure.

What human beings find pleasurable is similar. Because of foolish minds, we are consumed by wife and children, are deluded by wealth, eat fish and fowl, and take this to be pleasant. Viewed from the perspective of Buddhas and bodhisattvas, this looks even more wretched than the crows seem to us from our human vantage. Conjecturing from this, [we see that] what deluded people find pleasant actually brings pain; they only believe it is pleasure.

If a man committed a great crime and for this reason his wife and children were executed before his eyes at the government's command, then [their bodies were] cooked and he were forced to eat them, how painful this would be! When people eat fish and fowl it is just the same as this. When seen through the eyes of enlightenment, even fish and birds are the *Tathagata*, the *Dharmakâya*, and fundamentally one body with all the Buddhas. Since all Buddhas and bodhisattvas have great compassion, they [can look upon] all sentient beings as their own body, and regard them as their children.

Although all sentient beings are the same [that is, one with the Buddhas], such is the wretchedness of ordinary people that they say, "What good fish!", tear its flesh, crush its bones, eat it, and take great pleasure in this. When this behavior is seen through the eyes of a Buddha, it looks no different than that of a demon. It is the same as cutting off your children's heads,

tearing their flesh, and enjoying the sight, the smell, and the taste of it. We refer to this as the perversion of ordinary people.

Though we may think such a deed is pleasant, it is not truly pleasant. It is a great suffering. This kind of confusion between pleasure and pain is what we mean by the second *skandha* of sensation.

Such is the way with ordinary people wandering in the Three Worlds that they cannot escape from pleasure and pain. The reason for this is [as follows]. When we see blossoms in bloom, we find this pleasant, so that when in turn they scatter, we think it sorrowful. We enjoy seeing the moon as it rises, so when it sets behind the mountains, we find this sad. When we take pleasure in encountering something, then the separation is more painful. People who enjoy prosperity will also suffer times of decline. The poor suffer from not having. Wealthy people worry over what they have. Since currying favor is suffering, so in fact is living in luxury. Since loving is suffering, hatred is also suffering. How great are the two sensations of pain and pleasure! All sentient beings throughout the Three Worlds indulge in them and in the end cannot escape.

We refer to being born as "the suffering of birth", to aging as "the suffering of old age". Being ill is "the suffering of sickness", and dying is "the suffering of death."³⁸ Men suffer, and women also bear much pain. Farmers suffer, and so do all the craftsmen and merchants. Those who serve a lord suffer, and so do [those who have no lord], the *rōnin*. Retainers suffer, and their lords are not immune from it. Not only householders suffer, but so do monks and nuns.

Under these circumstances, when our suffering lightens a bit, we become confused and think that this pause [in the pain] is pleasure. For example, it is like a person carrying a heavy load putting it down and thinking that is pleasure, or when a seriously ill person gets better, they call that pleasure. Although we cannot say that [these experiences] are especially

³⁸ This is a standard listing of suffering which roughly corresponds to the examples of human suffering that the young Sakyamuni encountered in the *Buddhacarita*. Examples of its use are too numerous to cite.

pleasurable, we do think of a pause in our suffering as pleasure.

Moreover, when we believe that drinking sake, eating fish, and indulging in lust is pleasure, we are like a person suffering from itchy boils who warms himself by the fire and washes himself with hot water, and thinks that this is pleasure. Although itching cannot compare to an illness, in fact it is also painful. Thinking of warming or washing oneself as pleasurable is actually taking pain to be pleasure. In fact, for anyone not ill with boils to find warming oneself agreeable is not perverse, it really is a pleasure. If you realize this truth and transcend pleasure and pain, then you will escape from the second *skandha* of sensation, and attain the true pleasure of nirvana.

Section 4: Perception

Third, "perception" means thoughts, and refers to the illusions that arise in people's minds every day and every night. Daytime becomes illusion, and nighttime a dream. Everyone thinks that nighttime dreams are the only fabrications that lack a basis in fact, and that what they think about during the day is true. This is a terrible mistake. The thoughts of deluded people, even what they think about during the day, are the same as dreams. Since they don't realize that these are all illusions without foundation, they believe them to be the truth.

Illusions are empty and false. Anything that is actually without substance but which seems to exist we refer to as an illusion. For example, a shadow has the appearance of a figure, just like something that seems real in your dreams. Although they are all completely non-existent, they seem to exist in the dream. Although a shadow is non-existent, if you stand in the light of the sun, the moon, or a lamp, a shadow immediately takes on your shape. When you move, the shadow also moves; when you stop, the shadow also stops. Images reflected in a mirror or in water are the same. Fundamentally they do not exist, but they certainly seem to.

In the same way, people's illusions are truly non-existent, but when they come to mind, they certainly seem to exist. Whatever we think of as hateful, lovable, reproachful, enviable, beloved, or dear, are all illusions that don't change the dreaming mind at all. Originally we have

no such illusions in our true minds, which are like a shining mirror or pure water. Because we fail to realize our true mind, we leave the images of illusion reflected on our true mind. We believe they are true and become firmly attached to them, and so these illusions become increasingly extensive, and the delusions grow deeper and deeper.

Thinking that something is repulsive and thinking something is attractive are both figments of your own imagination. We label these figments of imagination "illusions". The reason that both repulsion and attraction result from our imagination is that, even in the case of a person you now find repulsive or attractive, before you got acquainted, the person was neither. In addition, when you first met, while you were still casual acquaintances who didn't know each other very well, such feelings did not yet exist.

As we gradually get to know someone, feelings of intimacy deepen toward a person we find compatible, and we create the feeling that they are attractive. It is precisely because of this circumstance that when we follow the paths of affection, however much it changes our lives, to that extent the ties of tenderness likewise increase. When you develop feelings of love in this way, love seems inevitable, and whichever way you turn it over in your mind, it is love without a trace of hatefulness.

When love reaches an extreme, and you think that even if you were to live one hundred million *kalpas* your feelings wouldn't change, you are mistaken. Though you are intimate friends, you will have some differences of opinion, and will quarrel. Then the quarrels grow into arguments. Or, as is the way of love, if your [lover's] feelings shift to another, however deep were your feelings of love at the beginning, that is how deep your hate will now become. These feelings of hatred and bitterness are so deep that you may even think that they will eventually kill you.

If you conjecture based on these truths, [you will see that] thinking something is attractive is an illusion. Since these [thoughts of love] are false like your dreams, thinking something is repulsive is also an illusion. If the thoughts of love were not false in the first place, then you would probably not have changed your mind in a short time and decided it was repulsive. Likewise,

if the feelings of repulsion were true, then you would not have thought it was attractive at the beginning. Since both attraction and repulsion are illusions, the mind is undetermined and shifts and changes just like a dream.

It is a wretched delusion to have these dreams of illusion bewilder us so that they burn our hearts, trouble our bodies, and if they are strong enough, kill us.

Since lovable and hateful are illusions in this way, then so are regrettable and desirable. To detest, to envy, to enjoy, to be sorrowful, are these not all illusions? Because we are deluded by illusions, we say that another person is our superior or inferior, an acquaintance or stranger, old or young, male or female, and do nothing but generate the seeds of hell.

We don't recognize these illusions are dreams, and so from the distant past without beginning down to this very life today, we have transmigrated without cease, fallen into hell, become hungry ghosts, been born as animals, and become *asuras*. Accordingly, if you ask the origin of becoming a Buddha or falling into hell, it comes down to whether or not you have these illusions. You must pay close attention and understand that these illusions cause harm; you must make it clear that they are just illusions and completely devoid of reality.

Although it is foolish from a worldly perspective, if you steal and suffer the government's orders, then you will expose yourself to shame in this life and a long fall into hell in the next. All of this results from a momentary illusion of coveting something. If a person plots rebellion and schemes to overturn the whole country, he falls into serious sin and exposes his family, wife, children and siblings to endless suffering. This is the result of just one moment of illusion. The first momentary thoughts of plotting rebellion are merely a momentary illusion, like the thin haze of tobacco smoke.

You don't realize that these momentary illusions are the origin of evil, and pile them up intently, so that in the end they become like clouds that fill the whole sky and it becomes increasingly difficult to stop them. If at the moment of the first thought, you could see clearly that, "This is an illusion!", then blotting it out of your mind would be the easiest thing of all. [As

Lao Tzu said,] "Even a tree that can fill the span of your arms started as a sprout."³⁹ Even a tree as big around as five or ten armspans was like the tip of a needle when it started growing, a mere seedling. When this seedling [first] appears, you can easily pull it up with one finger. When it has grown into a large tree, even with the strength of one thousand or ten thousand men you can't readily pull it up.

Illusions are the same way. At the first moment, you can quickly dispose of the thought. Illusions that cause evil are also like this. If you pile them up intently, they come to cause great harm to the country. When this happens, there are many troubles. Like a large tree, when [illusions first] take shape they are not difficult to abolish. Even if they have been piling up, when you decide to dispel them and cast them from your mind, just as the rising sun dispels the darkness, you have no trouble at all. We can compare this to lighting a lamp in a room dark for a thousand years. Although the darkness lasted a long time, when you light a lamp, you have no difficulty dispelling it. Illusions are just like this. When you change your mind for one moment, even delusions from the distant past with no beginning are dispelled in an instant (*ksana*). By understanding this truth and casting off your dream-like illusions, you can ground yourself in the mind of enlightenment.

If you don't cast off these delusions, and continue piling them up single-mindedly, there are many examples of people turning into demons and snakes⁴⁰ [in this lifetime], not to mention future lives. Women are said to be especially sinful because they are unwilling to cast off their deluded minds.

Even the ten billion triple-thousand great one-thousand worlds arise from the illusions of sentient beings. The one hundred thirty-six hells are also created by human illusions. We

³⁹ From the *Tao Te Ching*, #64. Tetsugen has paraphrased. The Chinese reads: 合抱之木、生於毫末.

⁴⁰ Stories of people becoming demons and snakes and so forth abound in collections of Buddhist stories like the *Konjaku monogatari* and the *Nihon ryōiki*. See Marian Ury, *Tales of Times Now Past* for a partial translation of the *Konjaku*, and *Miraculous Stories from the Japanese Buddhist Tradition: The Nihon Ryoiki of the Monk Kyōkai*, translated by Kyoko Motomochi Nakamura.

possess the wretched lot of ordinary human beings because we ourselves gave rise to an illusory fire and then for one hundred million *kalpas* have burned ourselves with it. If we cast off these illusions and transcend the third *skandha* of perception, then we can attain the land of enlightenment.

Section 5: Psychic Construction

Fourth, "psychic construction" means that your mind moves and changes, arising and passing away; as they say, "Psychic constructions move and flow."⁴¹ Since you have illusory thoughts in your mind, it never rests even for a moment, but constantly moves and changes. It is, for example, like water that flows endlessly without a moment's rest, or like a lamp flame that every instant is extinguished, yet while it flickers, never stops [shining]. From morning until night, people are constantly thinking about something, and you should examine closely [the mind's] movement and change. Just like a flash of lightening, it changes instant after instant and never stops.

Since all phenomena, that is all delusionary *dharma*s, are the change and flow of psychic construction, they are impermanent and change with every thought. Moment after moment, they arise and pass away without stopping for an instant. Although violent [degrees of] arising and passing away within the mind are apparent even to the foolish minds of ordinary people, subtle [degrees] that change with every passing moment are not, nor are they visible to the eyes of those in the two vehicles. This kind of arising and passing away [goes on] in their minds, so that when various *dharma*s arise from the mind, they also see the ten thousand *dharma*s change.

When the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* says, "When the clouds are swift, the moon moves. When the boat leaves, the shore shifts,"⁴² it means the [following]. When the movement

⁴¹ Unidentified.

⁴² T. 17, p. 915c.

of the clouds is swift, it looks as if the moon were moving, and when the boat moves quickly, it seems as if the shore and mountains were also moving. It isn't that the mountains are moving, it is because of the movement of the boat in which we are riding.

Since the clouds in our minds are swift, it looks like the moon of True Thusness is moving. Though all *dharma*s are fundamentally reality, and of themselves always have the marks of "quiet and extinction",⁴³ the Three Worlds seem to move and change, the changing of the four seasons never seems to stop. All of this is the delusion of psychic construction.

When the *Nirvana Sutra* says that, "All conditioned things are impermanent. This is the Dharma of arising and perishing,"⁴⁴ it means the [following]. "All conditioned things" means psychic constructions. Because psychic constructions arise, pass away, move and change, this means that all the ten thousand *dharma*s move and change without stopping for even an instant. If all *dharma*s, that is, the delusions of phenomena that arise and pass away, entirely ceased to pass away, then there would be no tranquility and no extinction of the uncreated, no great pleasure of nirvana. When the arising and passing away of the *dharma*s stops completely, that is when the *Dharma* of tranquility and extinction will appear before your eyes, as will the wondrous pleasure of nirvana in which "the ten thousand *dharma*s are one, and all *dharma*s are ultimate reality."⁴⁵ [The Buddha] taught this saying, "When arising and passing away are themselves extinguished, then quiet and extinction constitute pleasure."⁴⁶

Therefore, although our bodies and minds and all ten thousand *dharma*s are the eternal *Dharmakāya* itself, and originally there is no such thing as "arising and passing away", we do not perceive ultimate reality itself, and end up thinking that the ten thousand *dharma*s arise and pass away in the Three Worlds due to the delusions of psychic construction.

⁴³ This is a paraphrase of an earlier citation from the Lotus Sutra, see note 29 above.

⁴⁴ T. 12, 450a.

⁴⁵ Unidentified.

⁴⁶ T. 12, 450a. This is the second part of the verse identified in note 44.

When you transcend the delusion of psychic construction, first your mind is eternal and nothing moves or changes. When your mind does not move and change, neither do the *dharma*s. Therefore, your true mind not moving and changing is the same as the true form of a mirror. When you see images reflected in a bright mirror all day long, it reflects the sky, the land, flowers, willow trees, people, animals and birds. All the colors change and the types of things [reflected] change without a moments rest, but the true form of the mirror is not the birds and animals, nor the people, nor the willows, flowers, the land, nor the sky. It is just the shining and unclouded mirror itself.

Our original minds reflect and illuminate the ten thousand *dharma*s, but have no connection to their distinctions. The fact that [the mind] never participates in arising and passing away can be understood through the example of the mirror. Deluded people only see the reflections moving in their minds, they cannot see the mirror of the original mind [itself]. When the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* teaches that, people "take the phantoms of the six dusts to be the aspect of their minds",⁴⁷ that is what it means.

All the images reflected in the mirror are completely empty and non-existent, so only a foolish person would decide to purify [the mirror], cast off these images, and thereby see the mirror for the first time. Even if images of blossoms and willows are reflected, you should be able to see the shining mirror which itself has no coming or going, no form or scent.

We name this the *Dharmakāya*, we call it "true thusness". When the *Yuishikiron* (The Discourse on Consciousness Only)⁴⁸ says, "The Truth refers to things as they really are, without any falsehood or delusion. Thusness refers to intransience, without any change,"⁴⁹ it means the wondrous body of true thusness. In the *Diamond Sutra*, when it says, "The *Tathagata* is

⁴⁷ T. 17, p. 913b 24-5.

⁴⁸ *Yuishikiron* 唯識論, full name *Jōyuishikiron* 成唯識論 (Sk. Vijñapti-mātratā-siddhi) T. 31, no. 1585. This is the primary text for the Hossō school. It comprises various commentaries on Vasubandhu's *Trimsika karika*.

⁴⁹ T. 31, p. 48a. There is a minor variation between Tetsugen's text and the Taishō edition. Tetsugen uses 偽妄 instead of 虚妄.

without coming and without going,"⁵⁰ it is talking about the *Tathagata*, the *Dharmakāya*.

Since our original minds are already like this, the ten thousand *dharma*s are as well. When we see them as heaven, earth, and everything in the universe, these are actually reflected images. The ten thousand things are themselves the shining mirror. Someone deluded by these images is an "ordinary person" and someone who sees the mirror is a "saint."

Let me explain this with an example, it is like making the shapes of various things out of gold. When we look at them as shapes, the demons are terrifying and the Buddhas venerable, the old are wrinkled and the young charming. The crane has long legs and the duck short legs. The pine grows straight, and the brambles twisted, the willow is graceful and the blossoms elegant. When we look at them as gold, the demon is gold and so is the Buddha. Male and female have no distinction, nor is there superior/inferior between lord and retainer. If the long-legged crane is gold, so is the short-legged duck. Blossom, willow, pine, and bramble are all just gold, and not even the slightest distinction can be found.

The ten thousand *dharma*s are the same. When we look at them from the perspective of True Thusness, just as with the gold, there is no distinction at all. When we look at them from the perspective of the ten thousand *dharma*s, they are distinguished as different shapes. Sentient beings are deluded by these shapes. All the Buddhas recognize that they are thusness. When you realize that the gold is thusness itself, all the distinct shapes are equal and undistinguished just as they are.

There are no demons you should hate, no Buddhas to venerate. Since there is no one with whom you should be friendly, there is likewise no one you should slight. What is there to hate or to like? Whom would you censure or praise? There is neither bitterness nor envy. Although you don't intentionally stop them, all the afflictions pass away of themselves. For example, when the sun rises, although it isn't intentionally done, the darkness is naturally dispelled. Although you don't intentionally dispel the afflictions, there is only one ultimate reality,

⁵⁰ T. 8, p. 756c.

so delusion naturally is unattainable. Long ago, the Second Patriarch [Hui-k'o] stilled his mind by realizing this.⁵¹ The Sixth Patriarch [Hui-neng] realized it and received the robe [of Dharma transmission].⁵²

The *Diamond Sutra* says, "The Three Worlds are unattainable,"⁵³ and the *Lotus Sutra* says, "All phenomenal things are themselves the ultimate reality."⁵⁴ These are two aspects of the [same] idea. Because the Three Worlds are unattainable, all phenomenal things are themselves ultimate reality. Because all phenomenal things are themselves ultimate reality, the Three Worlds are unattainable. How wondrous are the golden words of the Tathagata!

You should try to quiet your mind. If you separate your original mind from arising and passing away, coming and going, and clearly realize what is intransient, the images reflected in your mind will also be intransient and unperishing. The reason for this it is that the distinctions between all the things in the universe, the arising and passing away of past and present, coming and going are fundamentally false and illusory. Nothing comes, nothing goes. Nothing arises and nothing passes away. Of course, if nothing arises and passes away, nor comes and goes, there is nothing that possesses all the distinctions. You should understand this from the [example] of reflections in the mirror.

When you first see something reflected in a mirror, it's not a matter of the image entering into the mirror. From the beginning, the image has not entered [the mirror], so there is nothing to get rid of. Since originally the object does not enter and leave, or come and go, the mirror is

⁵¹ Hui-k'o 慧可 (J. Eka; 487-593) was the disciple and Dharma heir of Bodhidharma who is said to have brought Ch'an to China. Tradition says that Hui-k'o cut off his arm and presented it to Bodhidharma in order to show his determination. See Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History*, vol. 1, pp. 94-96 for what little is known of him historically.

⁵² Hui-neng 慧能 (J. E'nô; 638-713) is known as the author of the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch* which begins with a short account of his life. For a discussion of his life and the sutra, see Philip Yampolsky's introduction to his translation, *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*.

⁵³ T. 8, p. 755c 25-6. Tetsugen abbreviates the line which reads 過去心不可待。現在心不可待。未來心不可待。The three worlds cannot be attained because the past mind has passed away, the present mind does not abide for even a moment, and the future mind does not yet exist.

⁵⁴ T. 9, p. 5c 11. Hurvitz, op.cit., p. 22-3. See note 17 above.

just the mirror, and does not eventually become the image. Since the mirror does not become the image, but reflects it, there is nothing in the universe that ceases to be distinct. It is difficult to say what is reflected and what is not. Various shapes made out of gold are not demons or Buddhas, but they take on the shapes of demons and Buddhas.

It is hard to say whether or not these [reflected images] exist. We refer to them as the phantom-like ten thousand dharmas, since "phantoms" are living things created with the magical arts. If a living thing has been produced by magic, then it's hard to say whether or not it exists. When we try saying it doesn't, then right before our eyes, it becomes a bird or animal and flies or runs around. When we try saying it does exist, then [we see that] it isn't a real bird or animal. Actually it is a piece of wood or a hand towel that has been changed into a living thing by magic.

Now, in the Three Worlds, this [view] extends to the entire universe, the ten thousand *dharmas*, as well as human beings. From the perspective of one mind⁵⁵ itself, we see that, in fact, there is not a single thing⁵⁶, and ultimate reality does not set up so much as one object of perception.⁵⁷ Therefore, there are no Buddhas, no sentient beings, no past, no present, nothing in heaven, nothing on earth, no self, and no other. This is the one mark of the *dharma-dhatu*.⁵⁸ It is similar to looking at things made from gold from the perspective of gold. We refer to this as "the aspect of mind as true thusness".⁵⁹

⁵⁵ *Isshin* 一心, the ultimate or Buddha-mind which penetrates all directions to see things as they are.

⁵⁶ The expression *honrai muichimotsu* 本来無一物 means that there is nothing to cling to, since all things are empty. It appears in the *Platform Sutra*, T. 48, p. 349a. This verse differs in the Tun-huang manuscript which reads 仏性常青淨 instead.

⁵⁷ *Itchin* 一塵, literally "one dust" or "one defilement." See note 31 above.

⁵⁸ *Hokkai* 法界, the realm of ultimate reality. Since all dharmas possess *buddha* nature, this term often refers to the ten thousand *dharmas*, or everything in the universe.

⁵⁹ *Shin shinnyomon* 心真如門. It says in the *Awakening of Faith*, 顯示正義者。依一心法有二種門。云何為二。一者心真如門。二者心生滅。(T. 32, p. 576a). Hakeda translates this passage, "The revelation of the true meaning [of the principle of Mahayana can be achieved] by [unfolding the doctrine] that the principle of One Mind has two aspects. One is the aspect of Mind in terms of the Absolute (*tathata*; Suchness), and the other is the aspect of Mind in terms of phenomena (*samsara*; birth and death)." Hakeda, trans., *The Awakening of Faith*, p. 31.

When we look at things from the perspective of the ten thousand *dharma*s, we make distinctions between heaven and earth, sun and moon, and distinguish all the various things in the universe. Flowers are always crimson and willows always green. Fire is hot, water cool; the wind moves and the earth is at rest. The pine is straight and the brambles twisted. The crane is white and the crow black. The sky is high and the earth low. There are Buddhas and sentient beings. We speak of "self" and "other". There are the four seasons, and the colors blue, yellow, red and white, each without any confusion. It is as if we saw things from the perspective of the individual forms and didn't see the gold [from which they are made]. We refer to this as "the aspect of mind as arising and passing away."⁶⁰

All sentient being are deluded by the aspects of the ten thousand *dharma*s, so when they see something, they covet it; when they hear something they argue over it; when they smell, taste, or touch something they become greedily attached to it. They have no conception at all that these *dharma*s are like dreams and illusions, or foam [on the water] and shadows. Like reflections in a mirror or the moon [reflected] on the water, they are illusory manifestations and empty delusions.

[As a result], they take on the four kinds of birth,⁶¹ from the womb, from an egg, from moisture, or by metamorphosis; they are transformed by the four marks of arising, abiding, changing, and passing away,⁶² they become attached to the objects of the five desires,⁶³ create the evil karma of the six senses, and for one thousand lifetimes and ten thousand *kalpas* their bodies burn in the flames of hell or [suffer] as hungry ghosts. Birth after birth and lifetime

⁶⁰ *Shinshōmetsumon* 心生滅門. See note 58.

⁶¹ *Shishō* 四生, the four kinds of birth are: from the womb (*taishō* 胎生), from an egg (*ranshō* 卵生), from moisture (*shisshō* 濕生), and by metamorphosis (*keshō* 化生).

⁶² *Shisō* 四相 are the four marks characterizing all phenomena: arising (*shō* 生), abiding (*jū* 住), changing (*i* 異), and passing away (*metsu* 滅).

⁶³ *Goyoku* 五欲, the five desires generally refer to attachments which arise in connection with the five senses. There are alternative lists, such as desire for wealth, sex, food and drink, fame, and sleep.

after lifetime they sink into suffering as animals and *asuras*. Even if they are born as human beings, they believe that their body formed by the union of the four great elements is the self, and because they take the external objects of the six senses to be their mind, they are constantly afflicted by old age, sickness, and death. They move through the four seasons, their black glossy hair becomes completely white, just as the sweet fragrance of the blossoms eventually withers, the morning dew disappears in an instant, and the evening mists lift.

In this floating world of transience and transformation, our lives are like a flash of lightning, not enduring for even a short time. We are not at peace for a moment, like constantly flowing water. We are like the flame that is extinguished every moment. Surely this is the shape of the *skandha* of psychic construction.

However, while sentient beings are transmigrating through the Three Worlds, they do not know that the ten thousand *dharma*s are illusory manifestations, and so become greedily attached to the dreams and illusions that are the objects of the six senses, and produce the illusory karma of the ten evil acts⁶⁴ and the five serious sins.⁶⁵ Therefore, they receive the illusory fruits of [falling into] hell and [becoming] hungry ghosts.

Your body is fundamentally an illusion, as is your mind. Since your mind is already an illusion, the afflictions are also illusions. Since the afflictions are fundamentally illusions, all evil karma is also illusion. Since evil karma is entirely illusion, so are the painful fruits of the three [lower] realms. Since the three [lower] realms are already illusion, the realms of heaven and of human beings must also be. Since birth and death in the Three Worlds are illusion, the causality of the four kinds of birth are also completely illusory, and so there is nothing within the entire *dharma-dhatu* that is not an illusion.

Because sentient beings create illusory karma and receive illusory suffering, all Buddhas

⁶⁴ *Jūaku* 十惡 are killing living things, stealing, sexual misconduct, lying, saying harsh words, saying words that cause disharmony between others, idle talk, greed, anger, and wrong views.

⁶⁵ *Gogyaku* 五逆 are killing one's father, killing one's mother, killing an arhat, causing the Buddha's body to bleed, and causing disunity among the Sangha.

extend their illusory compassion and teach the illusory *Dharma*, saving [sentient beings] from their illusory pain and offering them illusory pleasure. We refer to this as the supreme pleasure of nirvana.

You receive this supreme pleasure when you understand the illusory *Dharma*. Sentient beings are deluded about this illusory *Dharma*, so they receive illusory suffering from their illusory karma. The Buddhas have awakened to this illusory *Dharma*, and so escape from illusory suffering and turn it into illusory pleasure. Sentient beings are deluded by the illusory *Dharma* and befuddled by the dreams and illusions of arising and passing away, and so undergo birth and death, the unending suffering of impermanence,⁶⁶ and create the transmigration of psychic construction. The Buddhas, awakened to the illusory *Dharma*, turn these dreams and illusions of birth and death into nirvana, destroy the suffering of impermanence, and attain eternal pleasure. It is not especially difficult to see how to turn this suffering of impermanence into the eternal pleasure of nirvana. It is simply a matter of realizing that the transmigration of the ten thousand *dharma*s and the truth of birth and death are both dreams and illusions through and through.

Therefore, the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* says, "When you realize that it is illusion, then you escape it. Without using expedient means, you escape from illusion and so are enlightened. It is not a gradual process."⁶⁷ This can be explained as follows: The ten thousand *dharma*s of the Three Worlds are already illusion, so illusion originally does not arise. If the ten thousand *dharma*s don't arise, when would they pass away? If they have no connection with arising and passing away and coming and going, then wouldn't this be the nirvana of not-arising and not-passing away?

Originally, there is no birth and death, so "nirvana" is just a temporary name. Since there is neither birth and death nor nirvana, nor is there a distinction between affliction and enlightenment, nor a difference between sentient beings and Buddhas. Worrying about birth

⁶⁶ *Gyōku* 行苦 is one of the three basic kinds of suffering endured by sentient beings: contact with what one hates, impermanence, and separation from what one loves.

⁶⁷ T. 17, p. 914a.

and death is an affliction. Since there are no afflictions, there is no enlightenment. Since there are neither afflictions nor birth and death, what should we refer to as sentient beings? We call a sentient being who becomes enlightened a Buddha. Since originally there are no sentient beings, there is nothing we can call a now-enlightened Buddha. Therefore, what we call enlightenment is the certain discovery that in this way people are not fundamentally deluded, and [enlightenment] is merely their original form.

That is what it means in the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* when it says, "For the first time you understand that sentient beings are fundamentally perfected Buddhas (*honrai jōbutsu* 本来成仏)."⁶⁸ "Fundamentally perfected Buddhas" means being a Buddha from the beginning. Since originally they are not sentient beings, there is no particular need to call them Buddhas, but [in order to show that] they are not fundamentally deluded sentient beings, perforce we refer to them as Buddhas. Therefore, although there is no birth and death nor nirvana, we never say that there is no wondrous enlightenment, which ordinary people would find impossible to fathom.

For example, in the *Lankavatara Sutra*⁶⁹ there is a saying, "Just as the nature of a horse is not to be a cow, and the nature of the cow is not to be a horse, [so all *dharma*s have their own natures]."⁷⁰ For instance, just because we say [a horse] isn't a cow, doesn't mean that there is no horse nature. And when we say [a cow] isn't a horse, that doesn't mean the cow has no nature.

This is the same as saying there is no birth and death, no nirvana, no afflictions, no enlightenment, no sentient beings and no Buddhas. It is all the same as saying [a horse] is not a cow. In the same way, when we say birth and death and nirvana are not cows, that doesn't mean

⁶⁸ T. 17, p. 915a.

⁶⁹ Ryōgakyō 楞伽經 is one of the basic texts for Zen Buddhism since it teaches about the psychological process of enlightenment culminating in the eighth consciousness, the *alayā* consciousness. There are three translations in Chinese, they are all found in T. 16, nos. 670-672.

⁷⁰ T. 16, p. 505c.

that the horse of the mysterious and wonderful enlightenment has no nature.

It is like turning to someone who is dreaming and saying, "None of the things you see are real. The earth and sky you are looking at aren't the real earth and sky. The grass, trees and land that you see aren't the real grass, trees and land. What you see as yourself and as others, what you think of as sorrow and pleasure, none of these is real." [When you do this,] the dreaming person hears you and says, "Well then, if there is no earth and sky, no grass, trees and land, no self and no other, then does the awakened truth mean empty space?"

We say that it isn't this and it isn't that [for the following reason]. The things we see in dreams are all unfounded delusions. Although they aren't real, in the mind of the dreamer they are taken to be. The dreamer clings to them and thinks of them as suffering or pleasure. Therefore, we wake them from their dream to show them the real heaven and earth of waking hours.

Now, when you turn to deluded people and say that there is no birth and death, no nirvana, no sentient beings and no Buddhas, they wonder whether this is complete nihilism,⁷¹ if you are saying that true enlightenment is emptiness. This resembles the dreaming person saying, "When you say that nothing I see is real, are you saying that heaven and earth are empty and the real waking world is a place devoid of anything at all?" If you have never been enlightened and awakened from the dream of delusion, then you cannot know for certain what enlightenment is like.

In the *Lotus Sutra*, when [the Buddha] says of [the ten thousand *dharma*s], "the suchness of their marks, the suchness of their nature, the suchness of their substance, the suchness of their powers, the suchness of their function, the suchness of their causes, the suchness of their conditions, the suchness of their effects, the suchness of their retributions, and the absolute identity of their beginning and end,"⁷² this [describes] the moment you awaken from the dream

⁷¹ *Ikkô danmu* 一向斷無 is one of the heretical views about emptiness which advocates complete rejection of the self and the world and denies the process of causality. No definite cognate exists in English, so I have chosen to translate the term nihilism in order to convey in a single term the negative qualities of the position.

⁷² T. 9, p. 5c; Hurvitz, op.cit., pp. 22-23.

of delusion. "The dharma abide in the secure position in the world ever abiding"⁷³ also refers to it.

In addition, [the Buddha] also said, "When sentient beings see the *kalpa* ending and being consumed by a great fire, this land of mine is perfectly safe, ever full of gods and Buddhas."⁷⁴ This means that when the *kalpa* comes to an end and this world is being destroyed, in the eyes of deluded people, it seems that a fire from *avici*hell⁷⁵ has broken out and is burning everything as far as the First Meditation Heaven.⁷⁶ Yet in the eyes of the *Tathagata* Sakyamuni this world looks safe and filled with divine and human beings. Among the countless pleasures [he sees] there are various halls and pagodas in the garden adorned with all kinds of treasures, jewel trees laden with blossoms and fruit, and sentient beings amusing themselves there. Heavenly beings beat drums and continually play beautiful music. Heavenly blossoms rain down and scatter over the multitude, summoning the Buddhas.

[In the same way] although it is one and the same water, to the eyes of hungry ghosts it looks like fire, but human beings naturally see water. Although the Three Worlds are the tranquil Pure Land and not a burning house⁷⁷ if you are not deluded, just as the hungry ghosts see water as fire, for the deluded the Three Worlds look like the six paths.

Question: When you hear a truth as detailed as this, you understand for the most part and have no doubt that you yourself are originally a Buddha and that since the ancient past the world has been the Pure Land. Be that as it may, when you observe the changes in the phenomenal world, and associate your body with birth, old age, sickness, and death, it will seem

⁷³ T. 9, p. 9b; Hurvitz, op.cit., p. 41.

⁷⁴ T. 9, p. 43c; Hurvitz, op.cit., p. 243.

⁷⁵ *Mugen jigoku* 無間地獄, "the hell of unending pain", is another term for *avici*hell, the lowest of the Buddhist hells.

⁷⁶ *Shozenten* 初禪天 is the lowest of the four meditation heavens in the realm of form over which Brahma rules.

⁷⁷ The parable of the Burning House is found in the *Lotus Sutra*, T. 9, p. 12; Hurvitz, op.cit., p. 58ff.

as if you have not escaped from the suffering of impermanence, arising and passing away. How can you escape this suffering of impermanence and attain no-arising and no-passing away?

Answer: This kind of comprehension is known as faith and understanding. Although it seems that by careful conjecture you can understand the state of enlightenment a little bit, because true enlightenment still hasn't been disclosed, you have not yet awakened from the dream of ignorance. Since that is the case, while you know the gist of this truth, you have not escaped attachment to self or self-pride within your dream-like body, and [your thoughts of] hate and love or right and wrong are still deep. Deluded as you are within the realm of dreams and illusion, you are apt to arouse thoughts of gain and loss or benefit and harm, and create the karma of the three [lower] paths. All of this is a form within a dream.

The *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra* says, "Since they have not yet escaped transmigration and realized perfect enlightenment, it is said that even perfect enlightenment leads to transmigration."⁷⁸ This means that while your mind is not yet enlightened, you use your discriminating mind to distinguish and consider perfect enlightenment itself, and so even perfect enlightenment turns into transmigration.

In reality, if you think that you have realized enlightenment itself, and you do not cast off all intellectual understanding and cleverness, if you do not stop thoughts of right and wrong or wickedness and correctness, it is just like coming face to face with a silver mountain or a wall of iron. Indeed, you will give rise to a firm intention and focus on a single kōan, and without turning to look ahead or behind, to the right or the left, you will forget about sleeping, eating, cold and heat, and come to doubt. Therefore, when the [proper] time comes and the causes [are ripe], you will suddenly overcome the darkness of ignorance [that has surrounded you] for innumerable *kalpas*. For the first time you will wake up from the long night of dreaming. You will clap your hands and laugh out loud. You will reveal your original face⁷⁹ and illuminate the landscape of

⁷⁸ T. 17, p. 915c.

⁷⁹ *Honrai no menmoku* 本来面目 is used in the *Mumonkan* (T. 48, p. 295a) and other Zen texts as an expression for the true self or original nature.

the original state.⁸⁰ You will be able to accomplish the true desire of one thousand lifetimes and ten thousand *kalpas*. If you do not give rise to the thought of great truth, only then is it impossible to overcome ignorance.

Long ago, the venerable Ch'ang-shui⁸¹ wondered about the meaning of the passage in the *Śūramgama Sutra*, "How does pure nature suddenly gives rise to mountains, rivers, and the land?"⁸² He asked Master Hui-chueh⁸³ of Lang-yeh, "What does this verse mean?" [The master of] Lang-yeh answered, "How does pure nature suddenly gives rise to mountains, rivers, and the land?"⁸⁴ Upon these words, Ch'ang-shui suddenly attained great enlightenment just like the bottom of a bucket dropping out. Certainly this is a figure who overcame the skandha of psychic construction.

The meaning of that passage from the *Śūramgama Sutra* is [as follows]. "Pure nature" means that this world is originally the Pure Land of pure nature. When the World Honored One taught the *Śūramgama Sutra*, the venerable Pūrṇa⁸⁵ asked, "As the *Tathagata* said, this world is the Pure Land of pure nature, so how is it that it suddenly gives rise to mountains, rivers, the land, and all phenomena, and so constantly changes, arising and passing away?" Before Ch'ang-shui asked [his question], he had not awakened from the dream of psychic construction, and so the verse caused him great doubt. However, when he brought it up and asked, as a result of Master Lang-yeh's answer, he awoke from the dream for the first time and saw his pure nature.

⁸⁰ *Honji (honchi) no fûkô* 本地風光 is used in the *Hekigan roku*, case 99 (T. 48, p. 223b) with the same meaning as *honrai no menmoku*.

⁸¹ Ch'ang-shui Tzu-hsüan 長水子璿 (J. Chosui Shisen; d. 1038) was a disciple of Hui-chueh (see note 82 below). He wrote a commentary on the *Śūramgama Sutra* in Chinese.

⁸² T. 19, p. 119c.

⁸³ Hui-chüeh 慧覺 (J. Ekaku; dates unknown). A prominent Sung Dynasty Rinzai master, who was a disciple of Feng-yang Shan-chao 汾陽善昭 (947-1024). Hui-chüeh lived on Mount Lang-yeh and he is sometimes referred to as Master Lang-yeh.

⁸⁴ This exchange is recorded in Chang-shui's biography in the *Zoku dentōroku* 續伝灯録, T. 51, p. 511b.

⁸⁵ Pūrṇa (J. Furuna 富樓那) was one of the ten great disciples of the Buddha, renowned for his eloquence. Tetsugen was compared to him because of his talent for lecturing.

Long ago there was a monk who asked a virtuous old monk, "What should I do if [thoughts] won't stop arising and passing away?" The old monk answered, "You must immediately make them into cold ashes and a withered tree."⁸⁶ [The monk then] asked another virtuous old monk, "What should I do if [thoughts] won't stop arising and passing away?" The old monk answered, "Blind fool,⁸⁷ where do they arise and pass away?" It is said that upon these words the monk attained great enlightenment. These are all people who attained the realm of their original portion by means of [overcoming] psychic construction.

Section 6: Consciousness

Fifth, consciousness is basis of the four other [*skandhas* that we have already considered], namely matter and form, sensation, perception, and psychic construction. It produces the Three Worlds and the six paths; it is the root of delusion that produces everything from the human body to the universe as a whole, the heavens, earth and sky. This consciousness is itself the original mind, and although in itself free from distinctions, because of the misfortune of ignorance, we refer to it as consciousness. If it weren't for this misfortune of ignorance, then it would be the original mind. As Kuei-feng⁸⁸ said, "Consciousness is like an illusion or dream, [actually] it is just one mind."⁸⁹

What we call "consciousness" is just like the illusions that a magician makes when he takes a piece of wood and turns it into a bird or beast. No doubt it becomes an animate thing, flying or running about, but a piece of wood is fundamentally a piece of wood and not a bird or

⁸⁶ *Kankai koboku* 寒灰枯木 appears in *Daie Fukaku zenji goroku* 大慧禪師語錄 (T. 47, p. 884c) and the *Wanshi zenji goroku* 宏智禪師語錄 (T. 48, p. 27a).

⁸⁷ *Katsukan* 瞎漢 appears in the *Hekigan roku* case 10 (T. 48, p. 150b).

⁸⁸ Kuei-feng Tsung-mi 圭峰宗密 (J. Keihō Shūmitsu; 780-841) was the fifth patriarch of the Hua-yen school, and also regarded as a third generation Zen master in Ho-tse's lineage. He held the position that the teachings and meditation are one, and wrote a commentary on the *Perfect Enlightenment Sutra*.

⁸⁹ Unidentified.

beast. Showing it turn into something that doesn't exist is the power of the magician. In much the same way, through the magical power of ignorance, consciousness shows the original mind as something that changes, but the original mind itself does not change.

As a different example, [let me suggest that] consciousness is like people dreaming. When you aren't sleeping, you don't see dreams. When you are asleep, you see all kinds of dreams, and it seems as if all sorts of things that don't exist do. Consciousness is the same. When the original mind is not sleeping the sleep of ignorance, there are no distinctions between Three Worlds, there are no six paths, no hell, no heavenly realm, and nothing known as *saha*.⁹⁰ In that case, what would we refer to as "ultimate pleasure" [i.e. the Pure Land]?

Since originally there is no birth and death, we cannot apply the name "nirvana". From the start, afflictions do not arise, so we need not seek enlightenment. Originally, we do not become sentient beings, so we don't need to become Buddhas. Since the mind has never been deluded, to what should we be awakened now? Everything is just like this, and the splendid original mind itself does not express it in words. We pointlessly give [this level beyond all expression] a name, and refer to it as "original portion"⁹¹ or "original face". Affixing the sleep of ignorance to this original face is known as the root of ignorance. It is the beginning of ignorance. Because we affix the sleep known as the root of ignorance, we see all sorts of dreams. First of all, we see that there is emptiness, and this is the beginning of the dream.

In the *Śūramgama Sutra*, when it says, "Darkness makes emptiness"⁹² or "There is emptiness in delusion",⁹³ it means [the following]. Because we see that there is emptiness, it seems that within emptiness is heaven and earth, within heaven and earth are the myriad things,

⁹⁰ *Shaba* 娑婆 literally means endurance. It refers to this world in which sentient beings endure pain and affliction.

⁹¹ *Honbun no denchi* 本分田地 literally means the portion of land designated to an individual at birth, and is used here as a synonym for original face. The expression is used in several Zen texts, including the *Hekigan roku*, the *Keitoku dentōroku*, etc.

⁹² T. 19, p. 110c.

⁹³ T. 19, p. 130a.

among the myriad things are human beings, and among human beings is the self. Since there seem to be people, birds, animals, the moon and the blossoms, there are repulsive things, attractive things, things you like, and things you don't. Thereupon, there are things you desire and others you regret, and so you produce the dream of the eighty-four thousand afflictions.⁹⁴ Because of these afflictions, you kill, steal, feel lust, lie, and do other evil things with your body. You are driven mad with these afflictions and this is the evil karma you produce.

When you create all this evil karma, you fall into one of the three evil paths, hell, [the realm of] hungry ghosts or [the realm of] animals. For innumerable *kalpas*, your body is burned in raging flames, or your bones are frozen in the ice of the Crimson Lotus Hell and the Large Crimson Lotus Hell.⁹⁵ Or, you sink into the tortures of hungry ghosts which are difficult to stop, and for ten million *kalpas* you won't so much as hear the names of food and drink. When you come upon water and try to drink it, the water will turn to fire instead, and burn your throat. Even when you endure this kind of suffering, it is all just a dream within the sleep of ignorance.

On the other hand, if human beings reverse this evil karma, keep the five precepts⁹⁶ and [practice] the ten good acts,⁹⁷ they will escape from the three evil paths and attain a life as a human or heavenly being, and be born in their next life in a splendid body. Depending on the degree of their good karma, they will receive this or that pleasure. Be that as it may, they are still within the Three Worlds, inside the dreams within the sleep of ignorance. So, even though they are called pleasures, they aren't real pleasures. Though at the root they are suffering,

⁹⁴ *Hachiman shisen no bonnō* 八万四千煩惱 is an expression for all afflictions. It is used in various texts including the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra* and the *Hekigan roku*.

⁹⁵ *Guren daiguren* 紅連大紅連 (Sk. Padma and Mahāpadma) are the seventh and eighth of the eight freezing hells. The names indicate that they are so cold that the sinners' skin turns crimson and is torn into lotus blossom shapes. They are described in the *Daichido ron* 大智度論, T. 25, p. 176ff.

⁹⁶ *Gokai* 五戒 are the five precepts taken by lay Buddhists, not to kill, not to steal, not to commit adultery, not to lie, and not to drink alcohol.

⁹⁷ *Jūzen* 十善 are: not killing, not stealing, not committing adultery, not lying, not saying evil words, not saying words that cause enmity between others, not engaging in idle talk, not being greedy, not being angry, and not having wrong views.

because we are deluded, we think they are pleasure. Moreover, human beings endure the eight types of suffering⁹⁸ and heavenly beings the five marks of decline.⁹⁹ Since this suffering does not cease, [the human and heavenly realms] are not places where you can stop thoughts [of craving and desire]. [Instead, they are] worlds you should grow weary of and cast off at once.

If persons understand this truth, they will realize that though the pleasures of human and heavenly beings resemble pleasure, they still lie within the transmigration of the six paths. Theirs is still the transitory pleasure of phenomenal existence, and so is the ephemeral pleasure within the dream of ignorance. [Those who understand this] will give rise to belief in the Great Truth. When they sit in meditation and work on kôans, within their minds they will produce these three qualities: good, evil, and indifference. "Good" means the mind is thinking about good things. "Evil" means that evil things float through the mind. "Indifferent" refers to a mind which is neither good nor evil, but does things absent-mindedly and idly.

You never stop giving rise to these three kinds of thoughts. If you aren't thinking about something evil, then you are thinking about something good. If you aren't thinking about something good, then you are thinking about something evil. The short periods of time when you aren't producing good or evil thoughts are known as indifference; indifference [refers to] a mind that acts absent-mindedly without thinking anything, a state of idleness. Evil thoughts are the seeds of hell, hungry ghosts, and animals; good thoughts are the seeds of becoming a human or heavenly being; and indifference is the form of foolishness and ignorance which has not yet distinguished good and evil.

In this way, while you are not yet free from good, evil, and indifference, you are a beginner who has still not mastered sitting in meditation. When you are no longer concerned that such thoughts arise, your intention will deepen more and more, and you will sit in meditation intently,

⁹⁸ *Hakku* 八苦 are: birth, old age, illness, death, separation from what one loves, contact with what one hates, not getting what one seeks, growth of mind and body (*gounjôku* 五陰盛苦).

⁹⁹ *Gosui* 五衰 are: clothes becoming soiled, flowers in headdress withering, the body emitting a foul odor, perspiring under the arms, and becoming disinclined to take the appropriate seat or position.

without boredom. Then as your zazen matures a little, at times neither good nor evil thoughts will arise, nor will the indifferent mind act idly. Your mind will be perfectly clear, and for a little while you will produce a mind like a highly polished mirror or crystal clear water. This zazen mind is a sign that appears as long as the dew.

Once this happens, you must persevere in your meditation. If you sit in meditation intently without being negligent, at first your mind will clear for short periods, but gradually your mind will be clear while you meditate for one third of the time or two thirds of the time. Then it will be clear from beginning to end, neither good nor evil thought arise, nor is the mind indifferent. Like the clear Autumn sky or a polished mirror on a stand, the mind is the same as empty space, and you feel as if the Dharmakāya were within your breast. Nothing can compare with the coolness within your breast. This is the state of someone who has perfected sitting in meditation more than half of the time. In the Zen sect we call it "beating everything into one", "the realm of one form", "a person who has died the great death", and "the world of Fugen".¹⁰⁰

When this has happened, after a while the beginner wonders if he or she is already enlightened, or even if he or she is the equal of the Buddha Sakyamuni or Bodhidharma. This is a terrible error. It is just this kind of situation that we refer to as the fifth *skandha* of consciousness.

The *Sûramgama Sutra* says, "Entering deeply and encountering depth is the limit of consciousness."¹⁰¹ This means [the following]. There are some people in this world who practice zazen diligently. When they encounter this [level of experience], they immediately believe it is enlightenment, and may even deceive Lin-chi¹⁰² or Te-shan.¹⁰³ They spread it about that they

¹⁰⁰ *Tajō (dajō) ippen* 打成一片, *ishikihen* 一色辺, *daishitei no hito* 大死底人, *Fugen no kyōgai* 普賢境界 all appear in the *Hekigan roku* (cases 6, 42, 41, and 5, respectively) as expressions for breakthrough experiences which are not yet the great enlightenment. Fugen is the Bodhisattva Samantabhadra who represents meditation.

¹⁰¹ T. 19, p. 155a.

¹⁰² Lin-ch'i I-hsuan 臨濟義玄 (J. Rinzaigen; d. 866) was the first master in the lineage that bears his name. Both the Obaku and Japanese Rinzaigen sects are part of this lineage. For an account of Lin-ch'i and his work, see Dumoulin, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 179-209.

¹⁰³ Te-shan Hsuan-chien 德山宣鑑 (J. Tokusan Senkan; 782-865) was one of the prominent

have attained their original face and arrived at their original portion. They bestow *inka*¹⁰⁴ on many other people, make use of the [master's] rod, shout "*Katsu*!",¹⁰⁵ and in this way imitate the behavior of the patriarchs. But they have not yet realized the inner enlightenment of the patriarchs, nor reached the root of One Mind.

Not yet having attained [enlightenment], they believe in all sorts of truths and think that this is enlightenment. Or they say that enlightenment is a place of complete emptiness, or that it is a matter of moving ones eyes and mouth and working one's arms and legs. There are those who will grant permission [i.e. *inka*] even to people such as these. They are all far from the mind of the patriarchs.

Now those who are deluded by consciousness and think it is enlightenment are quite different from people [just described] who have such a shallow understanding. They [seek] the truth, and even though their practice climbs to this level [of sitting in meditation without thoughts arising], they don't understand transcending consciousness. Therefore they are deluded by consciousness and take it to be their original mind, because they have not yet attained [true] practice.

The *Sûramgama Sutra* says, "When there are no distinctions of this sort at all, then there is no form and no emptiness. Makkali Gosâla¹⁰⁶ was deceived and what he took to be the basic substance of existence has no distinct nature apart from all *dharma* causes."¹⁰⁷ It also says, masters of the T'ang Dynasty, well known for his use of shouts and the stick on his disciples.

¹⁰⁴ *Inka* 印可 are seals of recognition used in the Zen school bestowed by a master on a disciple to certify the disciple's attainment of enlightenment.

¹⁰⁵ *Katsu* 喝 is a shout characteristic of many Rinzai masters. It is often used to jar disciples out of the constraints of discursive thought so that they may attain enlightenment.

¹⁰⁶ Kujari 拘舍離 (Sk. Makkhali Gosâla) was a philosopher in ancient India and one of the six opponents of the Buddha. We know of his thought from the *Jôagongyô* 長阿含經 (Sk. Dīrghāgama) T. 1, no. 1, and the *Daihatsu nehangyô* 大般涅槃經 (Sk. Mahāparinirvanasūtra) T. 1, no. 7. He denied the truth of karmic causality. His teaching is one of the classical examples of wrong views. See W. Woodville Rockhill, *The Life of the Buddha* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1884), pp. 101-2, and 249-255.

¹⁰⁷ T. 19, p. 111a.

"Even if you extinguish thinking, hearing, learning, and knowing,¹⁰⁸ and preserve your internal quiet and seclusion, this is still a contrived notion of distinction, an object of the mind."¹⁰⁹

As virtuous monks of the past have taught, whenever this interior quiet and seclusion is preserved, in the end some wise and holy people are overwhelmed [by the experience of nothingness and cannot escape]. When we look at the Sung Confucian disposition in which joy, anger, grief and pleasure have not yet appeared,¹¹⁰ it is merely within this realm. Lao-tzu's attainment of extreme emptiness and his preservation of tranquility and kindness are also within this realm. In Buddhism, the entry of *arhats* and *pratyekabuddhas* into *samadhi*, and the fruits of their enlightenment are also said to be in this realm.

All of the [above-mentioned attainments] are free from the distinctions of seeing, hearing, learning and knowing. They indicate a place of no-thought and no-mind like the one that the Buddha and the patriarchs mention. The place of no-thought and no-mind which is like the clear blue sky is known as "the eighth consciousness of sentient beings"¹¹¹ (i.e. *alaya* consciousness), and is the source that produces the delusions of the Three Worlds and the six paths. It is from [the *alaya* consciousness] that we create heaven, earth, sky, and all sentient and insentient beings in them. It is just like seeing all kinds of dreams when you are asleep. This is what the Buddha meant when he taught that the Three Worlds are consciousness only.¹¹² It is also what it means to say that *alaya* consciousness "is the basic sense organs, the seeds [of consciousness]

¹⁰⁸ *Kenmon kakuchi* 見聞覺知 refers to all the workings of the six or eight (depending on the school of thought) consciousness. See note 110 below.

¹⁰⁹ T.19, p. 109a.

¹¹⁰ Tetsugen is making reference here to a state of "equilibrium" or "centrality" spoken of in Neo-Confucian texts. The locus classicus for all Neo-Confucian discussion of this state is found in the first chapter of *The Mean*. For Chu Hsi's comments on this passage from *The Mean*, see *Reflections of Things at Hand*, translated by Wing-tsit Chan, pp. 129-130.

¹¹¹ *Daihasshiki* 第八識 is another term for the *alaya* consciousness, since it is the eighth of the eight consciousness used by Yogacara (Hossô) thought to describe perception. The first five correspond to the five senses, the sixth to the mind that discriminates objects, the seventh, called *manas* consciousness, is ego awareness, and the eighth is the *alaya* consciousness which acts as a kind of storehouse for all sensory perceptions and thoughts.

¹¹² *Sangai yuishiki* 三界唯識 is the opening line of the *Yuishikiniuron*, T. 31, p. 74b.

and the perception of the physical world."¹¹³ He also taught in the *‘Sūramgama Sūtra*, "The *alaya* consciousness is the consciousness of detail. It makes habitual feelings continue without cease. Afraid of confusing truth and untruth, we never begin."¹¹⁴

As virtuous monks of the past explained, if the Buddha had taught one-sidedly that [the *alaya* consciousness] was true, then sentient beings would not progress in their practice, but fall into the pride of their own superiority. If he had taught one-sidedly that [the *alaya* consciousness] was untrue, then sentient beings would fall into self-despair and self-rejection, and give rise to nihilistic views. Accordingly, it is said that he never taught ordinary people or [*śrāvakas* and *pratyekabuddhas* in] the two vehicles about it.

Since this consciousness resembles the true original mind, but isn't the original mind, even the Buddha couldn't easily teach about it to foolish people. This is because, if he taught that this consciousness itself was the truth, then sentient beings would stop there, and thinking this [level of attainment] was sufficient, not persevere in their practice. [On the other hand,] if he taught that it wasn't true, then sentient beings would think that everything is completely void, doubt the existence of the original mind and fall into nihilism. Then they would indeed be unable to awaken to the original mind. That is what I mean when I say that this is a very great matter, and not even the Buddha can easily teach it.

Although this consciousness is the original mind itself, because we are asleep and attached to ignorance, it is difficult to say that it is. Although it is difficult to call it the original mind, just because all deluded thoughts have not instantly disappeared, doesn't mean that we can say it is totally delusion. If practitioners arrive at this level, they will produce more and more energy for practice. . Before long, they will [attain] true enlightenment of the sort previously described.

This is like the night growing light even before the sun has risen. Although the darkness

¹¹³ *Konshin* 根身 are the five senses; *shushi* (or *shuji*) 種子 are the "seeds" which make perception possible; and *kikai* 器界 is the "vessel realm", the physical environment.

¹¹⁴ T. 19, p. 124c.

of night will soon be lifted, for some reason, you don't realize that this will happen and the whole world will become bright. If you see the darkness dispelled and still ignore the fact that it has happened, then you will not be able to see the sun. If the darkness of delusion has been lifted, and you notice that your heart (*mune*) is perfectly bright and clear, and still ignore the fact that you are enlightened, then you cannot see the sun of *prajña*.

Although the darkness of delusion has been dispelled, you still don't believe this is [enlightenment], so you don't let it alone or enjoy it. Thinking this isn't the mind of enlightenment, but just no-thought and no-mind, you continue striving single-mindedly. Then, suddenly, real enlightenment appears, and the ten thousand *dharma*s will all be illuminated, just as if one hundred thousand suns had come up all at the same time. We say this is "seeing your [original] nature and becoming a Buddha",¹¹⁵ and call it "the Great Enlightenment and Great Penetration",¹¹⁶ and "the nirvana of pleasure."¹¹⁷

At that time, you will see all the Buddhas in the Three Worlds and will understand the marrow of Sakyamuni and Bodhidharma. You will see the original nature of all sentient beings, and penetrate to the origin of heaven, earth, and the myriad things. Nothing can compare to such a joyous event. Therefore, the *Sûramgama Sutra* says, "Purity comes to perfection, and light is transmitted. Tranquility and illumination encompass emptiness. When you return to look at the world, it is still like something in a dream."¹¹⁸

When this enlightenment has completely developed, your *Dharma* nature and the *Dharmakāya* are tranquil and illuminating. They are one, and not two, like the land and the sky. Everything in the universe is one, and there is nothing that is not within your original mind. For

¹¹⁵ *Kenshō jōbutsu* 見性成佛 is a very common expression in Zen texts for enlightenment.

¹¹⁶ *Daigo daitetsu* 大悟大徹 is another expression for enlightenment used by Yin-yüan, see *Ingen zenshū* II, p. 932.

¹¹⁷ *Jakumetsu iraku* 寂滅為樂 is found in the *Nirvana Sutra*, T. 12, p. 451a. It is part of the verse cited on p. 344, identified in notes 44 and 46.

¹¹⁸ T. 19, p. 131a.

this reason, the *Sûramgama Sutra* says, "Although what you see and perceive seem to be in the world before your eyes, from the beginning it is your own creation."¹¹⁹

"What you see" only mentions one of the six sense organs, the eyes, but it represents the other five as well. "What you perceive" means the realm of the six dusts, [that is] all the ten thousand *dharma*s. This teaches that the self and the ten thousand *dharma*s are just the one original mind, wondrous enlightenment itself. As they say, "The land is changed into gold, and the long river is churned into whey."¹²⁰ This is the true world of ultimate bliss.

Long ago there was a monk who asked Yun-men,¹²¹ "When you don't give rise to a single thought, what is it like?" Yun-men answered, "Mount Sumeru."¹²² There was another monk who asked Chao-chou,¹²³ "How would it be if I came carrying nothing at all?" Chao-chou said, "Set it down!" The monk replied, "But I am already carrying not one thing. What would I put down?" Chao-chou answered, "If you have set it down, then take it up again!" Upon these words, the monk attained great enlightenment.¹²⁴

One [monk] spoke of "not giving rise to a single thought", and the other of "not carrying a single thing". Both monks had reached the level of no-thought and no-mind. They believed that this was enlightenment and questioned Yun-men and Chao-chou [respectively]. Knowing that they were ill, the [masters] answered them as they did. When they could penetrate "Mount

¹¹⁹ T. 19, p. 113c.

¹²⁰ Tetsugen is paraphrasing a line from the Genjô kôan chapter of Dôgen's *Shôbôgenzô*, found in T. 82, p. 25a. The Taishô text is somewhat different: 佛家ノ風ハ大地ノ黄金ナルヲ現成セシメ。長河ノ酥酪ヲ参熟セリ。 Francis Cook translates the verse, "Because the wind is eternal, the wind of Buddhism manifests the yellow gold of the earth and turns the rivers into sweet cream." Cook, *Sounds of Valley Streams*, p. 69.

¹²¹ Yun-men Wen-yen 雲門文偃 (J. Unmon Bun'en; 864-949) was a founder of one of the "Five Houses" of Ch'an during the T'ang. Many chapters from the *Mumonkan* and *Hekigan roku* concern him. For a brief account of his life and work, see Dumoulin, op.cit., vol. 1, pp. 230-233.

¹²² *Hekigan roku* T. 48, p. 239b.

¹²³ Chao-chou Ts'ung-shen 趙州從諗 (J. Jôshû Jûshin; 778-897) was an eccentric T'ang master who appears often in the kôan collections. See Dumoulin, vol. 1, pp. 167-168.

¹²⁴ *Hekigan roku* T. 48, p. 263a. Tetsugen's quotation differs somewhat from the Taishô text.

Sumeru" or "Set it down!", for the first time they arrived at their original portion and could see eye to eye with Yun-men and Chao-chou. By practicing kôans diligently you should reach this level.

For this reason, people from the distant past said, "When hanging off a cliff, you should let go your hand of your own free will. After the end, when you come back to life a second time, no one will be able to deceive you."¹²⁵ They also said, "Take one step off the end of a hundred-foot pole and your body will appear in all the worlds in the ten directions."¹²⁶ All these [sayings] express the moment of enlightenment. By diligently sitting in meditation and practicing kôans, you should attain this level. You must not make a mistake and fall into a fox's cave.

¹²⁵ *Hekigan roku* T. 48, p. 226c.

¹²⁶ *Mumonkan* case 46, T. 48, p. 298c.