

Ingen and the Threat to the Myōshinjiha

Richard Jaffe

Introduction

A hundred years ago the true style changed and Zen followers adopted an obnoxious teaching. Those who would combine Pure Land with Zen are as common as hemp and millet. In olden times outward appearance was the *śravaka* practice, the internal mystery was the bodhisattva Way. Nowadays outward appearance is the Zen teaching and the inner mystery is the Pure Land practice. It is just like mixing milk and water in one vessel...

In this world these people create a great variety of superior environments and delude those on earth today. They attract a lay following and receive obeisances and offerings, but in the life to come they will without question fall to the lowest hell. How do they feel about the torture of having their flesh pared off and their bones ground to pieces, of drinking molten copper and swallowing balls of iron? If they give it some thought it will make their hair stand on end.¹⁾

In 1753, nearly one hundred years after Ingen Ryūki (C. Yinyuan Longqi, 1592–1673) came to Japan, Hakuin Ekaku (1686–1769) wrote this vitriolic attack on the Ōbaku school. Hakuin was not unique in his animosity toward this new, third Zen school in Japan and its Pure Land-Zen syncretist teachings. His attitude was consistent with that of his Rinzai school predecessors Mujaku Dōchū (1653–1744), Keirin Sōchin (1653–1728), and Hakuin's own great grand-teacher, Gudō Tōshoku (1577–1661).²⁾

There are of course doctrinal and other, more mundane, reasons for

the Rinzai school's, particularly the Myōshinjiha's, vehement opposition to the entry of a third stream of Zen into Japan. Rinzai monks, however, had not always been uniformly opposed to the teachings of Ingen. Ironically, the Ōbaku school would not have taken root in Japan without the aid of a handful of influential Myōshinjiha monks who were drawn toward Ingen's teachings. These monks — who conceived of their tradition more broadly than did Gudō, Mujaku, Hakuin, and other representatives of what is now considered to be Rinzai school orthodoxy — saw Ingen not as a foreign interloper, but as a transmitter of Rinzai's true teachings. For this group of monks, Ingen's arrival was construed as an opportunity to revive the sagging discipline and sinking fortunes of the Rinzai school in early Tokugawa Japan.

The Ōbaku school has been largely ignored by both Japanese and Western scholars. This is probably due to the marginal place the school has held in Japan since the end of the Tokugawa period. Additionally, without the relatively large number of sectarian scholars possessed by both the Rinzai and Sōtō schools, the history of the Ōbaku tradition has never come under the same intense self-scrutiny as the two major Zen traditions. Having been relegated to the periphery in most histories of Japanese Zen, this school has been all but ignored by Western scholars well. But the role played by the Ōbaku school in the history of Japanese Zen has not always been a marginal one.

When Ingen first came to Japan he captured the imagination of a significant portion of the Zen world. For a time, he and his supporters threatened to split or even to overwhelm the powerful Myōshinji faction. Although I cannot within the scope of this short paper provide a complete overview of the history of the Ōbakushū in Japan, I do intend to demonstrate, by examining the interaction between Ingen and his supporters and detractors within the Myōshinjiha, the impact of the Ōbaku school on Japanese Zen during the pivotal early-modern period.

A Brief Biography of Ingen in China

Before coming to Japan, Ingen had an illustrious career in Ming China. The following summary of Ingen's life in China is based on the detailed biography given by Hirakubo Akira and the brief biographical sketch found in chapter forty-five of the *Honchō kōsōden*.³⁾ Ingen was born in 1592 and when a short time later his father abandoned his family, Ingen was forced to halt his schooling and to work as a plowboy, clearing fields. At the age of twenty having deferred his marriage in order to search for his father, Ingen began to travel around China. Failing to locate his father, in desperation he appealed to Guanyin at Putuo shan, and vowed to realize the meaning of the Buddhist teachings.

Ingen was finally ordained on Mt. Huangbo by Jianyuan Xingshou (J. Kangen Kōju), in 1620 at age of twenty-eight. Travelling in search of an appropriate teacher, Ingen, then thirty-two, encountered Miyun Yuanwu (J. Mitsuun Engo, 1566-1642) who, because of his reputation as a great and demanding teacher, had collected a large following of students. Ingen moved to the Guanghui si on Mt. Jinsu, where, in 1624 at the request of a lay supporter, Miyun had become the new abbot. When Miyun moved to the Wanfu si on Mt. Huangbo, Ingen accompanied him. He remained with Miyun until 1630, when his teacher sent him out of the Wanfu monastery in order to raise money for the temple. After a brief unsuccessful period of soliciting donations for the temple, Ingen was invited by several laypeople to live at a small temple at the base of Shizi yan. Ingen remained in relative seclusion at Shizi yan for three years, until he was invited by Feiyin Tongrong (J. Hiin Tsūyō, 1593-1661), a dharma disciple of Miyun's who had succeeded to the abbacy of the Wanfu si, to return to the monastery and take up the post of *xitang* (J. *seidō*, visiting teacher). Three months into his tenure as *xitang*, Ingen was given transmission by Feiyin. Thus Ingen became the thirty-second generation dharma descendant

from Linji in the Yangqi branch of the Linji school.

Feiyin retired from the abbacy of Wanfu si in 1636; Ingen succeeded him in the office in 1637 and served for seventeen years (with one two-year leave of absence). Under Ingen's skillful management, major renovations and additions to the monastic facilities were accomplished, and monastic land holdings were increased from approximately 100 *mu* to over 400 *mu*. The monastic population also steadily increased during Ingen's term as abbot — the winter practice period of 1651 drew one thousand monks to Wanfu si. The group was so unwieldy that it became necessary to divide the assembly into two parts, with two *shouzuō* (J. *shuso*, head monk) and two *xitang*. During his abbacy, Ingen gave transmission to 12 disciples.

Given Ingen's success as abbot of Wanfu si, his decision to move to Japan in 1654 is surprising. One circumstance that may have contributed to Ingen's departure from Wanfu si was the increasingly chaotic condition that preceded the collapse of the Ming dynasty in 1661. The primary factor motivating Ingen to leave, however, was the series of invitations proffered to him by Yiran Xingrong (J. Itsunen Shōyū, 1601-1668). Yiran, who had come to Japan from China in 1644, was serving as the abbot of the Kōfukuji in Nagasaki, one of three temples that had been established by the Chinese expatriate community living there. (The other two Chinese temples in Nagasaki were Sūfukuji and Fukusaiji.)⁴⁾ When the abbacy at Sūfukuji became vacant, Wuxin Xingjue (J. Mushin Shōkaku, 1613-71), a monk in the assembly at Kōfukuji, suggested that his friend, Yelan Xinggui (J. Yaran Shōkei, d. 1651) be invited to come from China to assume that position. Yelan, one of Ingen's Chinese dharma successors, accepted the invitation, but he tragically perished at sea in 1651 en route to Nagasaki. Terribly distraught, Wuxin then asked Yiran to invite Yelan's teacher, Ingen, to Japan; Yiran agreed to do so.

Yiran, with the support of the Chinese community in Nagasaki, then invited Ingen to come Japan. Ingen was cautious and did not agree until

he received both a fourth letter of invitation from Yiran and a report from his grand-student, Lingsou Dinghuo (J. Reisō Jōkatsu, dates unknown), who had travelled to Nagasaki to survey the conditions there.⁵⁾ Finally, Ingen sent a letter to Yiran accepting the invitation to come to Nagasaki. Ingen, and twenty disciples, set sail from Amoy on the eleventh day of the sixth month of 1654.

Reactions to Ingen's Arrival in Japan

Even before he disembarked in Nagasaki, Ingen was known in Japan, particularly among a coterie of monks in the Myōshinjiha. Rumors of Ingen's success at Wanfu si may have been spread through the Chinese expatriate community; he also became known to the Zen community through his *goroku* (recorded sayings). Mujaku Dōchū (1653-1744), a disciple of Jikuin Somon (1610-77), one of the early supporters of Ingen in the Myōshinjiha, describes how Ingen's *goroku* was discovered by Tokuō Genkō (d. 1681), who was living at the Senjuin, a sub-temple of Myōshinji. According to the account in the *Ōbaku geki*, Tokuō found Ingen's collected sayings among a number of books he had bought en masse. Impressed by the contents of the work he shared it with another Myōshinjiha monk, Ryōkei Sōsen (1602-70), who was equally excited by the work. When Ingen arrived in Nagasaki three years later, they excitedly attempted to garner more information about the new Chinese master.⁶⁾

Mujaku's writings contain a hearty prejudice against Ingen and his supporters, particularly Ryōkei, but this passage is surprisingly neutral in tone and substance, and given the following supporting factors there seems little reason to doubt its verity. Mujaku's teacher, Jikuin, was intimately involved with the pro-Ingen group from the very beginning of Ingen's stay in Japan until around 1656. As a result, Mujaku, through his teacher, would have been privy to numerous stories about Ingen. The

edition of Ingen's *goroku* mentioned in this passage is probably the *Ingen goroku*, published in China in 1642⁷⁾ It is not at all implausible that this text could have reached Japan by 1651, three years before Ingen's arrival. In light of the large and rapid response to Ingen's arrival in Japan, the general contours of Mujaku's story are believable — Ingen's writings in some form were circulating in Japan prior to his arrival and had made a positive impression upon several members of the Myōshinjiha.⁸⁾

There is little information available concerning two of the monks mentioned in the above story, Jikuin Somon and Tokuō Myōkō (1611-81). Jikuin was a dharma successor of Senzan Genshō and a member of the Myōshinjiha's Reiunpa. Through contacts he made while working to bring Ingen to Kyoto, he was allowed to found the Ryūgein in 1658. Jikuin served as the 223d abbot of Myōshinji and gave dharma transmission to Mujaku Dōchū.⁹⁾ Ogisu Jundō has suggested that at the time of Ingen's arrival in Japan, Jikuin was acting as *kanjin* (solicitor of donations) for the repair of the Nara Daibutsuden, which had been destroyed in 1567.¹⁰⁾

Tokuō Myōkō, the 196th abbot of Myōshinji, was a disciple of Tai-shuku Genshō and the founder of the Senjuin, a sub-temple of Myōshinji that was established in 1652. After the death of Isshi Bunshu (1608-1648), Tokuō took over the role of spiritual adviser for the retired emperor Gomizunoo (r. 1611-29), giving Gomizunoo the refuges (*kie*) and lecturing to him about the *Rinzairoku*. After a brief period, Tokuō retired to the Bodaiin, then a part of Entsūji, and went into seclusion. The retired emperor gave the Bodaiin to Tokuō and allowed him to select a new spot for the temple. Tokuō chose the current site, north of Myōshinji, which at that time belonged to Eienji. Gomizunoo paid Eienji five hundred gold coins and had the Bodaiin moved to the new location, which incidentally is close enough to Ryūanji to make the above story plausible. The name was then changed to the Senjuin. If the story from the *Ōbaku geki* is true, it occurred either prior to the official completion of the Senjuin in 1652

or less than three years before Ingen's arrival.¹¹⁾

Ryōkei Sōsen, whose dharma name was later changed by Ingen to Shōsen, was another prominent member of the Myōshinjiha. In 1617, at the age of 15, he was ordained at Fumonji in Settsu. When the eighth abbot of Fumonji died in 1620, Ryōkei succeeded to the abbacy. According to Washio, Ryōkei had formerly received transmission from Hakubu Eryō, in the Reiunpa.¹²⁾ In 1651, Ryōkei became the abbot of Myōshinji by imperial command and was awarded the purple robe. After a short term he withdrew from that position. In 1654 Ryōkei once again bowed to an imperial decree and assumed a second term as abbot of Myōshinji. In 1655 Ryōkei gave a portrait of himself to one of his students. The painting bears the following words, written by Ryōkei: "Old man Ryōkei, current abbot of Myōshinji." Washio Junkyō concludes from this evidence that Ryōkei was becoming increasingly interested in Ingen at the same time as he was serving as the abbot of Myōshinji.¹³⁾ We may conclude from this information that Tōkuō and Ryōkei, purple-robed monks in influential positions within the Myōshinjiha, were interested in Ingen even prior to his arrival in Japan.

During the early Tokugawa period, one can detect within part of the Myōshinji community a palpable dissatisfaction with the current state of Japanese Zen practice. For some time prior to Ingen's arrival, numerous monks, frustrated in their search for an enlightened teacher within Japan, had attempted to travel to Ming China. Isshi Bunshu, an outspoken critic of the Zen establishment's decrepitude, attempted to leave for China but was stopped by the increasingly harsh restrictions on travel emanating from the Tokugawa government during the 1630s. Ryōkei and another Rinzai monk, Tetsugyū Dōki (1628-1700) also apparently wished to travel to China in search of transmission from an authentic master, but they too were unable to get permission to travel from the government.¹⁴⁾

Bankei Yōtaku (1622-93) is yet another monk who, after searching fruitlessly for a Japanese teacher to verify his enlightenment experience, looked to the Chinese Zen world for a master. (One of his teachers, Unpo Zenjō (1568-1653) had suggested that Bankei turn to Gudō Tōshoku (1577-1661), a greatly respected Japanese teacher, for verification, but Bankei was unable to contact him.) Bankei eventually went into seclusion, despairing of ever being able to find a satisfactory teacher. In 1651, Bankei learned that the famous Chinese Zen master Daozhe Chaoyuan (d. 1660) was in Nagasaki and immediately left his retreat to see him. Daozhe verified Bankei's *kenshō*, but warned that Bankei still "... had to clarify the matter beyond, which is the essence of our school." Bankei was impressed enough by Daozhe to remain at the Sufukuji, where Daozhe was abbot, for over one year. Several years later Bankei attempted in vain to gain governmental permission for Daozhe to leave Nagasaki in order to found a temple in the interior of Japan.¹⁵⁾

According to the *Tokugawa jikki*, Ingen arrived in Japan in 1654, on the fifth day of the seventh month. In the *Jikki's* laconic entry the reason given for Ingen's journey to Japan was, "to spread the *Dharma*."¹⁶⁾ The *bakufu* had been alerted to arrival of the eminent Zen monk by an urgent report sent from the Nagasaki magistrate.

The overwhelmingly positive response by a large number of Japanese monks to Ingen's arrival in Nagasaki was nothing short of phenomenal. This reaction is testimony to Ingen's reputation and to the widespread dissatisfaction within the Japanese Zen world. As soon as word of Yiran's invitation to Ingen leaked out, monks began to plan to visit the eminent Chinese master. As early as 1652, one hapless monk, Ryōō Dōkaku (1630-1707), left Edo for Nagasaki under the misapprehension that the Chinese teacher's arrival was imminent. Ryōō, at the outset of his journey, said, "In the great country of Ming there is a man named Zen Master Ingen. He has responded to an invitation to come to Japan. Truly this is an opportunity met with only once in a thousand years." Ryōō, who later

became a disciple of Ingen, did not realize his mistake until he and his travelling companion, another Zen monk, reached Okayama prefecture.¹⁷⁾

When Ingen finally disembarked in Nagasaki he received a splendid welcome from the Chinese emigres and the Japanese, both laypeople and monks. Ryōō Dōkaku, who finally managed to be on hand for the event, noted,

As Ingen's arrival drew close, the multitudes from all over the country grew more boisterous with each passing day... This year, on the sixth day of the seventh month, he disembarked. The men and women of Hizen and Higo, old and young alike, lined the roadside and paid obeisance [to Ingen]. Monks and laypeople, both high and low, lined up in front of the monks' hall and welcomed him. He was immediately enshrined [as the abbot of] the Tōmyōzan Kōzan Kofukuzen'in.¹⁸⁾

Another monk interested in Ingen's arrival was Tangetsu Shōen (1607-72), first abbot of the Myōshinji *tatchu*, the Jiun'in. By imperial order, Tangetsu became abbot of Myōshinji in 1661. Around the time of Ingen's arrival he sent a letter to Korei Ryōkaku, the abbot of the Zenrinji in Hiroshima, stating,

The day of Great Zen Master Ōbaku Ingen's coming to Japan to teach has arrived. He has intentionally travelled to Japan in order to clarify the teachings of the Patriarchs. Ah, what great fortune this is! Just when the Zen community had fallen into its autumn of decline, unexpectedly a patriarchal teacher came from the West. It as if cold ash has been rekindled. Who would not respond joyfully to this?¹⁹⁾

On the fifteenth of the tenth month, Ingen began the first *kessei* (practice period) at Kōfukuji. Korei Ryōkaku served as the *dōshu* (manager of the monks' hall) for the practice period, which lasted until the first month of 1655. Tōkuō contacted Korei, who then sent him a detailed letter describing the Kōfukuji *kessei*. In his letter, Korei mentioned that there were seventy Japanese and twenty Chinese monks participating in the

practice period.²⁰⁾

After the first *kessie* at the Kōfukuji, the number of monks assembling in Nagasaki to practice with Ingen continued to grow. Ingen, using funds donated from the lay community, expanded the temple facilities to accommodate the burgeoning sangha. In the fourth month of that year he began a second practice period at Kōfukuji; in the sixth month of 1655 he simultaneously began presiding over another retreat at the Sufukuji. Ingen remained in Nagasaki until the eighth month of 1655, when he moved to Fumonji in the Osaka area.

Mukai Genshō (1609-77), a Confucian doctor from the Nagasaki area, provides us with another view of Ingen's first year in Japan. In the *Chichihen*, completed before 1657, Mukai summarizes the impact of Ingen's arrival as follows:

In the seventh month of 1654 Zen Master Ingen, the former abbot of Mt. Huangbo in Fuzhou, took up residence in the Kōfukuji in Nagasaki. This Zen Master is a thirty-second generation descendant in the true transmission of Linji's lineage. It was said that a great teacher [like Ingen] was rarely met with even in the great land of Tang. The monks who have practiced under Ingen say that for more than three hundred years there has not been a teacher in Japan who has awakened to the Way. Since this Zen Master has awakened to the Way he is considered to be a reincarnation of Shakyamuni or Bodhidharma. Monks and laypeople, men and women, go to see him one after another. Day and night, there is no one who does not make obeisance to him... Not knowing right and wrong, or honor and disgrace, the monks of the Kanzanha alone — old and young monks, wearing purple robes or black robes — come and go without respite. I have heard that all of the two hundred-odd monks gathered in Ingen's assembly are members of the Kanzanha.²¹⁾

Mukai's claims about the size of the assembly at Kōfukuji and the incessant nature of the activity there are probably exaggerated. It is also im-

probable that the monks visiting Ingen were as homogeneous in their sectarian affiliations as Mukai suggests. Nevertheless, as the previous examples indicate, it appears that many of the monks who were coming to see Ingen, such as Jikuin, Korei, Tangetsu, etc., belonged to the Kanzanha. The Kanzanha, another appellation for the Myōshinjiha, is named for Myōshinji's founder, Kanzan Egen (1277-1360). Ingen's arrival in Japan came almost three hundred years after the death of Kanzan. Judging from Mukai's report, some Myōshinjiha monks studying with Ingen were claiming that from the death of Kanzan until Ingen's appearance in Nagasaki, there had not been an enlightened Zen teacher in Japan. This same attitude is also reflected, in a more moderate fashion, by Tangetsu's statement that was previously quoted. The fervor surrounding Ingen soon began to raise the hackles of the more conservative members of the Myōshinji faction. Mukai Genshō noted that news of Ingen's popularity greatly had disturbed the elder monks of the Myōshinjiha.²²⁾

While Ingen was leading increasingly large practice periods in Nagasaki, a group of Myōshinjiha monks led by Ryōkei, Tōkuō, and Jikuin was busily arranging for him to come to Kyoto. Korei, in his letter to Tōkuō, mentions that, while attending the first *kessei* at the Kōfukuji, he had informed Ingen of their plan, and that Ingen had responded positively to it. Judging from the contents of Korei's letter, Ryōkei and his compatriots had originally planned to bring Ingen to Myōshinji. Korei suggested that they first obtain the assent of the majority of the Myōshinji community before attempting to contact the *bakufu* to gain permission for Ingen to leave Nagasaki. Korei noted, however, that it was unlikely that the majority of monks would agree with their proposal. Apparently, because of the opposition to this plan within Myōshinji, Ryōkei and compatriots decided first to invite Ingen to Ryōkei's temple, the Fumonji, with the intention to eventually bring him to the Myōshinji.²³⁾

Within a short period of time, Jikuin enlisted the aid of his teacher, Senzan Genshō, who had been the 178th abbot of Myōshinji, and Tangetsu

Shōen. He then began to lobby actively for the support of officials to help gain permission from the *bakufu* for Ingen to leave Nagasaki for Kyoto. Jikuin, a skillful negotiator, wrote to the Kyoto *shoshidai* (shogun's deputy) to ask his advice. In his letter, Jikuin asked for an audience with the appropriate officials in Edo in order to gain permission to bring Ingen to the Osaka-Kyoto area.²⁴⁾ By means of this letter, Jikuin was able to gain the aid of the *shoshidai*, Itakura Shigemune (1586-1658). Itakura gave Jikuin introductions to two officials in Edo, the Rōjū (councilor of the shogun) Matsudaira Nobutsuna (1596-1662) and the Tairō (senior minister) Sakai Tadakatsu (1587-1662). Gaining the support of these two officials, Jikuin, Ryōkei, and Tokuō's request was granted by the *bakufu* during the fifth month of Meireki 1 (1655). After first refusing demurely, Ingen agreed to come to the Fumonji. At the beginning of the eighth month of 1655, he left Nagasaki for the Osaka area.²⁵⁾

Ingen's activities were greatly circumscribed by the suspicious *bakufu* during the first two years of his stay at the Fumonji. He was forbidden contact with the ordinary monks or laypeople. The Kyoto *shoshidai*, who began to visit Ingen regularly and even received a dharma name from him, managed to have the restrictions relaxed slightly, but the *bakufu* stood firm in their attempts to limit popular access to the Chinese master. The potential volatility of the situation was no doubt confirmed for the government in Edo later that year. According to a story in the *Ōbaku geki*, during the eleventh month of 1655, thousands of pilgrims, who were at a nearby temple commemorating the anniversary of Shinran's death, poured into the Fumonji hoping to catch a glimpse of the famous teacher. Jikuin was severely castigated by Itakura for this lapse.²⁶⁾

Ryōkei strenuously attempted to have the restrictions on Ingen's activity relaxed. Finally, in the seventh month of 1657, the *bakufu* decided to allow Ingen limited travel privileges in the Osaka-Kyoto area. As long as he was accompanied by either Tokuō, Ryōkei, or Jikuin, Ingen would be allowed outside the Fumonji. His travel was

restricted to Kyoto, Osaka, Nara, Sakai, and Otsu, for a period of ten to twenty days. The new ruling from the government also stipulated that Ingen could now give public lectures, and that a maximum of two hundred monks would be allowed to study with him at the Fumonji.²⁷⁾

Contra Ingen

We have seen that numerous monks in the Myōshinji faction were pleased by Ingen's presence in Japan. Some of these monks were highly respected, major figures within the sect — Tangetsu and Ryōkei had been abbots of Myōshinji, and Tokuō was a confidant of the retired emperor. With monks of that importance praising Ingen as the reviver of Japanese Rinzai Zen, it is no wonder that those within the Myōshinji faction whose reputations were overshadowed took offense. This was particularly true of one member of the sect, Gudō Tōshoku, who until Ingen's arrival, had been seriously regarded as the greatest living Zen teacher in Japan.²⁸⁾

Under the new *bakufu* ruling of 1657, Jikuin and Tokuō brought Ingen to Kyoto for a visit. The entry in the *Ōbaku geki* contains the following report of the trip.

Tōshoku says: Ingen went to Kyoto. First he visited the Senjuin [Tokuō's temple]. At that time, they had come slowly from the field by the street in front of the Tōjiin. They were led by an *inkin* [bell]. Numerous spectators gathered. They stopped briefly at the Senjuin and then entered Myōshinji. After visiting the Taizōin, they went to the Founder's Hall, [where Ingen] wrote a poem. (The temple still possesses the holograph.) They then went to the Ryūgein [Jikuin's temple], stayed three nights, and returned to Tonda.²⁹⁾

If Jikuin, Tokuō, and Ryōkei had hoped for more than a brief visit to Myōshinji, they were probably dissatisfied. Ingen did not spend even one evening within the main Myōshinji complex. He had spent three days at Jikuin's *tatchū* (sub-temple), the Ryūgein, founded in 1656,

and then departed.

According to Kawakami, the resistance encountered at Myōshinji was strong enough that Ingen and his party had been forced to withdraw to the Ryūgein and then to return to the Fumonji. Kawakami reports that during his visit, Ingen was informed that Gudō Tōshoku, along with many other monks, did not want him at Myōshinji. Gudō opposed bringing Ingen to the monastery on the grounds that,

This, our monastery is a place for one lineage alone. Of course, [we] are forbidden to reside at another school's monastery. Furthermore, we cannot invite someone from the lineage of a different school or sect to our monastery. This is based upon our [school's] [*Shūmon*] *shōtōroku* by Tōyō [Eicho].³⁰⁾

The *Shūmon shōtōroku* was written by Tōyō Eichō (1428–1504) the founder of Gudō's faction of the the Myōshinjiha, the Shōtakuha, during the Keichō era (1596–1615). This was a seminal text for the formation of the Shōtokuha's sectarian identity, because it detailed the words and actions of the great Patriarchs in Gudō's tradition, from Nangaku Ejō to Daitō Kokushi (1282–1338), and thus helped establish the legitimacy of his lineage. Gudō had a long-standing interest in the *Shūmon shōtōroku*. After discovering a neglected and decaying manuscript in the library at the Daisenji in 1630, Gudō raised the funds necessary to have the worm-eaten manuscript copied and published.³¹⁾

By the time Ingen came to Japan, Gudō Tōshoku was the most venerable leader in the Myōshinjiha. He was the dharma successor of Yōzan Keiyō (1559–1626) and had served three terms as abbot of Myōshinji, in 1628, 1635, and 1643. Until his death in 1661, Gudō served as a close spiritual advisor to the retired emperor, Gomizunoo, who in 1659, chose Gudō to lead the three-hundredth memorial anniversary for Kanzan Egen. Furuta has suggested that because of his seniority, close ties with the retired emperor, and his three terms as abbot, Gudō was the only monk within the Kanzan faction whose reputation could begin to approach that of

Ingen.³²⁾

On hearing Gudo's statement of opposition, Ingen retorted, "Does Kanzan have a *goroku* or not? If Kanzan does not have a *goroku*, then there is no way to validate his dharma transmission." According to Itō Kokan, almost all transmitters of the lineage had *goroku* attributed to them, except for the founder of Myōshinji, Kanzan Egen. Ingen attempted to attack the validity of whole lineage since Kanzan by pointing out this deficiency.³³⁾

Gudō's student, Daigi Sōgo, then replied on behalf of his teacher. "In the Kanzanha we have the koan about the oak tree. Why do we need to search for a *goroku*?" Ingen replied, "This is superior to one billion *goroku*!"³⁴⁾ According to this account, Ingen then cut short his visit to Myōshinji and returned to the Fumonji.

It is likely that the former "conversation, between Ingen and Gudō was created after Ingen's actual visit to Myōshinji. Ingen loses the debate with Gudō and gives up surprisingly easily. While the story is repeated by numerous authors, such as Kawakami, Itō, and Furuta, it is not attributed to a primary source. Judging from the ease with which Gudō subdues Ingen, however, it is probably found in a document that prejudiced in favor of the Myōshinji faction.

Whatever the origin of the story of Ingen's visit to Myōshinji, this account reflects important concerns for the Myōshinjiha. From the perspective of some accepted leaders of Myōshinji, particularly Gudō, Ingen's presence in Japan, his status as a thirty-second generation master in the Rinzai lineage, and his popularity among a large number of Myōshinjiha monks must have been perceived as a threat to their legitimacy. This becomes clear in another version of this story that is found in Mujaku's *Shōbōzanshi*. In this account Gudō, says to another monk,

I am one of the Venerable Elders in this country's Zen school. Although my virtue is not worth rivaling, why has Ingen not even

once given me the courtesy of a visit? It's as if that foreign monk doesn't know the customs of Buddhism. This mountain monk inherited Kanzan's true teaching. Why should I dash off to see him, acting like some *shami* or *dōji*?

I've also heard that Ingen came to Myōshinji and visited the Founder's Hall. He was about to make his obeisance when his attendant stopped him and said, "We have not yet been able to ascertain whether Kanzan's understanding was complete or not. It is alright not to bow." Then Ingen did not bow. What sort of behaviour is this?³⁵⁾

Gudō had been deeply offended by Ingen's lack of recognition of his high status within the Japanese Zen world. Worse, Ingen and his disciples even doubted the understanding of Kanzan Egen. There could be no baser affront to Gudō, who had devoted his life to enhancing the fortunes of the Kanzanha.

Another important cause for Gudō's repudiation of Ingen was the syncretism of Ingen's practice. Gudō probably learned of Ingen's Zen style from Myōshinji monks who had visited the Chinese master. One such monk, identified only as "Teki the head monk," studied with Ingen for one summer and in the *Shōbōzanshi* is reported to have said,

Look at the style of [Ingen's] school. It has *mondō* and lectures like the Zen school. Then, suddenly, they chant *amidabutsu* in a loud voice like the Jōdo school. Then again, they have *kechien* mandala like the Shingon school. It's as if they have opened a notion shop. One does not find the practices of the venerable ancients there.³⁶⁾

This is an obvious attack upon the syncretic nature of Ingen's teaching. Korei, in his letter to Tokuō, had also commented on this, albeit in a less pejorative manner. Korei was surprised by the circumambulatory chanting of the *nenbutsu* that was performed during each service. He also observed that Ingen's style of practice appeared to be a mixture of that of the Jōdo school and the Zen school, comparing Ingen's practice to that

of Yunqi Zhuhong (J. Unsei Shukō, 1535-1615), another Ming Buddhist noted for his Zen-Pure Land syncretism.³⁷⁾

On several instances Gudō compared Ingen to unorthodox members of the Kanzanha who had experimented with syncretic styles of Zen practice that he found distasteful, drawing parallels between Ingen's Zen and that of Isshi Bunshu and Ungo Kiyō (1582-1659). Isshi had begun his Buddhist career studying Vinaya as a student of the Shingon master Kenshun Ryōei (1584-1647). Isshi eventually began the study of Zen and took up koan practice. After a profound satori experience, he wished to go to China for verification of his enlightenment, but due to the government prohibition on foreign travel, he was unable to do so. Like Gudō and Tokuō, Isshi developed a close relationship with Gomizunoo, who urged him to pay a visit to Gudō. Gudō subsequently verified Isshi's enlightenment and granted him transmission. Despite his Myōshinjiha transmission, Isshi's earlier Vinaya training continued to color his practice; he became known for his adherence to the precepts and for his criticism of lax behaviour in the monasteries.³⁸⁾

Unlike his disciple Ishi, who died at the early age of 38, Gudō believed that the precepts were not applicable to an accomplished Zen master. Once one penetrated the teachings of Zen, formal precepts became unnecessary.³⁹⁾ Ingen's teaching, with its strong emphasis upon the precepts—Ingen revived the three-stage ordination procedure for Zen monks at Manpukuji — seems to have reminded Gudō of Isshi's teachings. In an entry dated Meireki 1 (1655) in the *Daien Hōkan Kokushi nenpu*, Gudō says,

“Isshi died before us. This is fortunate for our teaching. His whole life he immersed himself in words and strayed from his obligations to his teacher. If he had lived until now [after Ōbaku Ingen had come to Japan], he would have joined with Ingen's disciples, and certainly would have exchanged correspondence with them. If you think about it, Isshi's death perfected his reputation — how fortunate.”⁴⁰⁾

Although Gudō may have felt that he transcended the precepts, he was not beyond a degree of vindictiveness, as this passage demonstrates. His fears about his dharma disciple were no doubt confirmed when one of Isshi's students, Nyosetsu Bungan (1601–71) struck up a relationship with Ingen. As early as 1655 he was making donations to Ingen's sangha in Nagasaki. Later he visited Ingen at the Manpukuji's Shōindō and exchanged verses with him. When Nyosetsu died in 1671, Ingen composed a verse eulogizing him.⁴¹⁾

Gudō also compared Ingen's Zen to that of another Myōshinjiha monk, Ungo Kiyō. A recipient of the purple robe and a former abbot of Myōsinji (1621), Ungo incurred the wrath of part of the Myōshinji faction after he wrote and published the *Ōjōyōka*, a lengthy poem that extolled the recitation of the *nenbutsu*. This poem became highly popular among lay Buddhists, much to the displeasure of a small group of elder monks in the Kanzan faction. These monks found this sort of "vulgar and shallow teaching device" unsuitable for a Zen monk. Eventually, in 1649, the Myōshinji establishment threatened to ostracize Ungo and strip him of his status as a monk if he did not stop the publication of the poem. Despite the pleas from his disciples and threats from the head temple, Ungo refused to renounce his poem. As a result, Ungo remained pushed to the fringes of the Myōshinjiha until his death. Like Isshi, he was also noted for his advocacy of stringent adherence to the precepts and his frugal style of practice.⁴²⁾

The *Daien Hōkan Kokushi nenpu*, as quoted in Itō, reveals Gudō's attitude toward the *zenjō itchi* (Zen-Jōdo syncretism) of Ingen and Ungo in a dialogue that supposedly took place between Jikuin and Gudō in 1655 when Gudō was the abbot of the Shōtōan in Edo. Jikuin visited Gudō to gain approval for his efforts to support Ingen. Gudō asked, "I have heard that Ingen recites the *nenbutsu*. Is this true or not?" Jikuin responded, "It is not so." Gudō then retorted,

"Ungo already chants the *nenbutsu*. And now, Ingen also chants the

nenbutsu. Even if I were to fall to the bottom of the eighty-four thousand hells I would [adhere to] the Zen of the Teachers and Patriarchs. We do not know at this point if Ingen's Zen will benefit or harm our school. It will not do if I alone advocate this position, so I will commend the matter to the community for discussion."⁴³⁾

Itō concludes that this passage besides revealing Gudō's attitude toward Zen *nenbutsu* syncretism, also shows the extent to which the pro-Ingen movement had made inroads into the Myōshinjiha, leaving Gudō feeling increasingly threatened and isolated.

With the resistance encountered during Ingen's brief visit to Myōshinji, it became increasingly clear to many of his Myōshinjiha supporters, such as Tokuō and Jikuin, that he was not going to be welcomed at the *honzan*. Even worse, the split between the advocates of Ingen and the Myōshinjiha partisans was becoming unbridgeable. Through the unflinching efforts of Ryōkei, further concessions were won from the *bakufu*, and Ingen became more firmly ensconced at the Fumonji. In the third month of 1657, the Fumonji community was granted a monthly rice stipend.⁴⁴⁾ Ingen, Ryōkei and Tokuō were granted an audience with the Shōgun in the autumn of 1658.⁴⁵⁾ At this point, for reasons that are not altogether clear, Jikuin withdrew from the pro-Ingen faction.⁴⁶⁾ With Ingen, who was perhaps growing impatient with the continuing governmental restraints on him and who had promised his monastic community in China that he would return after three years, impatiently requesting permission to leave Japan, Ryōkei went to Edo to plead with the officials to make it possible for Ingen to stay. The *bakufu* refused to allow Ingen to return to China on the grounds that he was too old. Perhaps to make his enforced stay in Japan more palatable, he was simultaneously informed that he could choose a site near Kyoto suitable for the construction of a new monastery to be built for him.⁴⁷⁾

In the same year, 1659, that Ingen gained permission to found a

monastery, the tricentennial memorial service for the founder, Kanzan Egen, was held at Myōshinji. This proved to be a watershed event for the Kanzanha, serving to reunite numerous leaders of the sect who had been divided by their relationships to Ingen. The retired emperor, Gomizunoo, asked the eighty-two year old Gudō Tōshoku to take charge of the proceedings. Tokuō, and another Myōshinjiha supporter of Ingen, Mansetsu Chizen of the Daiōin, availed themselves of this opportunity to sever their connections with Ingen and Ryōkei, and rejoined the Myōshinji faithful for the memorial service.⁴⁸⁾

At the ceremony, Gudō offered incense on behalf of his deceased dharma ancestor and read a poem he had composed. "Of the twenty-four streams of Japanese Zen, regrettably most have been lost. Fortunately for Kanzan, there have been descendants, and the torch of the teaching was passed on for the last three-hundred years."⁴⁹⁾ Mujaku comments that this particular verse was intended to attack those who claimed that Ingen was responsible for the restoration of Japanese Zen.⁵⁰⁾ Gudō took this opportunity to celebrate the Myōshinjiha's survival in the face of the great threat posed by Ingen's presence.

Gudō's view of his role in preserving the Kanzanha is highlighted in an incident surrounding the creation of this verse. According to Mujaku, in the original rendering of the dedicatory poem the third line read, "Fortunately for Kanzan there is Gudō..." On hearing Gudō's verse, Daigu Sōchiku (1584-1669), another great master in the Myōshinji faction, objected, "You must change two words in the third line." Gudō asked why, and Daigu replied, "There is also Daigu." Gudō then changed the line to the more inclusive version.⁵¹⁾

This was not the only occasion in which Gudō made the statement that he was responsible for having rescued the Myōshinji faction from destruction. He had also written a verse on one of his paintings that read, "This old fellow is the one who has blazed the way along the path of the dharma, which has for a long while been cut off in Japan."⁵²⁾ It is

ironic, but no accident, that Gudō, the main opponent of Ingen in Japan, had described himself in this manner. Gudō's self-characterization clearly mirrored the claims made for Ingen by the pro-Ingen partisans. As noted previously, Mukai Genshō and Tangetsu Shōen were but two individuals who made similar statements concerning the importance of the Chinese master.

The strife between the followers of Ingen and the Myōshinjiha did not abate after the commemorative ceremony for Kanzan. If anything, the decision by the *bakufu* to allow Ingen to begin his own monastery in the Kyoto region reified the differences between the two branches of Rinzai Zen. Defections to Ingen's new school continued. (Ogisu asserts that approximately five thousand monks attended the winter *ango* in 1663, but I have been unable to find his source for this statement.⁵³) Such monks from Myōshinji as Daisō Ezen continued to assert their independence by maintaining close contact with Ingen. At the time of Ingen's arrival, Daisō had sent many of his disciples to Nagasaki to study with the illustrious teacher. Later, Daisō went so far as to change all the rules at his temple, the Ryūhoji, to conform to the strictures followed by Ingen at the Fumonji. The construction of a three-part ordination platform at the Manpukuji in 1663 and the popularity of the subsequent Ōbaku *sandan kaie*, which attracted five hundred ordines in 1665 and eleven hundred in 1670, must have further exacerbated the problem with Myōshinji.⁵⁴

The Myōshinjiha suffered another major blow with the death of Gudō in 1661. Until that time, Gudō had been acting as a close spiritual adviser to Gomizunoo, a position that had traditionally been awarded to an illustrious monk in the Myōshinjiha. As early as 1657 that position was increasingly shared with the recusant monk, Ryōkei. By 1663, Ryōkei began to see the retired emperor regularly, lecturing to him about the Zen texts such as the *Hekiganroku* and the *Rinzairoku*, and conferring the *bosatsukai* on him. Gomizunoo bestowed a rare

honor upon his mentor by writing a preface for Ryōkei's *Shutōroku*.⁵⁵⁾ Ryōkei also began to act as intermediary for exchanges of written questions and answers between Gomizunoo and Ingen. The retired sovereign was apparently impressed enough to begin to send gifts to Ingen and even to take the refuges with him.⁵⁶⁾ When Ingen died in 1673 Gomizunoo gave Ingen the title Daikō Fushō Kokushi, and praised the deceased master, claiming that, "... in Japan, for a long time teachers have been few. Fortunately, Master Ingen Ryūki of Mt. Ōbaku accepted an invitation and came to Japan, to once again establish the laws of the dharma and clarify the way of Rinzaï. He has greatly illuminated this country, and his merit cannot be extinguished."⁵⁷⁾

The growing prosperity of the newly formed Ōbakuha was more than the Myōshinji establishment could bear. In 1665 an assembly of the Myōshinjiha took place, and a notice was posted at Myōshinji that completely severed the possibility for rapprochement with the monks at Manpukuji. The Myōshinji *hekisho* (wall poster) forbid all monks of the Kanzanha to participate in *ango* at the monasteries of other sects, because this was inconsonant with the established rules of Myōshinji. Lashing out against the past actions of such monks as Ryōkei and Daisō, the new strictures prohibited changing one's dharma name, one's monastic clothing, or the rules followed at one's temple. Anyone who contravened these strictures was to be barred from Myōshinji.⁵⁸⁾ This poster formalized the break between Ingen and his disciples and the Myōshinjiha. Ryōkei, having violated all these strictures, was formally censured and stripped of his membership in the sect. As a capping gesture from Myōshinji, when, in 1670, Ryōkei drowned in a flood, they deemed the waters that killed him "the waves of Kanzan" — Ryōkei had finally been punished for his transgression against the Myōshinjiha.⁵⁹⁾

Conclusions

The Emperor offer'd [Ingen], for his residence, a mountain in the neighbourhood of the holy City of Miaco, which he called Obaku, by the name of his former papal residence in China. An incident, which happen'd soon after his arrival, contributed very much to forward his designs, and rais'd in several Inhabitants of this Empire an uncommon respect for his person, and a great opinion of his holiness. After a very great drought, the country people, his neighbours, desir'd him to say a Kitoo, or extraordinary solemn prayer, in order to obtain rain from heaven for their rice-fields. He answer'd, that it was not in his power to make rain, and that he could not assure them that his Kitoo would obtain it. However, at their pressing instances, he promis'd to do his utmost. Accordingly he went up to the top of the mountain, and made his Kitoo. The next day there fell such profuse showers, that even the smaller bridges in the city of Miaco, were wash'd away, which made both the city and country believe, that his Kitoo had been rather too strong.⁶⁰

I have seen no references, other than Kaempfer's, to Ingen's thaumaturgical power. No doubt the stories about Ingen that were circulating in Japan at the time of the Dutch physician's visit were not historically accurate. They are indicative of the powerful reputation that Ingen developed during his seventeen-year sojourn in that country. Ingen's appearance on the stage of the early Tokugawa Zen world had broad repercussions. The entry of this renowned Chinese teacher into Japan was viewed by many Zen monks and lay supporters as a major event in the history of their tradition. For monks such as Ryōkei, Tangetsu, Jikuin, and Daisō, the event was laden with promise — a true teacher in the Rinzai lineage had come to Japan, making possible a restoration of the Zen school. Ingen consist-

ently attracted the attention of large numbers of Japanese monks and laypeople, and a steady stream of seekers came to him for spiritual advice. His audience in Japan was not restricted to members of the Rinzai school alone; numerous Sōtō monks came to visit Ingen and it is possible that his fresh style of Zen practice, with its strong emphasis upon the precepts, also had an impact upon the Sōtō school during the critical Edo period.⁶¹⁾ Influential officials and the retired emperor Gomizunoo were similarly enamored with Ingen. Reactions to Ingen's presence were not entirely positive; those in the Myōshinjiha who felt threatened by the "Ingen Boom" reacted with a vehemence that continued long after Ingen's death.

Ingen has been far too passive a figure throughout this paper. This is undoubtedly an incomplete picture of a man who managed to quickly capture the support of many influential Japanese, from Ryōkei, to Gomizunoo and several important *bakufu* officials. What were Ingen's intentions in coming to Japan? It is doubtful that he wanted to found a *new* school of Zen. As Furuta has cogently argued in his essay "Iwayuru Ōbaku Zen to Rinzai shōshū," "Ingen saw himself as within the mainstream of the Rinzai tradition. It was precisely this contention that caused the conflict with Gudō and the Myōshinji establishment."⁶²⁾ Nevertheless, it is not clear whether Ingen wanted a monastery of his own from the beginning of his stay in Japan. At each step along the way, he accepted a more prominent position when it was offered to him. Is it possible that he used his promise to return to China after three years to force the hand of a suspicious government and thereby gain permission to found the Manpukuji?

There are strong indications that Ingen, or at least some of the Chinese monks who accompanied him to Japan, were ambitious. There is evidence that Daozhe Chaoyuan was forced out of Nagasaki by Ingen's Chinese disciples. A Myōshinjiha monk, Kōsai Soryō, who details the rivalry between Daozhe and Ingen, claims that one of Ingen's disciples burned Daozhe's document of succession, and that others attempted to

poison Daozhe.⁶³⁾ This statement was made by a Myōshinjiha monk in the eighteenth century and therefore may be another attempt to discredit Ingen. Much of what Kōsai claims, however, seems to be echoed by partisans of Daozhe as well. At the very least we may assume that a power-struggle was taking place within the Chinese expatriate Buddhist community. What was Ingen's contribution to this conflict, and how did he view of his opponents at Myōshinji? These questions will remain unanswered until Ingen's letters, lectures, and other documents have been carefully examined.

The backdrop for Ingen's arrival, the early Tokugawa, was a fertile variegated period for the Japanese Rinzai tradition. Monks such as Bankei, Isshi, Ungo, and others, dissatisfied with what the Myōshinji establishment had to offer, experimented vigorously with new methods of teaching and practice. They searched for enlightened teachers to verify their religious experiences, and, finding no one in Japan to satisfy them, tried fruitlessly to enter Ming China. To the chagrin of more conservative religious figures, such as Gudō, the styles of practice developed by these innovators were often dangerously popular, and, as in the case of Ungo's *Ōjōyōka*, demanded a firm response from the Myōshinji establishment. The response that Ingen engendered from his supporters and his opposition must be viewed in the context of these diverse, often competing, interpretations of Rinzai practice within the Myōshinjiha.

Ingen's arrival in Nagasaki threatened to upset the balance of power within the Kanzan faction. The support of numerous purple-robed, current and former abbots of Myōshinji for this Chinese monk was seen as a challenge by those who were satisfied with the status quo. As we have seen in the case of Gudō, his own reputation within the Zen community and his understanding were profoundly called into question by the strong support for Ingen within both the Zen and lay communities. The vituperation that resulted is evidence of the severity of the threat posed by the pro-Ingen movement.

Several Japanese scholars, such as Ogisu, Hirakubo, and Minamoto have postulated that there were two contending factions within Myōshinji at the time of Ingen's arrival. One faction was led by Gudō and adhered to a doctrine of "pure Zen" and transcendence of the precepts; Ogisu calls this faction the *godō shugisha* (proponents of enlightenment). The pro-Ingen contingent had a more syncretic interpretation of Zen, blending *nen-butsu* and adherence to the precepts with more conventional Zen techniques. Ogisu refers to this group as the *jikai shugisha* (proponents of observance of the precepts). As we have seen, many of Ingen's supports, including Nyōsetsu, Ryōkei, and Tokuō favored strict adherence of the precepts and were all aligned with Isshi Bunshu. In fact, the *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten* notes that Ryōkei had originally invited Ingen to Myōshinji in order to bolster support for Isshi's precept-Zen.⁶⁴

Unfortunately, apart from Gudō Tōshku, the "proponents of enlightenment" remain largely a faceless group. The great monk Daigu Sōchiku is often mentioned as another opponent of the pro-Ingen group. However, there is little indication of his involvement with the anti-Ingen group aside from the oblique reference made by him about having helped preserve the Kanzanha, a statement made when he critiqued Gudō's commemorative poem for Kanzan. Only a careful investigation of Daigu's writings will reveal the extent of his involvement in the anti-Ingen group.

The anonymity of the *godō shugisha* should not be construed as a sign of unimportance. This group, if the story found in Ungo's *Kinenroku* can be believed, had the power to threaten dissident monks with excommunication. And, as we have seen, they managed to prevent Ingen's coming to Myōshinji and stripped Ryōkei of his membership in the Myōshinji faction. Finally, in 1665, with the dissemination of the Myōshinji *hekisho*, they enjoined all participation in the practices of other Zen sects. This power to discipline the sect was, at least in part, a result of the new head-branch temple system that had been completed by the *bakufu* in the 1630's. As Winston King notes,

This institution of tight sectarian control under governmental supervision had... unfortunate results as far as Buddhism itself was concerned. First it could not help but solidify sectarian lines and confirm the most traditional-institutional tendencies in each of the sects, thus separating Buddhism even further from the new social and intellectual currents of the time.⁶⁵⁾

The ability of the Myōshinji establishment to repel the dissident pro-Ingen group, as well as earlier reformers such as Ungo, demonstrates the verity of King's assertion.

A number of unanswered questions remain concerning the intentions of both Gomizunoo and the *bakufu* with regard to Ingen. The *bakufu* had since the beginning of the Tokugawa period attempted to constrain the power of both the court and the Buddhist establishment. Some of the stern *hatio* (prohibitions) enacted by the Tokugawa government were aimed specifically at breaking the relationship between the throne and the two large and powerful Rinzai temples Myōshinji and Daitokuji. The new *bakufu* strictures that prohibited the appointment of abbots and the awarding of purple robes by imperial order are but two examples of efforts by the shogunate to vitiate the Buddhist establishment and the court at the same time.⁶⁶⁾ The *bakufu* officials' acceptance of Ingen must be viewed in light of their overall intentions for the Buddhist establishment. By prolonging the dissension over Ingen's presence at Myōshinji, they helped weaken that monastery. By allowing Ingen into the Kansai area and granting him permission to found the Manpukuji, the Tokugawa government may have been hoping to divide one of the larger Rinzai sects, just as, at the beginning of the era, Ieyasu had split the powerful Shinshū school into the Nishi and Higashi Honganji.

The victory of the anti-Ingen faction, led by Gudō, has had major implications for the subsequent history of Japanese Zen. It is a reflection of Gudo's ultimate success that we now view the Zen professed by Ingen, Isshi, or Ungo as less than true Zen. Our standards have been molded by

the one surviving Rinzai Zen lineage in Japan, the Ō-Tō-Kan, which flows through Gudō, to Hakuin, down to the recent and powerfully influential apologist for that school, D.T. Suzuki. Perhaps Gudō and his supporters at Myōshinji ensured that their transmission would survive until today by their adamant insistence that it remain a “one-stream lineage.” Ingen’s presence in Japan served as a catalyst in the solidification of the Ō-Tō-Kan tradition, because of the magnitude of the threat posed by him and the newly formed Ōbakuha. This led the Myōshinji establishment to reject once and for all the positions advocated by Ryōkei and Ingen, and, indirectly, those of Isshi and Ungo. The Myōshinji *hekisho*, by formally barring Kanzanha monks from practice at the monasteries of other sects, helped to seal the Ō-Tō-Kan tradition and was a crucial factor in its preservation.

-
- 1) Hakuin Ekaku, *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings*, tr. by Philip Yampolsky (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 171-2. On p. 171, n.30 Yampolsky states, “The mention of a hundred years would indicate a direct reference to Yin-yüan Lung-ch’i (Ingen Ryōki, 1592-1673) who brought the Ōbaku school of Zen to Japan in 1654 almost exactly a hundred years before the writing of this work. This school contained many elements of the Pure Land teaching.”
 - 2) Mujaku Dōchū attacked the Ōbaku school in his *ōbaku geki* and his *Shōbōzanshi*, which was a collection of materials relating to the history of Myōshinji. Keirin Sōchin wrote the polemical work *Zenrin shūheishū*, published in 1700. For more information on these works, see Minamoto Ryōen, *Tetsugen*, Vol. 17 in the *Nihon no zen goroku* series (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1979), 95-103.
 - 3) Hirakubo Akira, *Ingen* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1962), 1-67. Hirakubo based his biography of Ingen on three works compiled by Ingen’s disciples: the *ōbaku Ingen zenji nenpu* (1654), compiled by Duyao Xingri (J. Dokuyō Shōnichi), the *Ingen zenji goroku* (1653) and the *Fushō kokushi nenpu* (c. 1690) compiled by Duyao Xingri and Nanyuan Xingpai (J. Nangen Shōha, 1631-1692). See Hirakubo, pp. 1-4. The primary events of Ingen’s life are also mentioned in his biography in Mangen Shibana, *Honcho kōsōden*, Vol. 91 of the *Kokuyaku issaikyō*

- Wakan senjutsubu* (Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha, 1961), 8–11. See now, Ōtsuki Mikio, Katō Shōshun, and Hayashi Yukimitsu, eds., *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1988), 21–23. (Hereafter abbreviated *OJT*.)
- 4) Ogisu Jundō, “Ingen Zenji to Ōbakusan,” Chapter 12 in *Zenshūshi no sansaku* (Tokyo: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1981), 522–23. First published in *Zen bunka*, Vol. 18 (March 1960). Sūfukuji is alternately pronounced Sōfukuji.
 - 5) See now, *OJT*, 398.
 - 6) Mujaku Dōchū, *Ōbaku geki*, in Kagamishima Genryū, ed. *Shōbōgenzō senpyōlōbaku geki* (Tokyo: Komazawa Daigaku Zenshū Jiten Hensanjo, 1960), 163–64. See also, Washio Junkyō, “Ōbakuha no kairitsu to Ryōkei,” in *Nihon bukkuyō bunkashi kenkyū* (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1938), 209–10.
 - 7) *Shinsan zenseki mokuroku* (Tokyo: Nihon Bussho Kankōkai, 1962), 12c.
 - 8) A summary of Mujaku’s criticisms of Ingen in the *Ōbaku geki* can be found in Minamoto Ryōen, *Tetsugen*, 99–103.
 - 9) Ogisu Jundō, *Myōshinji*, Vol. 2 in the *Jisha shirizu* (Kyoto: Tōyō Bunkasha, 1977), 232
 - 10) Ogisu, “Ingen Zenji,” 533. *OJT*, 141–2.
 - 11) Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, 237. See now, *OJT*, 273–74.
 - 12) Interestingly, Ryōkei’s name is not included in any of the Reiuropa lineage charts that I have seen. See *Zengaku daijiten*, Appendix 2, “Zenshūh ōkeifu,” 46, line 2.
 - 13) Washio Junkyō, “Ōbakuha,” 230–31. A very sketchy account of Ryōkei’s biography can be found in Chiku Dōkei, *Zoku Nihon kōsōden*, revised by Ōuchi Seiran, Vol. 104 of the *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* (Tokyo: Bussho Kankōkai, 1917), 229–30. As with the official lineage charts mentioned in note 10, Ryōkei’s name is not found in the list of Myōshinji abbots provided in Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, 245–49. Tangetsu Shōen, whom we shall encounter again later in this paper, was installed as the 194th abbot of Myōshinji in 1654. (Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, 239, and the chart on 246.) Given the extremely short period of time that people served as abbot, it is possible that both Tokuō and Ryōkei served as abbot in 1654. Nevertheless, although the *Zoku Nihon Kōsōden*, 229, mentions Ryōkei’s first term as abbot in 1651, he has not been included in whatever list Ogisu used as the basis for his chart.
 - 14) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 93–94. Hirakubo is citing a number of primary sources, the *goroku* of each of these teachers, as evidence for his claims concerning these monks. These primary sources are unavailable to me at this time. These works are the *Butchō kokushi goroku* (1718), *Shūtōroku* (c. 1669), and the *Tetsugyū Zenji shichie goroku* (1700). The story about Isshi’s attempt to travel to Ming China is recounted in Shibana, *Honchō*, vol. 91, 7.
 - 15) Norman Waddell, tr, *The Unborn: The Life and Teaching of Zen Master Bankei* (San Francisco: North Point Press, 1984), 11–17. Waddell states that the

- comment from Daozhe comes from Daozhe's *goroku*. The same story can be found in Fujimoto Tsuchishige, *Bankei Kokushi no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1971), 121. Fujimoto uses the *Bankei Oshō gyōgō ki* (1740, compiled by Mōsan Soin) as the source for the same story.
- 16) *Tokugawa jikki*, vol. 41 of the *Shintei zōho kokushi taikai*, (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan, 1931), 119a.
 - 17) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 91.
 - 18) *Ibid.*, 92. Tōmyōzan is the "mountain name" of the Kōfukuji.
 - 19) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 96-97. See now, *OJT*, 221.
 - 20) Kawakami Kokan, *Zōho Myōshinjishi*, revised by Ogisu Jundō (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1975), 458.
 - 21) Mukai Genshō, *Chichihen*, in Shinmura Izuru, ed., *Kaihyō sōsho*, vol. 1 (1927-8; reprint, Tokyo: Naruyamadō Shoten, 1985), 23-24. I am indebted to Professor Stanley Weinstein of Yale University for his help with the translation of this passage.
 - 22) Mukai, *ibid.*, 24.
 - 23) Washio, "Ōbakuha," 215. For Korei's letter see Kawakami, *Myōshinjishi*, 458. A summary of Korei's letter is found in Ogisu, "Ingen Zenji," 529.
 - 24) Mujaku, *Ōbaku geki*, 148-49. See also, Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 67-68.
 - 25) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 104-6. The story of Jikuin's trip to Edo is based upon an account in the *ōbaku geki*, 150. See Washio, "Ōbakuha" 217-18. There is no record in the *Tokugawa jikki* that the *bakufu* granted this request.
 - 26) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 110-11. *ōbaku geki*, 153-54.
 - 27) *Tokugawa jikki*, Vol. 4, 236. The entry is for Meireki 3 (1657), seventh month, twenty-third day.
 - 28) Waddell, *Unborn*, 11. Waddell. Waddell notes that after Bankei's initial enlightenment, his teacher, Unpo, recommends that he go to "Gudō Tōshoku, the most highly regarded Zen teacher of the day..." The next portion of the paper will show to what extent Gudō actually had that reputation.
 - 29) Mujaku, *Ōbaku geki*, 171-2. See also, Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 112.
 - 30) Kawakami, *Myōshinjishi*, 462. The dialogue between Ingen and Gudō that follows is taken from this passage. See also Furuta Shōkin, *Kinsei no zensha*, Vol. 5 of *Furuta Shōkin chosakushū* (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1981), 266.
 - 31) Itō Kokan, *Nihon no shōtō: Gudō* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1969), 162-66.
 - 32) Furuta, *Kinsei*, 242-47.
 - 33) Itō, *Gudō*, 165.
 - 34) The final reply by Ingen is not found in Kawakami's version of the story. Furuta, *Kinsei*, 266, completes the story in this way, but he gives no source.
 - 35) Mujaku Dōchū, *Shōbōzanshi* (1935: reprint, Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1975), 163. See also Itō, *Gudō*, 122, and Furuta, *Kinsei*, 263. The date of compilation for the *Shōbōzanshi* is not exactly known, but it is believed to be between 1684

- and 1744. It is also believed that Mujaku did not compile this text alone. See *Zengaku daijiten*, 584b.
- 36) Mujaku, *Shōbōzanshi*, 161.
 - 37) Kawakami, *Myōshinjishi*, 459. As with Ingen, Yunqi frequently became the target for Hakuin's contumely. See Hakuin, *The Zen Master Hakuin*, 147.
 - 38) Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, 87-88. See also Shibana, *Honchō*, Vol. 91, 6-8, and Ogisu Jundō, *Zenshūshi nyūmon* (Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 1977), 233-35. For Isshi's Vinaya teacher see Shibana, *Honchō*, Vol. 91, 226-27.
 - 39) Itō, *Gudō*, 231.
 - 40) Itō, *Gudō*, 101. Also Furuta, *Kinsei*, 262-63. The *Daien Hōkan Kokushi nenpu* was compiled by Setsujin Hōgyoku, a dharma successor to Gudō Tōshoku.
 - 41) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 173. For a biography of Nyosetsu, see Chiku Dōkei, *Zoku Nihon kōsōden*, 211-12. Nyosetsu's visit to Ingen at the Shōindō (Ingen's hermitage at Manpukuji) is mentioned in this biography. According to Itō, *Gudō*, 100-101, Gudō did not regard Nyosetsu highly. He dismissed Nyosetsu as a mere Vinaya scholar. See now *OJT*, 295-97. Like Isshi, Nyosetsu had a deep interest in Vinaya and was a strong advocate of adherence to the precepts.
 - 42) Daiki Kin'yō (1626-1697), ed., *Ungo Oshō kinen roku* (1705), in Hirano Sōjō, ed., *Ungo Oshō nenpu* Vol. 3 in the *Kinsei zensōden series* (Kyoto: Shibunkaku Shuppan, 1983), 227-8. According to Hirano, p. 133, Daiki was a dharma successor of Ungo, and interestingly, after Ungo's death, he is said to have studied with Ingen. See also Ogisu, *Myōshinji*, 70-87.
 - 43) Itō, *Gudō*, 123, 269.
 - 44) *Tokugawa jikki*, 233.
 - 45) *Ibid.*, 284.
 - 46) Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 72. Minamoto speculates that Jikuin was angered by two things: Ryōkei's having a purple robe made for Ingen without the permission of either the court or the bakufu and, perhaps, Ingen's increasing reliance upon Ryōkei at Jikuin's expense. According to the *OJT*, 142, Jikuin was not in favor of Ingen appearing before the Shōgun in Edo.
 - 47) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 125-26.
 - 48) Ogisu, "Ingen Zenji," 536. See also, Kawakami, *Myōshinjishi*, 464.
 - 49) Furuta Shōkin, *Nihon Bukkyō shisōshi no shomondai* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1964), 165. See also Furuta *Kinsei*, 246.
 - 50) Furuta, *Nihon Bukkyō*, 170. See also Mujaku, *Shōbōzanshi*, 68.
 - 51) Mujaku, *Shōbōzanshi*, 151.
 - 52) Furuta, *Kinsei*, 246. Furuta does not state whether this painting still exists, nor does he attempt to date the poem. Judging from the similarity between the poem and the verse from Kanzan's memorial service, I assume that the poem was written toward the end of Gudō's life.
 - 53) Ogisu, "Ingen Zenji," 537.

- 54) Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 160. For more on the Ōbaku *sandan kaie*, see Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 145-47.
- 55) Chiku Dōkei, *Zoku Nihon kōsōden*, 229. Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 86-88.
- 56) Washio, "Ōbakuha," 257-61. See also Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 77, and 88-89.
- 57) Furuta, *Nihon Bukkyō* 168. Furuta is citing the *Fushō Kokushi kōroku*.
- 58) Tsuji Zennosuke, *Nihon no Bukkyōshi*, Vol. 9, *Kinseihen* 3 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1961), 359. See also Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 88-89. Minamoto states that the *hekisho* was posted in Kanbun 7. Tsuji dates it at Kanbun 5, as do Furuta, and Kawakami, so I have followed their dating.
- 59) Kagamishima Genryū, "Preface," *Ōbaku geki*, 4. See also, Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 88.
- 60) Engelbert Kaempfer, *The History of Japan*, Vol. 2. Translated from the German by J. G. Scheuchzer, M. D. (Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1906), 149-50. Useful information on the reliability of Kaempfer's information and various problems with the English translation may be found in Beatrice M. Bodart Bailey, "Kaempfer Restor'd," *Monumenta Nipponica* 43, no. 1 (Spring 1988): 1-33.
- 61) Kurebayashi Kōdō, "Gesshū no Undō jōki to Ōbaku shingi," *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 5, no. 1 (January 1957): 108-109. For information on Ingen's contact with Sōtō monks see Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 173.
- 62) Furuta, *Nihon Bukkyō*, 165-173.
- 63) Waddell, *Bankei*, 30-31, note 26. Waddell is using Fujimoto, *Bankei Kokushi*, 165-66, as his source for this statement.
- 64) *OJT*, 381. See also, Ogisu, "Ingen Zenji," 533-35. See also, Hirakubo, *Ingen*, 103-4, and Minamoto, *Tetsugen*, 70-71.
- 65) King, *Death Was His Koan* (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1986), 44-45.
- 66) Ogisu, *Zenshūshi nyūmon*, 213-15. See also Winston L. King, *Death Was His Koan*, 40-47.

GLOSSARY

<i>Bankei Oshō gyōgō ki</i>	盤珪和尚行業記
Bankei Yōtaku	盤珪永琢
Bodaiin	菩提院
<i>Butchō Kokushi goroku</i>	仏頂国師語録
<i>Chichihen</i>	知耻篇
<i>Daien Hōkan Kokukshi nenpu</i>	大円法鑑国師年譜
Daigi Sōgo	大疑宗悟
Daigu Sōchiku	大愚宗築
Daiki Kin'yō	大亀金葉
<i>Daikō Fushō Kokushi</i>	大光普照国師
Daiōin	大雄院
Daisō Ezen	提宗慧全
Daozhe Chaoyuan	道者超元
<i>dōshu</i>	堂主
Duyao Xingri	独耀性日
Eienji	永円寺
Entsūji	円通寺
Feiyin Tongrong	費隱通容
Fukusaiji	福濟寺
Fumonji	普門寺
<i>Fushō Kokushi kōroku</i>	普照国師広録
<i>Fushō Kokushi nenpu</i>	普照国師年譜
<i>godō shugisha</i>	悟道主義者
Gomizunoo	御水尾
Guanghai si	広慧寺
Gudō Tōshoku	愚堂東寔
Hakubu Eryō	伯蒲慧稜
<i>hekisho</i>	壁書
Huangbo shan	黄檗山
Ingen Ryūki	隱元隆琦
<i>Ingen Zenji goroku</i>	隱元禅師語録
Isshi Bunshu	一糸文守
Itakura Shigemune	板倉重宗
Jianyuan Xingshou	鑑源興寿
<i>jikai shugisha</i>	持戒主義者
Jikuin Somon	竺印祖門
Jinsu shan	金粟山
Jiun'in	慈雲院

Kanzan Egen	関山慧玄
Kanzanha	関山派
Keirin Sōchin	桂林宗琛
Kenshun Ryōei	賢俊良永
<i>kessei</i>	結制
Kōfukuji	興福寺
Korei Ryōkaku	虚穰了廓
Kōsai Soryō	江西祖頌
Lingsou Dinghuo	靈叟定竊
Mangen Shibān	卍元師蠻
Mansetsu Chizen	万拙知善
Matsudaira Nobutsuna	松平信綱
Miyun Yuanwu	密雲円悟
<i>mu</i>	畝
Mujaku Dōchū	無著道忠
Mukai Genshō	向井元升
Myōshinjiha	妙心寺派
Nanyuan Xingpai	南源性派
Nyosetsu Bungan	如雪文巖
<i>Ōbaku geki</i>	黄檗外記
<i>Ōbaku Ingen Zenji nenpu</i>	黄檗院元禪師年譜
<i>Ōbaku sandan kaie</i>	黄檗三段戒会
<i>Ō-Tō-Kan</i>	応灯関
<i>Ōtsu</i>	大津
<i>Ōuchi Seiran</i>	大内青巖
Reiunpa	靈雲派
<i>rōjū</i>	老中
Ryōanji	竜安寺
Ryōkei Sōsen	竜溪宗潛
Ryōō Dōkaku	了翁道学
Ryūgein	竜華院
Ryūhōji	竜峰寺
Sakai	堺
Sakai Takadatsu	酒井忠勝
Senjuin	仙寿院
Senzan Genshō	千山元松
Setsujin Hōgyoku	雪潭豊玉
Settsu	撰津
Shizi yan	獅子巖
<i>Shōbōzanshi</i>	正法山誌
Shōindō	松隠堂

Shōsen	性潛
Shōtakuha	聖沢派
Shōtōan	正灯庵
<i>shuso</i>	首座
<i>Shūmon shōtōroku</i>	宗門正灯祿
<i>Shūtōroku</i>	宗統祿
Sūfukuji (Sōfukuji)	崇福寺
<i>tatchū</i>	塔頭
<i>tairō</i>	大老
Taishuku Genshō	泰叔玄昌
Taizōin	退藏院
Tangetsu Shōen	湛日紹円
Teki shuso	的首座
<i>Tetsugyū Zenji shichie goroku</i>	鉄牛禪師七会語録
Tokuō Myōkō	秃翁妙宏
Tōmyōzan	東明山
Tonda	富田
Tōshuku	東叔
Tōyō Eichō	東陽英朝
Unpo Zenjō	雲甫全祥
Ungo Kiyō	雲居希膺
<i>Ungo Oshō kinenroku</i>	雲居和尚紀年祿
Wanfu si	万福寺
Wuxin Xingjue	無心性覺
<i>xitang (j. seidō)</i>	西堂
Yelan Xinggui	也懶性圭
Yiran Xingrong	逸然性融
Yōzan Keiyō	庸山景庸
Yunqi Zhuhong	雲棲袞宏
<i>zenjō itchi</i>	禪淨一致
<i>Zenrin shūheishū</i>	禪林執弊集