

# 5

## “Rules of Purity” in Japanese Zen

*T. Griffith Foulk*

The so-called transmission of Zen from China to Japan in the Kamakura period (1185–1333) was a complex event, but it is convenient to analyze it as having two distinct aspects: (1) the communication to Japan of Chan mythology, ideology, and teaching styles; and (2) the establishment in Japan of monastic institutions modeled after the great public Buddhist monasteries of Southern Song China. The first aspect of the transmission of Zen was accomplished largely through three genres of texts that contained the lore of the Chan lineage (C. *chanzong*; J. *zenshū*): histories of the transmission of the flame (C. *chuandenglu*; J. *dentōroku*), discourse records (C. *yulu*; J. *goroku*), and *kōan* (C. *gongan*; J. *kōan*) collections.<sup>1</sup> It was also facilitated by means of ritual performances in which the rhetorical and pedagogical methods of Chan (as represented in the aforementioned literature) were reenacted, the two most important being the rites of “ascending the hall” (C. *shangtang*; J. *jōdō*) and “entering the room” (C. *rushi*; J. *nisshitsu*).<sup>2</sup> The establishment of Song-style monasteries in Japan, on the other hand, was facilitated by various collections of monastic regulations, known generically as “rules of purity” (C. *qinggui*; J. *shingi*), that were brought from China at the same time.

This chapter outlines the history of the Japanese Zen appropriation and adaptation of Chinese “rules of purity” from the Kamakura period down to the present. It is the continuation of a piece previously published under the title “*Chanyuan qinggui* and Other ‘Rules of Purity’ in Chinese Buddhism.”<sup>3</sup>

As is detailed in that essay, medieval Chinese “rules of purity” actually constituted a rather diverse body of literature. Several texts

belonging to this nominal genre were compiled in order to standardize bureaucratic structures and ritual procedures in a large group of monasteries; others were written to address the unique circumstances of a single institution. Some were aimed at individual monks in training, providing them with norms of personal etiquette and behavior for ordinary activities such as meals, sleeping, and bathing; others established guidelines for communal activities, including convocations for worship of the Buddha, sermons by the abbot, memorial services for patriarchs, prayers on behalf of lay patrons, and the like. Still others addressed duties and concerns specific to particular monastic officers, such as the controller, rector, labor steward, and cook. Some “rules of purity” also contained daily, monthly, and annual calendars of activities and observations, liturgical texts, such as prayers and formulae for dedications of merit, and meditation manuals. A few texts that are styled “rules of purity” are comprehensive and lengthy enough to include most of the aforementioned kinds of rules and regulations, but the great majority have a narrower focus on one or another aspect of monastic discipline.

The history of the “rules of purity” in Japanese Zen is marked by periodic borrowing from China, where the genre continued to develop from the Song through the Yuan and Ming dynasties, and by the adaptation of Chinese Buddhist institutional and ritual forms to meet the needs of Japanese Zen monastic communities.

### Pioneers of Japanese Zen

All aspects of the transmission of Zen to Japan (mythological, ideological, pedagogical, and institutional) were the work of monks who had trained in major Chinese monasteries in Zhejiang Province and become the dharma heirs of Chan masters there, then returned to Japan armed not only with the aforementioned texts but with a great deal of personal experience as well. The pioneers were Japanese monks such as Myōan Eisai (1141–1215), Enni Ben'en (1202–1280), and Dōgen Kigen (1200–1253), who had traveled to China in search of the dharma and wished to introduce the new Buddhism they had learned to their native land. They were followed by émigré Chinese monks, such as Lanqi Daolong (1213–1278), Wuan Puning (1197–1276), Daxiu Zhengnian (1214–1288), and Wuxue Zuyuan (1226–1286), who hailed from the same group of leading public monasteries in Zhejiang and also worked to establish the Chan dharma and Chinese-style monastic institutions on Japanese soil.

All of the monks involved in the initial establishment of Zen in Japan were well versed in the *Chanyuan qinggui* (*Rules of Purity for Chan Monasteries*),<sup>4</sup> compiled in 1103 by Changlu Zongze (?–1107?). They were also familiar with the kinds of behavioral guidelines, monastic calendars, ritual manuals, and liturgical texts found in other Song Chinese rulebooks, such as: *Riyong qinggui*

(*Rules of Purity for Daily Life*); *Ruzhong xuzhi* (*Necessary Information for Entering the Assembly*); and *Jiaoding qinggui* (*Revised Rules of Purity*), and they used these materials to regulate the new Song-style monasteries they founded in Japan. During the Yuan (1280–1368) dynasty, the production of rules of purity continued unabated in China with a tendency toward ever more comprehensive collections. Some of them, we shall see, played an important role in the ongoing evolution of the Japanese Zen institution. Before considering those later developments, however, let us see how the pioneers of Japanese Zen made use of the aforementioned Song rules of purity.

The monk Myōan Eisai (1141–1215) is regarded as the first to establish a branch of the Linji (J. Rinzai) Chan lineage in his native Japan. Eisai visited a number of the leading monasteries in Zhejiang on two separate trips to China, the first in 1168 and the second from 1187 to 1191. He trained under Chan master Xuan Huaichang when the latter was abbot at the Wannian Monastery on Tiantai Mountain in Taizhou, and then abbot at the Jingde Chan Monastery on Tiantong Mountain in Mingzhou. In the decade following his return to Japan in 1191, Eisai founded Song-style monasteries in Kyushu (Shōfukuji), Kamakura (Jufukuji), and Kyoto (Kenninji). In doing so, he clearly relied on the *Chanyuan qinggui*, citing it several times in his *Kōzen gokokuron* (*Treatise on Promoting Zen for the Protection of the Nation*).<sup>5</sup> This work, completed in 1198, summarized the organization and operation of monasteries in China.

Enni Ben'en (1202–1280), founder of another major branch of the Linji lineage in Japan, entered Song China in 1235 and stayed until 1241, training at the Xingsheng Wanshou Chan Monastery on Jing Mountain, where he received dharma transmission from the eminent Chan master Wuzhun Shifan (1177–1249). Upon his return to Japan, Enni put the monastic rules that he had learned from Wuzhun into effect at a series of Song-style Zen monasteries in Kyushu (Jutenji, Sūfukuji, and Manjuji) and Kyoto (Tōfukuji).<sup>6</sup> Presumably, he also made use of the *Chanyuan qinggui*, the title of which is found in a catalogue of the works he brought back from China.<sup>7</sup>

Following in the footsteps of Eisai, Dōgen (1200–1253) spent the years 1223 to 1227 in Zhejiang visiting and training at such major centers as the Guangli Chan Monastery on Aśoka Mountain in Mingzhou, Tiantong Mountain, Tiantai Mountain, and Jing Mountain near Hangzhou. Upon his return to Japan, he devoted his life to replicating the Song Chinese system of monastic training, first at Kōshōji in Uji and then at Eiheiji (originally named Daibutsuji) in Echizen.

Dōgen is widely regarded today as an author of Zen monastic rules, but he never claimed to be one. He presented himself, rather, as a transmitter and authoritative interpreter of sacred rules, principles, and procedures that he had read, been instructed about, and/or witnessed in actual practice in the great monasteries of Song China. He promoted those rules on the grounds that they had been promulgated by Śākyamuni Buddha (in the case of *vinaya* texts) and

by the Chan patriarch Baizhang (in the case of *shingi*). Virtually all the texts by Dōgen that scholars regard as his monastic rules are actually commentaries on the *Chanyuan qinggui* and works deriving from the *vinaya* tradition.

In his *Tenzokyōkun* (*Admonitions for the Cook*), for example, Dōgen asserted that “One should carefully read the *Chanyuan qinggui*.” He then proceeded to quote that text six times as he explained the duties and proper attitude of the head cook.<sup>8</sup> More than 75 percent of the text of Dōgen’s *Fushukuhanpō* (*Procedures for Taking Meals*) is taken verbatim from the *Chanyuan qinggui*.<sup>9</sup> His *Chiji shingi* (*Rules of Purity for Stewards*) too draws heavily on the sections of the *Chanyuan qinggui* entitled “Controller,” “Rector,” “Cook,” and “Labor Steward.”<sup>10</sup> All of these works were evidently produced by Dōgen as a means of introducing certain parts of the *Chanyuan qinggui* to his followers and elaborating on the significance of the rules and procedures in question.

The following chapters of Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō* (*Collection of the Eye of the True Dharma*) also contain direct quotations of the *Chanyuan qinggui*: *Shukke* (*Leaving Home*),<sup>11</sup> *Jukai* (*Receiving the Precepts*),<sup>12</sup> *Shukke kudoku* (*Merit of Leaving Home*),<sup>13</sup> *Senmen* (*Face Washing*),<sup>14</sup> *Ango* (*Retreats*),<sup>15</sup> *Senjō* (*Purifications [for the Toilet]*),<sup>16</sup> *Hotsu bodaishin* (*Producing the Thought of Enlightenment*),<sup>17</sup> *Kie buppōsō* (*Taking Refuge in the Three Jewels*),<sup>18</sup> and *Fukanzazengi* (*Universal Instructions for Zazen*).<sup>19</sup> These texts too are representative of Dōgen’s efforts to explain to his Japanese followers the letter and spirit of rules and procedures found in the *Chanyuan qinggui*.

Dōgen was basically a transmitter, not an innovator, of monastic rules. His style of commenting on the *Chanyuan qinggui* was highly creative, however, for it drew on the Chan discourse records and *kōan* collections, which previously had never been connected in any way with rules of purity. In Song China it was taken for granted that monastic rules, whether they derived from Śākyamuni or Baizhang, pertained to the entire Buddhist *saṅgha*. The Chan lineage records, on the other hand, comprised a distinctive body of literature that was of concern primarily to followers of the Chan School. It was only in Japan that Song-style monastic institutions came to be identified as uniquely “Zen” in their architectural layout, bureaucratic organization, and ritual function. In Dōgen’s day that identification had not yet become firmly established, but he himself was keen to read the spirit of the Chan patriarchs into the rules of purity. In *Tenzokyōkun*, for example, he interspersed direct quotations from the *Chanyuan qinggui* with famous *kōans* and personal recollections of his own conversations with two cooks he met in China.<sup>20</sup> That mixing of genres served Dōgen’s purpose well, for it helped to bring otherwise dry prescriptions of monastic etiquette to life and bestow them with spiritual significance. By the same token, it familiarized his Japanese followers with the rhetorical conventions of the Zen “question and answer” (*mondō*) literature, rendering that difficult material more accessible by placing it in a concrete, practical context. In my view, Dōgen’s real genius as a pioneer of Japanese Zen consisted in this

brilliant juxtaposition and elucidation of Chinese Buddhist monastic rules and Chan teachings, two types of literature that had been treated quite separately in China.

Several modern Japanese scholars have argued that Eisai’s Kenninji and Enni’s Tōfukuji were “syncretic” institutions that did not represent “pure” Song-style Zen but rather were an admixture of Zen with elements of indigenous Tendai and Shingon esotericism (*mikkyōi*). They point out that both monasteries had facilities for the practice of Tiantai meditation routines and esoteric rites. Kenninji, for example, had a “calming and insight hall” (*shikan-in*) which was used for practice of the four *samādhis*.<sup>21</sup> Tōfukuji had an “Amida hall” (*Amidadō*) and a “Kannon hall” (*Kannondō*), which may have been used for the same purposes.<sup>22</sup> Kenninji also had a “Shingon hall” (*Shingon-in*) that was used for “land and water offerings” (*suiriku gu*) to hungry ghosts,<sup>23</sup> consecrations (*kanjō*), and other esoteric rites. Tōfukuji also had a consecration hall (*kanjōdō*) that may have served the same functions. Takeuchi Dōyū regards even the prayer ceremonies (*kitō*) and *sūtra* chanting services (*fugin*) that Eisai and Enni incorporated into their monastic practice as “esoteric” observances borrowed from the “old Buddhism” of Japan.<sup>24</sup>

All the elements of “syncretic” practice that Eisai and Enni are supposed to have adopted from Japanese Tendai, however, were commonly found in the public monasteries of the Southern Song, including those that bore the Chan name. Song-period ground plans survive for three of the leading monasteries in Zhejiang that were visited by Eisai, Dōgen, and Enni: Tiantong Mountain, Tiantai Mountain, and Bei Mountain.<sup>25</sup> The plans reveal monastery layouts that were actually quite eclectic, with facilities to accommodate a wide range of Buddhist practices. In addition to saṅgha halls (C. *sengtang*; J. *sōdō*), common quarters (C. *zhongliao*; J. *shuryō*), and dharma halls (C. *fatang*; J. *hattō*), there were buildings for offering services dedicated to the buddhas (C. *fodian*; J. *butsuden*), patriarchs (C. *zushitang*; J. *soshidō*), arhats (C. *luohantang*; J. *rakandō*), Guanyin (C. *kuan'yintang*; J. *kannondō*), and various local deities (C. *tuditang*; J. *dojidō*). There were also “quarters for illuminating the mind” (C. *zhaoxinliao*; J. *shōjinryō*) through *sūtra* study; *sūtra* libraries with revolving stacks (C. *luncang*; J. *rinzō*); *sūtra* reading halls (C. *kanjingtang*; J. *kankindō*), where prayer services for patrons were performed; *nirvāṇa* halls (C. *niepantang*; J. *nehandō*), where sick and dying monks were tended and prayed for with recitations of the buddhas’ names (C. *nianfo*; J. *nembutsu*), and “water and land halls” (*shui-lutang*), used for the esoteric rites of feeding famished spirits (*shieguihu*). It is likely that Eisai got the idea for the “Shingon hall” he built at Kenninji from the Chinese model, for he stated that it was used for “land and water offerings.” The “calming and insight hall” at Kenninji too may well have been based on one that Eisai encountered on Tiantai Mountain; there is no need to assume that it was a concession to Japanese Tendai influences. The prayer ceremonies and *sūtra* chanting services that Eisai and Enni incorporated into their monastic

practice, similarly, are all found in the rules of purity of Song China. Both Kenninji and Tōfukuji were, in fact, excellent replicas of the public monasteries in Zhejiang Province that were most often visited by Japanese monks in the thirteenth century.

Modern Japanese scholars, just as they have worked to depict the Zen of Eisai and Enni as “syncretic,” have been at pains to portray Dōgen’s Zen as especially “pure.” One champion of this view, Kagamishima Genryū, has argued that Song Chan was already syncretic and degenerate compared with the “pure Chan” (*junsui zen*) that had existed in the golden age of the Tang.<sup>26</sup> According to him, virtually all of the Zen transmitted to Japan, whether by Eisai, Enni, or the Chinese monks who followed, was at its very source overly ritualized and beholden to the religious and political needs of the court and aristocracy. Dōgen alone, Kagamishima argues, spurned the syncretic doctrines he encountered among the Chan schools in Song China, criticized the worldly tendencies of continental Chan with its aristocratic patronage, rejected the syncretism of early Japanese Zen, and insisted on an “unadulterated” form of Zen. Thus, he concludes, what Dōgen transmitted to Japan was not the Zen that he actually encountered in Song China but rather the pure Zen of Baizhang that had flourished in China during the Tang dynasty.<sup>27</sup>

Dōgen’s writings on monastic rules were rather typical in that they focused on some aspects of monastery organization and operation and took others for granted. The fact that he did not leave writings that dealt with every aspect of the “rules of purity” literature does not mean that he rejected or neglected the practices that were prescribed in them. I stress this point because scholars have too often taken Dōgen’s silence on a particular feature of monastic practice as evidence that he was a purist who rejected it. If one pays attention to the many passing references to multifarious rituals and bureaucratic procedures that occur in his writings, however, there is ample evidence that Dōgen embraced the model of the Song Chan monastery in its entirety, including most of the ostensibly “syncretic” and “popular” ceremonies and rituals that were later treated explicitly in the *Keizan shingi* (*Keizan’s Rules of Purity*).

Scholars associate the “purity” of Dōgen’s Zen with his putative rejection of ritual and his emphasis on seated meditation (*zazen*). A passage from Dōgen’s *Bendōwa* (*A Talk on Cultivating the Way*) is frequently cited in support of this interpretation:

From the start of your training under a wise master [*chishiki*], have no recourse to incense offerings [*shōkō*], prostrations [*raihai*], recitation of buddha names [*nembutsu*], repentances [*shūsan*], or *sūtra* reading [*kankin*]. Just sit in meditation [*taza*] and attain the dropping off of mind and body [*shinjin datsuraku*].<sup>28</sup>

In this passage Dōgen gives advice to the beginning Zen trainee, stressing that sitting in meditation is the one practice essential for attaining enlighten-

ment and thereby inheriting the true transmission of the buddha-dharma. Although Dōgen clearly did extol seated meditation as the *sine qua non* of Buddhism, scholars who seize on just this passage (and a few others like it) to characterize his approach to monastic practice badly misrepresent the historical record.

The specific rituals that seem to be disavowed in the *Bendōwa* passage are all prescribed for Zen monks, often in great detail, in Dōgen’s other writings. In *Kuyō shobutsu* (*Making Offerings to All Buddhas*), Dōgen recommends the practice of offering incense and making worshipful prostrations before buddha images and *stūpas*, as prescribed in the *sūtras* and *vinaya* texts.<sup>29</sup> In *Raihaitokuzui* (*Making Prostrations and Attaining the Marrow*) he urges trainees to venerate enlightened teachers and to make offerings and prostrations to them, describing this practice as one that helps pave the way to one’s own awakening.<sup>30</sup> In *Chiji shingi*, Dōgen stipulates that the vegetable garden manager in a monastery should participate together with the main body of monks in *sūtra* chanting services, recitation services (*nenju*) in which the buddhas’ names are chanted (a form of *nembutsu* practice), and other major ceremonies; he should burn incense and make prostrations (*shōkō raihai*) and recite the buddhas’ names in prayer morning and evening when at work in the garden.<sup>31</sup> The practice of repentances (*sange*) is encouraged in Dōgen’s *Kesa kudoku* (*Merit of the Kesa*),<sup>32</sup> *Sanjigō* (*Karma of the Three Times*),<sup>33</sup> and *Keiseisanshiki* (*Valley Sounds, Mountain Forms*).<sup>34</sup> Finally, in *Kankin* (*Sūtra Chanting*), Dōgen gives detailed directions for *sūtra* reading services in which, as he explains, texts could be read either silently or aloud as a means of producing merit to be dedicated to any number of ends, including the satisfaction of wishes made by lay donors, or prayers on behalf of the emperor.<sup>35</sup> *Kankin*, as Dōgen uses the term, can also refer to “turning” (without actually reading) through the pages of *sūtra* books, or turning rotating *sūtra* library stacks (*rinzō*), to produce merit. He occasionally uses *kankin* to mean “*sūtra* study,” but the *Bendōwa* passage most likely refers to *sūtra* reading as a merit-producing device in ceremonial settings.

In short, Dōgen embraced Song Chinese Buddhist monastic practice in its entirety, in a manner that was scarcely distinguishable from that of Eisai or Enni. It is true that he occasionally engaged in polemical criticism of certain members of the Linji lineage in China, but the disgust with and rejection of Song monastic forms that Kagamishima and other scholars ascribe to him is almost entirely missing from his lengthy, generally laudatory writings on the subject. Indeed, Dōgen had far more complaints about his Japanese compatriots who were ignorant in the proper way of doing things—that is, the way they were done in Song China.

The first of the émigré Chinese monks who helped transmit the Chan dharma and Song-style monastic forms to Japan was Lanqi Daolong (1213–1278). Shortly after his arrival in 1246, Lanqi was made abbot of Jōrakuji, which

was converted into a “Zen” monastery and reorganized in accordance with Chinese monastic rules.<sup>36</sup> In 1252 he was installed by the shogun Hōjō Tokiyori as the founding abbot of Kenchōji, a large monastery constructed in Kamakura on the model of Jing Mountain in Zhejiang. The “Rules for Kenchōji” (*Kenchō kushiki*) that Lanqi established do not survive,<sup>37</sup> and his extant writings do not mention the *Chanyuan qinggui* by name, but there is little doubt that when he urged the strict observation of rules of purity, he had that text (or something very similar) in mind.

After Lanqi, a series of Chinese monks came to Japan and worked to spread the Chan dharma. Wuan Puning (1197–1276) arrived in 1260 and became the second abbot of Kenchōji. Daxiu Zhengnian (1214–1288), who had been invited to Japan by Tokiyori, came in 1269 and served as abbot at several Zen monasteries in Kamakura. When Lanqi died in 1278, Hōjō Tokimune (Tokiyori’s son) invited Wuxue Zuyuan (1226–1286), an eminent monk who was at the time serving as head seat (*shouzuō*) at Tiantong Mountain. Upon his arrival in Japan in 1279, Wuxue became the abbot of Kenchōji; in 1282 he was installed as the founding abbot of yet another newly built Song-style monastery, Engakuji. Yishan Yining (1247–1317) came to Japan in 1299 and served as abbot at Kenchōji, Engakuji, and Nanzenji in Kyoto. None of those émigré Chinese monks left any monastic rules to posterity, but all of them have extensive discourse records, from which we may readily ascertain that the monasteries they presided over were organized and run in accordance with the *Chanyuan qinggui* and other Chinese rules of purity.

The vast majority of monks who led the way in establishing Song-style monasteries in Japan in the thirteenth century were dharma heirs in the Chan lineage. There were a few, however, who transmitted essentially the same institutional forms from China without also stressing the Chan teachings that were predominant there. The most striking example of such a monk is Shunjō (1166–1227), who spent twelve years in Song China studying the Chan, Tiantai, and especially Nanshan *vinaya* traditions. After returning to Japan in 1211, Shunjō became the abbot of a monastery in Kyoto that he turned into a Song-style institution, renaming it Sennyūji. Sennyūji was not identified as a Zen monastery, and Shunjō himself was known in his day as a *vinaya* master (*risshi*). A ground plan of Sennyūji, however, shows that its basic layout was the same as that of the Zen monasteries, such as Tōfukuji in Kyoto and Kenchōji in Kamakura, that were built a few decades later: all of them adhered closely to the same Song Chinese model.<sup>38</sup> A comparison of Shunjō’s rules for Sennyūji with the monastic rules that Zen masters Eisai, Dōgen, and Enni prescribed, moreover, leaves no doubt that the monasteries founded by all of them were nearly identical in organization and operation.<sup>39</sup>

The case of Sennyūji is significant because it confirms that neither the arrangement of the public monasteries in Song China nor the rules of purity that regulated them were actually the invention or exclusive domain of the

Chan School. Despite the official designation of many important monasteries in China as “Chan” establishments, the attachment of the “Chan” name to the most influential rules of purity, and the promotion of Baizhang as the “founder” of those, opposition from the Tiantai and Nanshan Lü schools prevented the Chan school from gaining exclusive control of the Buddhist institution at large. Moreover, because so-called Teachings (Tiantai lineage) monasteries and *Vinaya* (Nanshan Lü lineage) monasteries featured the same facilities, bureaucratic structures, and ceremonial calendars as their Chan counterparts, it was difficult to see the designation “Chan monastery” as indicating anything more than the fact that the abbacy was reserved for monks in the Chan lineage, and that followers of the Chan school tended to congregate there. Thus, a monk such as Shunjō could train in China and promote Song-style Buddhist monastic practices in Japan, including the practice of seated meditation in a *saṅgha* hall,<sup>40</sup> without being a proponent of Chan.

Another aspect of the transmission of Zen to Japan that has not received sufficient attention from modern scholars is the extent to which the pioneers of Zen were part of a broader movement to revive strict monastic practice based on the Hīnayāna *vinaya*, which had been discarded by Saichō some three centuries earlier. Disaffection with the lack of monkish discipline in the dominant Tendai and Shingon schools, together with the belief that the world had entered the period of the decay and final demise of the buddha-dharma (*mappō*), had set the stage for two opposite developments in Japanese Buddhism in the Kamakura period. One was the Pure Land movement led by figures such as Hōnen (1133–1212) and Shinran (1173–1262), who tended to further deemphasize the strictures of the *vinaya* or abandon them altogether on the grounds that they were “difficult” or “sagely” practices that were no longer feasible in a degenerate age. The other approach, which appealed to some reform-minded monks within the established schools of Japanese Buddhism and to the newly empowered Kamakura shoguns, was a return to stricter observance of the *vinaya*. Leaders of this conservative approach included monks who tried to revive the *vinaya* tradition of the old Nara schools, such as Jōkei (1155–1213) of the Hossō School and Kakuō (1194–1249) of the *Vinaya* School. There were also monks with backgrounds in the Shingon School, such as Eison (1201–1290) and Ninshō (1217–1303), who actively promoted the upholding of “Hīnayāna” monkish and lay precepts (*kairitsu*). For the most part, however, the movement to restore strict monastic practice looked for inspiration to China, where, as is clearly reflected in the *Chanyuan qinggui*, the Buddhist institution had preserved the tradition of strict monastic practice based on the *vinaya* to a far greater degree than had the Buddhist schools of the Heian period in Japan. It should not be surprising, then, that most of the Japanese and Chinese monks whom history remembers as the first transmitters of the Zen to Japan were also known in their own day as promoters of the *vinaya*, especially the practice of receiving and upholding Hīnayāna as well as Mahayāna precepts.

Eisai, for example, wrote in his *Kōzen gokokuron* that his teacher, Chan master Hsuan, had given him the precepts of the Hīnayāna Prātimokṣa (*shibunkai*) as contained in the *Sifenlu* (J. *Shibunritsu*, *Four Part Vinaya*) as well as the Mahayāna bodhisattva precepts.<sup>41</sup> In the same text he stated that “at present the Zen lineage holds the precepts to be essential”<sup>42</sup> and further remarked that outwardly one maintains the forms of the *vinaya* and guards against wrongdoing; inwardly one is compassionate and wishes to benefit others: that is what is called the principle of Zen and what is called the teachings of Buddha.<sup>43</sup>

Dōgen, too, relied on Hīnayāna *vinaya* texts that were commonly used in Song monasteries. For example, he quoted the *Sifenlu* and related commentaries in his *Kesa kudoku* and *Fushukuhanpō*, and he cited the *Sanqian weiqing* (*Sūtra on Three Thousand Points of Monkish Decorum*), another *vinaya* text, no less than eighteen times in his *Senjō*, *Gyōji* (*Observances*), *Senmen*, and *Chiji shingi*.<sup>44</sup> Dōgen’s *Taitaiko gogejari hō* (*Procedures for Relating to Monks Five Retreats Senior to Oneself*), moreover, is basically a commentary on the “Procedures for Relating to Teachers and Procedures for Entering the Assembly” (*shihshih fa juchung fa*) section of the *Chiao-chiai hsin-hsüeh-pi-ch’iu hsing-hu lü-i* (*Instructions on the Ritual Restraints to be Observed by New Monks in Training*) by Tao-hsüan.<sup>45</sup> In the opening lines of his *Shuryō shingi* (*Admonitions for the Common Quarters*), Dōgen recommended studying *vinaya* texts and stated that behavior in the common quarters (*shuryō*) should be in respectful compliance with the precepts laid down by the buddhas and patriarchs (*busso no kairitsu*), should follow in accord with the department for monks established in both the Hīnayāna and Mahayāna [*vinaya*] (*daishōjō no igi*), and should agree entirely with Baizhang’s rules of purity (*Hyakujō shingi*).<sup>46</sup> The stance that both Eisai and Dōgen took on this issue, of course, was based directly on the *Chan yuan qinggui* and on what they had witnessed firsthand in the great monasteries of the Song.

### The Importation and Production of the “Rules of Purity” in Medieval Japan

The fall of the Song dynasty to the Mongols in 1278 was, at first, reason for considerable trepidation within the Chinese Buddhist *saṅgha*, and a number of eminent Chan masters (Wuxue Zuyuan among them) did in fact flee to Japan. It soon became apparent, however, that the new rulers of China were more interested in patronizing and regulating the monastic order than in destroying it, and life in the great public monasteries continued much as before. Some of the monastic rules produced during the Yuan dynasty (1280–1368), most notably the *Beiyong qinggui* (*Auxiliary Rules of Purity*) and *Chixiu baizhang qinggui* (*Imperial Edition of Baizhang’s Rules of Purity*), represented attempts to collate and systematize all previous rules of purity. Others, such as the *Huan-zhu an qinggu* (*Rules of Purity for the Huan-chu Hermitage*), were pared-down

documents intended to regulate a single, small monastery.<sup>47</sup> All of these rules found their way to Japan within a short time of their publication in China, where they had a significant impact on the ongoing development of Zen monastic institutions.

Throughout the thirteenth century, the *Chanyuan qinggui* remained the basic reference work for all Japanese and Chinese monks concerned with establishing Song-style monastic practices in Japan. By the first decades of the fourteenth century, however, one begins to find evidence of the production of rules of purity within Japan itself. The new texts composed from that time were no doubt conceived in response to the needs of the growing Zen institution and attuned to local conditions. They were, moreover, clearly influenced by the various rules produced in China after the *Chanyuan qinggui*.

Perhaps the oldest extant example of a set of monastic rules composed in Japan is a text entitled *Eizan koki* (*Old Rules of E[nichi] Mountain*).<sup>48</sup> E'nichi is the mountain name (*sangō*) for Tōfukuji, and these “old rules” are attributed to Enni. The text as we have it today, however, bears a colophon that dates its composition to 1318. It contains an annual schedule of rituals that is very similar to those found in the *Beiyong qinggui*, issued in 1311, and the *Huanzhu an qinggui* (*Rules of Purity for the Huanzhu Hermitage*), written in 1317. There is no way of knowing for certain if the *Eizan koki* was based on either of those Chinese texts, but its date of composition strongly suggests that it was at least influenced by similar materials arriving from China.

The next of the fourteenth-century texts worthy of note is the *Nōshū tōkokuzan yōkōzenji gyōji shidai* (*Ritual Procedures for Tōkoku Mountain Yōkō Zen Monastery in Nō Province*),<sup>49</sup> written by Keizan Jōkin (1268–1325) in 1324. The text subsequently became known as the *Keizan oshō shingi* (*Preceptor Keizan's Rules of Purity*) and took on the role of a standard reference work in Sōtō Zen monasteries, but it seems likely to have originated as a handbook of ritual events and liturgical texts for use in the single monastery named in its title. The original *Keizan shingi* was similar in this respect to the *Huanzhu an qinggui*, written in China some seven years earlier. Another feature that the *Keizan shingi* shares with the *Huanzhu an qinggui* is a detailed daily, monthly, and annual calendar of rituals. Given the fact that the Chinese text is the oldest extant rules of purity to display that feature, it seems likely that it had a direct influence upon Keizan's work.

Another text worth mentioning in this connection is the *Daikan shingi* (*Daikan's Rules of Purity*),<sup>50</sup> compiled by the émigré Chinese monk Qingzhuo Zhengcheng (1274–1339) in 1332. Qingzhuo had been invited to Kamakura by Hōjō Takatoki and was working to spread Zen in provincial centers when he composed his rules of purity. The text is very similar in organization and content to the *Jiaoding qinggui*, compiled in 1274, which Qingzhuo mentions as a source. He also refers to the *Beiyong qinggui* (1311) as a source, so it seems that by this time, at least, those two Chinese codes were becoming known in Japan.

The *Daikan shingi*, it may be said, represented an effort to simplify those Chinese rules of purity and render them easier to use in smaller monasteries of the sort that Qingzhuo encountered in Japan.

Eventually the *Chixiu baizhang qingqui*, completed in 1338, became the standard set of rules for large Zen monasteries in Japan. Smaller monasteries, however, continued to rely on works such as the *Daikan shingi* and the *Rinsen Kakun* (*House Rules for Rinsenji*) that Musō (1275–1351) wrote in 1339 for his monastery in Kyoto.<sup>51</sup>

The Muromachi period (1333–1573) saw the rise of the “Five Mountains” (*gozan*) network of Zen monasteries, which were officially ranked by the Ashikaga shogunate. At its peak, prior to the outbreak of the Ōnin War in 1467, this network encompassed some 300 monasteries ranked in three tiers, with eleven Kyoto and Kamakura monastic centers at the top and several thousand affiliated branch temples throughout the country.<sup>52</sup> The single most important rules of purity text used within the Five Mountains system was the *Chixiu baizhang qingqui*. The first Japanese printing of the *Chixiu baizhang qingqui* was the “Five Mountains edition” (*gozan ban*), issued in 1356. The text was reprinted in 1458, and a Japanese language commentary on it entitled *Hyakujō shingi shō* (*Summary of Baizhang’s Rules of Purity*) was produced, based on lectures on the text given by various abbots of major Zen monasteries in Kyoto between 1459 and 1462. Subsequent reprinting of the *Chixiu baizhang qingqui* took place during the Tokugawa period (1603–1868), in 1629, 1661, 1720, and 1768.<sup>53</sup>

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Japanese Zen institutions spread and evolved in ways that were relatively independent of developments on the continent. There was a tendency for Zen lineages to splinter as “brother” and “cousin” dharma heirs competed for the abbacies of monasteries in the generations succeeding a founding patriarch. That development, together with new patterns of patronage that linked individual Zen masters and their lineal descendants with particular lay clans among the wealthy and powerful, led to the proliferation of mortuary subtemples at the major metropolitan Zen monasteries and the eventual demise of their central facilities. The subtemples, called *stūpa* sites (*tatchū*), began as walled compounds that contained a worship hall (*shōdō*), where the memorial portrait (*chinzō*) of a former abbot and mortuary tablets (*ihai*) for the ancestors of the patron clan were enshrined; an abbot’s quarters (*hōjō*) for the *stūpa* chief (*tassu*) or monk in charge of memorial services and his attendants (*jisha*); and a kitchen-cum-office building (*kuri*). As time went on, this layout was simplified with the worship hall moved into the abbot’s quarters, which then became known as the “main hall” (*hondō*), and with the kitchen-cum-office building used as the residence of the monks who performed the services there.

The abbot’s quarters of the memorial subtemples were often fine pieces of architecture that were lavishly appointed with secular as well as religious

works of art, rock gardens, and adjacent teahouses, all provided by patrons, basically to enhance their own enjoyment and the prestige of their clans. The styles of gardens, tea utensils, calligraphy, and ink painting found in Japanese Zen subtemples had their origins in the elite literati culture of Song and Yuan China. They were brought to Japan in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in connection with the establishment of Chinese-style monasteries and the transmission of Chan lineages, but in their native China they were never known as “Chan” (or even as Buddhist) arts. The notion of “Zen” arts is strictly a Japanese conceit, and the idea that rock gardens were built as aids to meditation (or as artistic representations of meditative states) is a modern myth.

In any case, with the proliferation of subtemples,<sup>54</sup> the main monastery (*hongaran*) facilities—the great saṅgha halls, dharma halls, buddha halls (*but-suden*), administration cloisters (*kuin*), and other buildings designed to support large-scale communal training—emptied out and fell into ruin, or burned down and were not rebuilt. The type of Zen monastic institution that had originally been imported from China and regulated by the *Chanyuan qingui* and *Chixiu baizhang qingqui* had virtually disappeared by the latter half of the sixteenth century.

Under the circumstances, the old rules of purity were no longer of much interest in Japanese Zen, but some new sets of guidelines were written to meet the changing needs of the Zen institution. One such work was the *Shoekō shingi* (*Rules of Purity with Various Dedications of Merit*),<sup>55</sup> composed by the Rinzai monk Tenrin Fuin (n.d.) in 1566. The text contains verses for dedicating merit (*ekōmon*) to be used in conjunction with daily, monthly, annual, and occasional *sūtra*-chanting services, which were the main ritual activities in the mortuary subtemples. Those verses were based on ones found in earlier rules of purity such as the *Chixiu baizhang qingqui*, but they were adapted and expanded to include more prayers for the ancestral spirits of patron families. The *Shoekō shingi* also includes procedures for funerals, rites of repentance (*sanbō*), and receiving precepts (*jukai*), all of which were basic ways of involving lay followers in the practice of Buddhism.

### The Revival of the “Rules of Purity” in the Tokugawa Period

The Tokugawa period (1603–1868) was a time of major institutional changes in Japanese Zen, and indeed in all the schools of Japanese Buddhism. Many of the changes were instigated by the Tokugawa shogunate, which ruled a newly unified Japan from its capital in Edo (Tokyo) and exercised strict control over all religious organizations in the country. Three policies implemented by the shogunate that had a great impact on Buddhism were: (1) the banning of Christianity; (2) the establishment of a parish system (*danka seidō*), whereby every household in the country was compelled to register as a patron (*danka*, literally

“donor house”) of a Buddhist monastery in its locale; and (3) the organization of Buddhist monasteries and temples into a head/branch system (*honmatsu seidō*) in which all of the Buddhist monasteries in the country were linked, in accordance with traditional denominations and lineages, into hierarchical networks controllable from the top by the shogunate. The aims of these policies were: to seal Japan off from foreign influences associated with Christian missionary activity, which had flourished in the late sixteenth century; to curb the Christian *daimyō* who had fought against the Tokugawa; to prevent the spontaneous rise of popular, potentially seditious religious movements; and to provide the shogunate with a bureaucratic network capable of organizing and controlling the population and furthering the centralization of power in Edo.

Buddhist monasteries thus, in addition to whatever religious functions they served, became instruments of the state and charged with keeping birth, death, and residency records at the local level and with communicating government directives to the people. The demands of the parish system resulted in a huge increase in the number of Buddhist monasteries of all denominations in Japan, but the Zen schools in particular flourished. One reason was the intimate involvement of Zen monks in the formulation of the shogunate's policies.<sup>56</sup>

The typical Zen branch monastery of the Tokugawa period was a small facility occupied by an abbot (*jūshoku*) and a handful of monk disciples who had been recruited locally. Both the architectural layout and the ritual calendar of such ordinary monasteries were based on those of the mortuary subtemples (*stūpa* sites) that flourished on the grounds of the head monasteries of the various Zen orders. The main difference was that the *stūpa* sites at head monasteries such as Myōshinji and Daitokuji in Kyoto were all the mortuary temples (*bodaiji*) of a single wealthy family, whereas most of the Zen temples that came into existence under the parish system had dozens or even hundreds of ordinary households affiliated with them as patrons. The typical Zen temple thus became a place where a resident priest or abbot and a few assistant monks performed funerals and memorial services for their lay parishioners (*danka*) and perhaps engaged them in other Buddhist practices as well, such as receiving the precepts or repentances or celebrating the Buddha's birthday (*gotan e*) or his *nirvāṇa* (*nehan e*). The only rules of purity needed at the great majority of ordinary Zen temples were liturgical manuals, such as Tenrin Fuin's *Shoekō shingi*. That text, which had initially been written in 1566 and was handed down as an in-house document, was published in 1657 and widely circulated thereafter.

Even as those developments took place, however, the complacency of the established Rinzai and Sōtō schools of Zen was shaken by a new wave of Chinese Buddhism that entered Japan and threatened to lure away their brightest and most serious monks. The Ōbaku school of Zen, as the newcomer came to be called, represented a style of Ming-dynasty (1368–1644) Chinese Buddhist

monastic practice that had evolved directly from the public monasteries of the Song and Yuan. The Ōbaku movement began about 1620, when Chinese traders, permitted by the shogunate to do business in Nagasaki, began inviting monks from China to serve the religious needs of their community and build monasteries in the late-Ming style with which they were familiar. The movement got a big boost when Yinyuan Longqi (1592–1673), a prominent Chan master glad to leave war-torn China, arrived in Nagasaki in 1654. Yinyuan gained the patronage of the fourth Tokugawa shogun, Ietsuna, who supported the building of a large Ming-style monastery in Uji (south of Kyoto) in 1660. Yinyuan was installed as founding abbot of the monastery, called Manpukuji, and compiled a set of regulations for it entitled *Ōbaku shingi* (*Ōbaku Rules of Purity*),<sup>57</sup> subsequently published in 1672. The text reflected a few evolutionary changes that had taken place in Chinese monasteries since the Yuan, but it was squarely in the tradition of classical rules of purity such as the *Chanyuan qingui* and *Chixiu baizhang qingui*.

From the perspective of Japanese Zen Buddhists, the most striking features of Ōbaku Zen were: large-scale communal practice based on central monastery facilities, such as a buddha hall, dharma hall, meditation hall (*zendō*), refectory (*saidō*), and the like; the aforementioned rules of purity used to regulate that practice; an emphasis on receiving precepts at all levels of participation in the Buddhist *saṅgha*, including the full precepts (*gusoku kai*) of the Hīnayāna *vinaya*; a concern with copying and printing Buddhist *sūtras*, both as an encouragement to study and as a meritorious work; and the practice of *nembutsu kōan*, common in Ming Buddhism, which entailed using *nembutsu*—recitation of the Buddha Amitabha’s (C. Amituo; J. Amida) name—as the basis for an introspection of one’s own mind with the existential question (*kōan*), “Who is reciting?”

In Japan, where the various Pure Land and Zen orders had existed (and competed for patronage) in entirely separate institutional settings for the previous three centuries, the “combination” of *nembutsu* with *zazen* and *kōan* practice struck some people as odd or objectionable. Reciting “Namu Amida Butsu” had been touted by Japanese Pure Land teachers as an easy way to salvation and as an expression of faith in the “other power” (*tariki*) or saving grace of Amida. In the Japanese Zen tradition, on the other hand, “seeing one’s own buddha-nature” (*kenshō*) and inheriting the dharma (*shihō*) were considered difficult things that only a few exceptional monks could attain through their own assiduous efforts. In Chinese Buddhism, however, there was no history of institutional separation between followers of the Chan School and devotees of Amitabha, and a person could be both at the same time without feeling any conflict, as indeed was the case with Zongze, the compiler of the *Chanyuan qingui*. And, regardless of its inclusion of Pure Land elements, the fact remained that the Ōbaku school, with its group practice of *zazen* on the platforms in a meditation hall and its emphasis on keeping the precepts, rep-

resented a type of communal monastic discipline far more rigorous than anything that existed at the time in Japanese Buddhism.

A number of Rinzai and Sōtō monks gravitated to Ōbaku teachers and monasteries, but there were also those who, while impressed with the newly imported Chinese institutions, remained loyal to their own lineages and strived to reform their own monasteries along the lines of the Ōbaku model. An early example is the Rinzai Zen master Ungo Kiyō (1582–1659), who in 1636 assumed the abbacy of Zuiganji, the family mortuary temple of the Date clan (*daimyō* of Sendai) and converted it into a training monastery where the precepts were strictly observed and a regular schedule of twice daily meditation (*niji no zazen*), three daily *sūtra*-chanting services (*sanji no fugin*), and manual labor (*fushin samu*) was implemented.<sup>58</sup> At the same time, he convinced the *daimyō* to ban hunting and fishing in the region and began teaching a form of *nembutsu* Zen to laypeople, including a group of samurai women. Although Ungo did not study under Ōbaku masters, it is clear that he was greatly influenced by the main currents of Ming Buddhism.

In 1645 Ungo became abbot of Myōshinji, where he was criticized by some monks for taking a syncretic approach that was alien to the so-called Ōtōkan branch of the Rinzai lineage deriving from the founding abbot, Kanzan Egen (1277–1360). Even so, when Yinyuan arrived in Japan, there were some other monks at Myōshinji who wished to invite the Chinese prelate to become abbot. The move was blocked by Gudō Tōshoku (1579–1661), 137th abbot and champion of the Ōtōkan line, but even Gudō was sufficiently impressed by the new Ming-style Zen monasteries to set about rebuilding some of Myōshinji's central facilities (the main gate, buddha hall, and dharma hall, but not the saṅgha hall) in the Chinese manner.

The revival of rigorous communal training in Rinzai Zen during the Tokugawa period was stimulated by the appearance of Ōbaku school monastic institutions, but it did not result in the building of any new Rinzai monasteries on the large scale of Manpukuji, let alone the vast Zen edifices (such as Tōfukuji or Kenchōji) that were originally erected in Kyoto and Kamakura during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Rather, what usually occurred was something along the lines of Ungo's conversion of Zuiganji: the transformation of a relatively small Zen monastery, often a family mortuary temple with a single powerful patron (such as a *daimyō* or wealthy merchant), into a somewhat larger facility for communal training called a "saṅgha hall."<sup>59</sup> The typical Tokugawa-period Zen monastery, as was noted earlier, was a mortuary temple consisting of a main worship hall (*hondō*, also known as *hōjō* or abbot's quarters) and a residence building with a kitchen and offices. The key elements in the transformation to saṅgha hall status were the installation as abbot of an eminent Zen master who could attract students, and the construction of a communal meditation hall, modeled after the ones found at Ōbaku monasteries. The technical term for this process was "opening a meditation platform"

(*kaitan*) as opposed to “opening a mountain” (*kaisan*), which meant founding a new monastery.

Most Rinzai saṅgha halls retained the character of the clan mortuary temple that they had had prior to “opening a meditation platform.” The increase in the number of resident monks, of course, meant considerably greater expense for the patron. On the other hand, the merit produced and available for dedication to ancestors was also understood to be much greater, since it resulted from the sponsorship of an entire community of monks who were keeping the precepts and engaging in rigorous Buddhist practice; a saṅgha hall, in short, was a more fertile “field of merit” than an ordinary mortuary temple. The establishment of saṅgha halls was a significant phenomenon that changed the face of Rinzai Zen in the Tokugawa period, but it affected less than one percent of the Rinzai monasteries, the vast majority being simply local branch temples in the parishioner system.

Mujaku Dōchū (1653–1744) was a leading Rinzai reformer of the Tokugawa period who twice served as abbot of Myōshinji. Familiar with both the *Ōbaku shingi* and Dōgen’s writings on monastic discipline, Mujaku set out to produce a Rinzai alternative. Carefully studying all of the earlier Chinese rules of purity that were available to him, including the *Chanyuan qingui* and *Chixiu baizhang qingqui*, he wrote the *Shōsōrin ryaku shingi* (*Abbreviated Rules of Purity for Small Monasteries*).<sup>60</sup> Published in 1684, the work became a standard reference for Rinzai monks who converted ordinary temples into saṅgha halls during the Tokugawa period, and it remains the basis for various sets of rules presently in use in Rinzai monasteries. Mujaku was a prolific scholar who left a huge collection of writings on many aspects of Zen history and literature, but his lifelong work on Chan and Zen rules of purity was particularly thorough and remains useful to scholars even today. Two outstanding products of his research are the *Chokushū hyakujō shingi sakei* (*Commentary on the Imperial Edition of Baizhang’s Rules of Purity*),<sup>61</sup> which he worked on from 1699 until 1718, and his *Zenrin shōkisen* (*Encyclopedia of Zen Monasticism*),<sup>62</sup> whose preface is dated 1741.

Historically, the most influential of the Rinzai masters who made use of elements of Ōbaku Zen was Kogetsu Zenzai (1667–1751). Kogetsu received the full 250 precepts and bodhisattva precepts (*bosatsukai*) from an Ōbaku monk and emphasized keeping the precepts in his teachings. He also shared the Ōbaku concern with promoting Buddhist *sūtras*. Kogetsu engaged in copying the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* (*Dai hannya kyō*) and strived to obtain a copy of the Buddhist canon (*issai kyō*) from China. Monks in the lineage of Kogetsu were initially in the forefront of the movement to convert ordinary monasteries into saṅgha halls. For example, Seisetsu Shūcho (1745–1820), a “grandson” dharma heir of Kogetsu, became the abbot of Engakuji in Kamakura and converted the founding abbot’s *stūpa* subtemple into a saṅgha hall. Later, Seisetsu moved to Kyoto and was instrumental in establishing subtemple

saṅgha halls at Tenryūji and Shōkokuji, two other high-ranking monasteries in the shogunate's head/branch system. His dharma heir, Sengai Gibon (1750–1837), opened a saṅgha hall at Shōfukuji in Fukuoka.

The efforts of monks in Kogetsu's lineage, however, were eventually overshadowed and co-opted by dharma heirs of Hakuin Ekaku (1685–1768). Hakuin is honored in Rinzai Zen circles today as *the* reformer of the Tokugawa period, a hero who acted virtually single-handedly to fight off the Ōbaku threat and maintain the integrity of the Rinzai tradition. Hakuin was adamantly opposed to the Ming style of “mixing” Pure Land and Zen. Scorning *nembutsu kōan*, he championed a “pure” form of Rinzai Zen practice based on *zazen*, contemplating the “old cases” (*kosoku*) of the Tang and Song patriarchs, and manual labor. He did not oppose the Ōbaku concerns with precepts and *sūtra* copying, but neither did he view them as vital matters.

Hakuin converted the Shōinji (in present-day Shizuoka) into a saṅgha hall where he promoted his own vision of Rinzai monastic practice, and later he founded the Ryūtakuji saṅgha hall. Insofar as those monasteries featured Ōbaku-style meditation halls and rigorous communal discipline, Hakuin was not as free from the influence of Ming Buddhism as he liked to profess. In his approach to lay followers, moreover, he took an eclectic and tolerant approach that owed much to Ōbaku Zen. His well-known *Zazen wasan* (*Vernacular Hymn in Praise of Zazen*), for example, belongs to the genre made popular by Unko Kiyō's *Ōjō yōka* (*Song of Rebirth in the Pure Land*) and even contains some lines that are almost identical to the latter work. For lay followers, Hakuin also recommended recitation of the *Enmei jukku kannongyō* (*Life Prolonging Ten-Clause Kannon Sūtra*) as a form of practice similar to the *nembutsu* recitation of the Pure Land schools.<sup>63</sup> Dharma heirs of Hakuin opened many new saṅgha halls and eventually, in the nineteenth century, succeeded in taking over those that had been established earlier by monks in the Kogetsu line.

In the Sōtō Zen school, an early example of a reformer influenced by Ōbaku practices is Gesshū Sōko (1618–1696), who trained with Yinyuan and other Chinese monks in the middle of his career and then went on to become the abbot of Daijōji, an important Sōtō monastery. Inspired by the *Ōbaku shingi* and desirous of producing a Sōtō counterpart that could be used to facilitate communal saṅgha-hall training and hold formal retreats (*kessei*) at Daijōji, Gesshū consulted Dōgen's commentaries on the *Chanyuan qingui* and Keizan's *Nōshū Tōkokuzan Yōkō zenji gyōji shidai*, then compiled the *Shōjurin shinanki* (*Record of Guidelines for Shōju Grove [Daijōji]*), also known as *Shōjurin shingi* (*Rules of Purity for Shōju Grove*), in 1674.<sup>64</sup> In 1678 Gesshū and his disciple Manzan Dōhaku (1636–1715) took the aforementioned set of rules that Keizan had written for Yōkōji and published them for the first time under the title of *Keizan oshō shingi*.

The need that Sōtō lineage monks felt to have proprietary rules of purity to counter the *Ōbaku shingi* can also be seen in the actions of the thirtieth abbot

of the Sōtō head monastery Eiheiiji, Kōshō Chidō (?–1670), who pieced together such a text from six separate commentaries that Dōgen had written on different aspects of the *Chanyuan qingui*. Kōshō’s compilation, styled *Nichiiki Sōtō shoso Dōgen zenji shingi* (*Rules of Purity by Zen Master Dōgen, First Patriarch of Sōtō in Japan*), was published in 1667. The text later became known as the *Eihei shingi* (*Eihei Rules of Purity*). Dōgen’s various writings on monastic discipline were also the basis of the *Tōjō kijō* (*Sōtō Standards*),<sup>65</sup> compiled by Jakudō Donkō (Donkō, n.d.) and published in 1733. The title of that work echoed the references to “Baizhang’s standards” (*Hyakujō kijō*) found in the *Chanyuan qingui* and Dōgen’s own writings.

The single most influential reformer of Sōtō Zen in the Tokugawa period was Menzan Zuihō (1683–1769), whose work continues to serve as a standard for the modern Sōtō school. Continuing the movement started by Gesshū and Manzan, Menzan produced the *Sōdō shingi* (*Rules of Purity for Saṅgha Halls*), which was published in 1753.<sup>66</sup> Written in Japanese (as opposed to classical Chinese, which had previously been the norm for monastic rules), the text was intended to establish the definitive Sōtō approach to various ritual procedures on the basis of historical study. To that end, Menzan compared the *Nichiiki Sōtō shoso Dōgen zenji shingi* and *Keizan oshō shingi* to all of the various Song and Yuan Chinese rules of purity to which he had access. He explained the decisions he had made and presented his research findings in a companion volume entitled *Tōjō sōdō shingi kōtei betsureoku* (*Separate Volume of Notes on the Sōtō Rules of Purity for Saṅgha Halls*),<sup>67</sup> published in 1755. Menzan also researched the arrangement of Zen monastery buildings and sacred images used in Dōgen’s and Keizan’s day, publishing his findings in 1759 in his *Tōjō garan shodō anzōki* (*Record of Images Placed in the Various Halls of Sōtō Monasteries*).<sup>68</sup> Menzan was not the only one interested in countering the Ming style of monastery layout with an older Song-style layout sanctified by the Sōtō founding patriarchs: the Sōtō monk Futaku (n.d.) compiled a similar work entitled *Tōjō garan zakki* (*Miscellaneous Records of Sōtō Monasteries*),<sup>69</sup> which was published in 1755.

Gentō Sokuchū (1729–1807) was heir to the movement (starting with Gesshū and Manzan and continuing with Menzan) to oppose the *Ōbaku shingi* and revive the “old rules of purity” of Dōgen and Keizan. In 1794, a year before he became the fiftieth abbot of Eiheiiji, Gentō edited the *Nichiiki Sōtō shoso Dōgen zenji shingi* and published it with the title *Kōtei kanchū Eihei shingi* (*Revised and Captioned Eihei Rules of Purity*).<sup>70</sup> His new edition was widely distributed and subsequently became known simply as the *Eihei shingi*. With its attribution to Dōgen (who did, in fact, write each of the six essays contained in the work), it helped to cement the erroneous but convenient notion that Dōgen himself had compiled a set of rules of purity. The text is also referred to today as the *Eihei dai shingi* (*Large Eihei Rules of Purity*), to distinguish it from a set of regulations by Gentō entitled *Eihei shō shingi* (*Small Eihei Rules of Purity*),<sup>71</sup>

published in 1805. Written to regulate training at Eiheiiji while Gentō was abbot, the latter text is similar in many respects to Menzan's *Sōdō shingi*. That is to say, it makes reference to various Song and Yuan rules of purity such as the *Chanyuan qingui*, *Huanzhu an qinggui*, and *Chixiu baizhang qinggui*, favoring the first on the grounds that it was closest to Baizhang and relied on by Dōgen.

In general, the movement of the Tokugawa-period Sōtō Zen to “restore the old” (*fukko*) ways of monastic training associated with Dōgen and Keizan was centered in a few relatively large and important monasteries in the head/branch system, such as Daijōji, Eiheiiji, and Sōjiji. Despite the efforts of Sōtō purists such as Menzan to promote ground plans and sacred images that were in keeping with ones originally established by Dōgen, those places were rebuilt in what was basically a Ming Chinese style, with main gates (*sanmon*), meditation halls, buddha halls, and refectories similar to those found at Manpukuji (the Ōbaku head monastery). There were also a few examples of “opening a meditation platform” at smaller Sōtō monasteries, as was the norm in Rinzai Zen.

### Zen Monastic Rules in the Meiji Era

Tokugawa rule ended in 1867 with the restoration of the Meiji emperor, and Japan embarked on a course of rapid modernization and industrialization that was inspired by the model of the leading Western colonial powers. Because Buddhism was closely associated with the old feudal regime and regarded as a backward, superstitious religion by many leaders of the new government, it was subjected to very harsh treatment in the early years of the Meiji era (1868–1912). A movement to “discard the buddhas and destroy [the followers of] Śākyamuni” (*haibutsu kishaku*) wreaked havoc (with degrees of severity that varied according to the locale) by destroying temples, confiscating their lands, and forcing priests to return to lay life.<sup>72</sup> By 1876 the number of Buddhist temples in Japan had dropped to 71,962, which by one estimate was a reduction of more than 80 percent from the Tokugawa period.<sup>73</sup> Government policies dictated a clear separation of Shinto and Buddhism (*shinbutsu bunri*) and established the former as the official (“ancient” and “pure”) religion of the Japanese nation. The associations of households with temples, mandatory under the Tokugawa parishioner system, were rendered voluntary, and many of the Zen saṅgha halls that had been mortuary temples for *daimyō* clans found themselves deprived of support when their patrons lost power. The Meiji government also passed a number of laws designed to laicize what remained of the Buddhist priesthood and turn it into an ordinary profession. Thus, for example, an ordinance of 1872 permitted “eating meat, marriage, and wearing hair” (*nikujiki saitai chikuhatsu*) for monks. Other laws required Buddhist monks to

keep their lay family names (as opposed to their traditional dharma names) for purposes of the national census, and subjected them to conscription into the military.

The Meiji government did, however, retain the principle of state control of Buddhism that had informed the old head/branch monastery system. In 1872 it decreed the administrative unification of each of the main Buddhist traditions: Tendai, Shingon, Jōdo, Jōdo Shin, Nichiren, Ji, and Zen. A new bureaucratic entity called the Zen Denomination (*Zenshū*) thus came into existence, forcibly uniting all the diverse lineages and temple groupings of the Rinzai, Sōtō, and Ōbaku traditions under the control of a single state-appointed superintendent priest (*kanchō*). That heavy-handed policy proved unworkable, however, and in 1874 the various historical groupings of Rinzai and Sōtō temples were permitted to form into two separate religious corporations. Government controls were further relaxed in 1876, allowing a group of temples formerly affiliated with Manpukuji to regain an independent identity as the Ōbaku school and the newly formed Rinzai school to dissolve into nine distinct corporations, each with its own head monastery and network of affiliated branch temples that closely resembled the late-Tokugawa head/branch system.<sup>74</sup> The newly created Sōtō school remained a single religious corporation, albeit one with two head monasteries, Eiheiji and Sōjiji.

The attacks on Buddhist institutions and ideas that occurred early in the Meiji era must be understood within the broader context of the vast project of modernization (Westernization) and nation building. James Ketelaar, in his examination of the persecution of Buddhism in Meiji Japan, identifies three main thrusts to the anti-Buddhist critique:

- (1) the socio-economic uselessness of its priests and temples, which detracted from the nation's entrance into the “realm of civilization”;
- (2) the foreign character of its teachings, which promoted disunity and was incompatible with the directives of the Imperial Nation; and
- (3) its mythological—that is, “unscientific”—history.<sup>75</sup>

The first two of these arguments, while couched in terms of the detrimental effect that Buddhism supposedly had on the effort to modernize and unify Japan under the imperial banner, were actually clichés of anti-Buddhist rhetoric that had already seen more than a millennium of use in China; nevertheless, they seemed relevant enough to be repeated frequently by opponents of Buddhism and to elicit responses from its supporters. The third argument—that Buddhism was a superstitious religion with a false (mythological as opposed to scientific) cosmology and history—was the most potent, for it derived from the same rationalist and historicist mindset of “civilization and enlightenment” (*bunmei kaika*) that was inspired by the West and promoted by Japan's new Westernizers.

Given the aforementioned policies and criticisms, it is remarkable that any

aspects of the Zen reforms of the Tokugawa period were able to survive the Meiji Restoration. After all, those reforms had been characterized by stricter adherence to the precepts of the Indian *vinaya* and the study and reimplementation of monkish rules of purity originally formulated in China. The main thrust of Meiji government policies, however, was in exactly the opposite direction—toward the relaxation of precepts, the laicization of the Buddhist institution, and the promotion of a “pure Japanese” national religion styled “Shinto.” The traditional history of the Zen lineage (*zenshūshi*), with its stories of the twin patriarchs Bodhidharma and Hyakuōjō (Baizhang) and the subsequent transmission of the formless buddha-mind to Japan, was particularly vulnerable to the charge of being mere mythology. Proponents of Zen, however, did not shrink from their past as they struggled for survival and relevance in the new world of the Meiji regime. Rather, they seized on saṅgha-hall training and the rules of purity that regulated it as potent symbols of everything that was positive about the Zen tradition and used them to forge a new identity adapted to the needs of the time.

That process of self-reinvention was highly complex, but key elements in it may be singled out as follows. In the first place, proponents of Zen stressed the communal, hierarchical, ascetic, and highly disciplined nature of traditional monastic training—all characteristics of social structure that were, clearly enough, also desirable in the new world of corporations, factories, and military units that the Meiji oligarchs were building. Recalling that the initial establishment of Zen monasteries in Japan in the thirteenth century had taken place with the patronage of the Kamakura *bakufu*, they also emphasized the putative link between Zen and Bushidō (*bushidō*), the “way of the warrior,” promoting both as traditional values ideally suited to modern Japan. Remarkably, this polemic was even shared with the English-speaking world by Nukariya Kaiten (1867–1934), a leading Sōtō Zen scholar, in a 1913 book entitled *The Religion of the Samurai*. Nukariya wrote:

As regards Japan, it [Zen] was first introduced into the island as the faith first for the Samurai or the military class, and molded the characters of many distinguished soldiers. . . . After the Restoration of the Mei-ji (1867) the popularity of Zen began to wane, and for some thirty years remained in inactivity; but since the Russo-Japanese war its revival has taken place. And now it is looked upon as an ideal faith, both for a nation full of hope and energy, and for a person who has to fight his own way in the strife of life. Bushidō, the code of chivalry, should be observed not only by the soldier in the battle-field, but by every citizen in the struggle for existence. If a person be a person and not a beast, then he must be a Samurai—brave, generous, upright, faithful, and manly, full of self-respect and self-confidence, at the same time full of the spirit of self-sacrifice. We

can find the incarnation of Bushidō in the late General Nogi, the hero of Port Arthur, who, after the sacrifice of his two sons for the country in the Russo-Japanese war, gave up his own and his wife’s life for the sake of the deceased Emperor.<sup>76</sup>

Nogi (1849–1912) made an excellent case in point for Nukariya because the general had, in fact, taken up the practice of Zen as a relatively young, up-and-coming officer in the 1880s, training at the Kaisei Saṅgha Hall (*Kaisei sōdō*) in Nishinomiya City under the famous Nantenbō Rōshi (1839–1925). Later, before his ritual suicide upon the death of the Meiji emperor, he had also served as schoolmaster to the emperor’s grandson (the future Shōwa emperor) Hirohito, incorporating some elements of saṅgha-hall training into the young prince’s daily routine.

Apologists such as Nukariya nurtured the mythical ideal of the warrior who, through the practice of Zen, was ostensibly able to face combat and the prospect of death with complete equanimity, thereby gaining a decisive advantage over his opponents. They even claimed that the samurai who repelled the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century (with the aid of the famous *kamikaze* or “winds of the kami”) had been steeled in their resolve by their Zen training. In point of fact, there is little historical evidence for the notion that the Kamakura samurai actually practiced *zazen* or meditated on *kōans*; as Martin Collcutt has pointed out, most were Pure Land devotees who patronized Zen for very different reasons: its tradition (inherited from China) of docile cooperation with the state; its rules of purity which forbade weapons in monasteries (an undesirable feature of some Tendai and Shingon school monasteries in the preceding Heian period); and its function as a conduit for trade with China and the desirable trappings of elite Song culture.<sup>77</sup> Moreover, it was more than a little ironic that Bushidō should be celebrated during the Meiji era, a time of great social upheaval that saw the dissolution of the samurai class and formerly unthinkable conscription of masses of peasants into the military. Nevertheless, the myth of “warrior Zen” did appeal to elements of the Meiji elite as Japan went through its successful wars with China and Russia and geared up for future conflicts as a colonial power. By focusing attention on the rigorous training that took place in the saṅgha halls or “special training centers” (*senmon dōjō*) that retained the rigorous communal Zen practice implemented by Tokugawa-period reformers on the basis of Chinese rules of purity, Meiji Zen Buddhists were able to counter the charge of the social uselessness of its priests and temples. The figure of Hyakujō (Baizhang) and his ancient rules of purity were also invoked in this connection, to argue that Zen monasteries instilled the values of hard work and economic self-sufficiency.

Although Buddhism in general came under attack early in the Meiji era as a “foreign” creed, after two or three decades of rapid modernization and wrenching social change such criticisms rang hollow. Indeed, it was now West-

ern “materialistic” culture that was increasingly characterized as spiritually bankrupt and alien to Japan’s traditional values. Viewed in that nostalgic light, Buddhism seemed rather familiar and attractive. Zen Buddhists were quick to remind their countrymen that many domestic arts and cultural refinements that were considered traditionally Japanese, such as rock gardens, tea ceremonies, and calligraphy, had originally been developed in the context of Zen monasticism.

Buddhism, of course, had originally been imported from China, but apologists for the tradition argued that Japan was now the leading representative and guardian of this profound “Eastern” (*tōyōteki*) tradition of philosophy and spirituality. Zen Buddhists, in particular, used their story of the transmission of the dharma from India to China to Japan to argue that the flame of enlightenment still burned brightly in their saṅgha halls, whereas it had entirely died out in the “syncretic” and “degenerate” monastic institutions of Ming and Qing dynasty Chan. As keeper of the flame of oriental culture, that argument seemed to imply, Japan had a right and a duty to bring not only China but perhaps even India under its protection.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century it became fashionable and prestigious not only for military officers such as Nogi but also for leaders of banking and industry to associate with and patronize Zen masters just as samurai rulers and wealthy merchants had in the past. Moreover, a number of saṅgha halls were opened up for lay men and women (called *koji* and *daishi*, respectively) to join with monks in *zazen* and *kōan* practice under a master (*rōshi*). Suzuki Daisetsu (1870–1966), influential author of numerous books on Zen in English as well as Japanese, got his start as a lay practitioner under Sōen Rōshi (1859–1919) in the Shōzokuin Saṅgha Hall at Engakuji in Kamakura.<sup>78</sup> Being close to Tokyo, the latter was a convenient place for many of the Meiji elites to get a taste of Zen monastic practice.

Finally, Japanese Buddhists countered the charge that their religion was irrational and mythological, as opposed to scientific, by opening numerous Western-style schools and universities and taking a critical, historical approach to the study of their own traditions.<sup>79</sup> The Myōshinji branch of Rinzai Zen opened the Hanazono Academy (*Hanazono gakuin*, later called Hanazono University) in Kyoto, and the Sōtō School University (*Sōtōshū daigaku*, later renamed Komazawa University) was founded in Tokyo. Those became centers for the academic study of the history of Zen, which lent weight to the aforementioned apologetics. Modern Japanese scholarship on the “rules of purity” literature got its start at that time and was instrumental in idealizing Dōgen’s monastic rules as “pristine” and close to the original spirit of Baizhang, while portraying Yuan, Ming, and later Chinese monastic institutions as “degenerate” and “spiritually dead.”

The government-induced unification of the two main branches of Sōtō Zen (the Eiheiji and Sōjiji factions) under the nominal control of a single

administrative headquarters (*Sōtō shūmukyoku*) in Tokyo necessitated the production of a single, authoritative manual that could be used when Sōtō monks from different lineages got together for joint ritual performances. Such a manual was first published in Meiji 22 (1889) under the title of *Tōjō gyōji kihan* (*Standard Rites of the Sōtō Tradition*). According to the preface, it was based primarily on three sources: Gesshū Sōko’s *Shōjurin shinanki*, compiled in 1674; Menzan Zuihō’s *Sōdō shingi*, published in 1753; and Gentō Sokuchū’s *Eihei shō shingi*, published in 1805. Those Tokugawa-period works were themselves modeled after the *Keizan oshō shingi*, with its schedule of daily, monthly, annual, and occasional observances, and they incorporated many elements of Dōgen’s various commentaries on the *Chanyuan qinggui*, as those were found in the collections entitled *Eihei shingi* and *Shōbōgenzō*. While taking the three aforementioned Tokugawa-period texts as a starting point, the editors of the Meiji-era *Tōjō gyōji kihan* also stated in their preface that they had consulted a wide range of earlier Chinese and Japanese rules of purity: the *Chanyuan qinggui*, *Eihei dai shingi*, *Keizan shingi*, *Jiaoding qinggui*, *Beiyong qinggui*, *Riyong qinggui*, *Huanzhu an qinggui*, *Chixiu baizhang qinggui*, *Ōbaku shingi*, and various other related works.

The academic study of all the extant rules of purity that took place in the Meiji era, influenced by Western methods of text criticism and historical criticism as well as the research of earlier scholar monks such as Menzan and Mujaku, fueled a movement at Eiheiji to return to the original, “authentic” modes of Zen monastic practice that had first been established in Japan by Dōgen. What that meant, in practical terms, was to purge Eiheiji of various buildings and procedures that had been adopted during the Tokugawa period under the influence of Ming-style Ōbaku Zen, replacing them with older Song-style facilities and ritual forms that the modern research had begun to reconstruct. Thus, for example, the Ming-style meditation hall that had served to revive the practice of communal *zazen* at Eiheiji in the eighteenth century was replaced by a “proper” Song-style saṅgha hall. Later, Sōjiji (after moving to Yokohama in Meiji 44, 1911) and a few other Sōtō training monasteries also strived to embody Song-style ground plans and ritual procedures, to whatever degree was practicable.

Because the various branches of the Rinzai lineage broke apart into institutionally independent entities as soon as the relaxation of Meiji government controls allowed them to, they did not form a single Rinzai denomination comparable to that of the Sōtō school and had no need to craft a common set of monastic rules or ritual procedures. Nevertheless, a group of abbots from leading Rinzai training monasteries (*sōdō*) formed an association toward the end of the Meiji era in order to standardize admission formalities and various other aspects of monastic practice, establishing uniform procedures that have held down to the present. This association, originally called the “League of Monasteries” (*sōrin dōmeikai*), was founded in 1900 with twenty-two Rinzai

monasteries participating, including those at the headquarters temples Myōshinji, Daitokuji, Nanzenji, Kenninji, Tōfukuji, Tenryūji, Engakuji, and Kenchōji. Later the name was changed to the “League of Rinza School Special Training Centers” (*Rinzaishū senmon dōjō dōmeikai*), and the number of participating saṅgha halls increased to about thirty. The standard procedures it agreed on and revised over the years (the latest revision being in 1938) were distributed to the various saṅgha halls in manuscript copies.<sup>80</sup>

### The Legacy of the “Rules of Purity” in Contemporary Japan

The legacy of Song, Yuan, and Ming Chinese rules of purity is still very much alive in contemporary Japanese Zen, both as a major topic of academic study at Zen universities and in the ritual manuals and liturgical texts currently in use in Zen monasteries and temples. There are at present only about sixty training monasteries (called *senmon sōdō* in the Sōtō school and *senmon dōjō* in the various branches of Rinza Zen) in all of Japan where anything akin to the old rules of purity are actually put into systematic practice. The vast majority of Zen “monasteries” (*jiin*), more than 20,000 in number, are simply parish temples dedicated mainly to performing funerals and memorial services for their lay parishioners.<sup>81</sup> Nevertheless, all Zen temple priests (nominally *jūshoku* or “abbots”) are graduates of one of the training monasteries, and the rigorous communal training that goes on in them is universally heralded as the true “essence” of Zen.

A number of texts that derive more or less directly from Sung and Yuan Chinese and medieval Japanese rules of purity are in use today. The *Sōtōshū gyōji kihan* (*Standard Rites of the Sōtō Zen School*), published by the Sōtōshū shūmuchō (Administrative Headquarters of Sōtō Zen) in Tokyo, is an updated version of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* first compiled in 1889. It was first published with its present title in Taisho 7 (1918) and was subsequently revised in Showa 25 (1950), Showa 41 (1966), and Showa 63 (1988). Major Sōtō training monasteries such as Eiheiji, Sōjiji, and Zuiōji all follow their own calendars of daily, monthly, annual, and occasional observances (*gyōji*) and make use of their own slightly different versions of various liturgical texts, but none of those proprietary texts vary in any significant way from materials found in the *Sōtōshū gyōji kihan*, which is distributed to all Sōtō temples nationwide. The Sōtō school, like every organization registered with the Japanese government as a tax-exempt religious corporation or “juridical person” (*shūkyō hōjin*), is required by law to have a set of “Denominational Regulations” (*shūsei*) in which it declares its basic teachings, objects of worship, ritual observances, bureaucratic structure, and so on.<sup>82</sup>

The fifteen branches of Rinza Zen in Japan today have no single set of

shared monastic rules comparable to the *Sōtōshū gyōji kihan*, because they are independent religious corporations each with its own “Denominational Regulations” traditional ritual manuals. Training monasteries and ordinary temples belonging to the Myōshinji branch (Myōshinji-ha) of Rinzai Zen, for example, makes use of a manual entitled *Gōko hosshiki bonbai shō* (*Summary of Ritual Forms and Melodic Chanting for Communal Services*), which was compiled by the Center for Research on Ritual (Hōgi Kenkyūshitsu) at Hanazono University in 1956 and subsequently updated in 1964 and 1967. According to its preface, the *Gōko hosshiki bonbai shō* is based on several sources: the Yuan *Chixiu baizhang qingqui*, Mujaku Dōchū’s Tokugawa-period *Shōsōrin ryaku shingi*, the *Hōzan shoshiki* (*Various Rites for Myōshinji*),<sup>83</sup> and Myōshinji’s “Denominational Regulations.”<sup>84</sup>

Every one of the training monasteries affiliated with Rinzai Zen has its own set of ritual procedures and ceremonial calendars that derive from earlier rules of purity literature. In the early 1980s, for example, the Daitoku Sōdō was using a *Nyūsei kokuhō* (*Admonitions for Retreats*), which consisted of two parts: “rules for the [officers of the] administrative branch” (*jōjū kitei*) and “standards for daily life” (*nichiyō kikan*). Both were manuscripts that had been edited and copied within the past twenty years, but they were attached to and based on two similar manuscripts dated Taisho 2 (1913) and Meiji 40 (1907), respectively. Daitoku Sōdō also had a *Kaisei kokuhō* (*Admonitions for Between Retreats*) and a frequently updated manuscript entitled *Nenju gyōji* (*Annual Observances*).<sup>85</sup>

In visits to a number of Rinzai training monasteries in the 1980s, I obtained copies of various rules and ritual manuals that were actually in use on the premises. This is not the place to list all the manuscripts in question, still less to give a detailed account of their contents, but I can confirm that, on the whole, they derive directly from the various Sung and Yuan Chinese and medieval Japanese rules of purity discussed earlier.

A book entitled *Rinzaishū nōto* (*Rinzai School Notes*), compiled by Itō Kōkan and published by the Kichūdō Bookstore in Kyoto in 1980, gives a good account of the actual practices that go on in Rinzai training monasteries today. Itō’s intention in producing the *Rinzaishū nōto*, in fact, was to provide a standard handbook for Rinzai monasteries. He based the work on: Mujaku Dōchū’s *Shōsōrin ryaku shingi*; the *Hosshiki bonbai shishin* (*Manual of Ritual Forms and Melodic Chanting*); and the *Gōko hosshiki bonbai shō*. In contents, the *Rinzaishū nōto* deals with: (1) basic ritual forms (*gyōji kihon*), such as *gasshō*, *sanpai*, and *kekka fuza*; (2) daily observances (*nikka gyōji*), such as *sūtra*-chanting services, *zazen*, and meals; (3) monthly observances, including *sūtra*-chanting memorial services, head shaving, and bathing; (4) annual observances, such as new year’s rites, opening and closing retreats, memorial services, and Buddha’s birthday, enlightenment, and *nirvāṇa*; and occasional observances (*rinji gyōji*), such as

funerals, special prayer services, installing new images, and so on. In its organization as well as its specific contents, the *Rinzaishū nōto* harks back to many earlier rules of purity.

There is no way to sum up all of the historical and textual data presented in this chapter in a meaningful conclusion, except to note the remarkable resilience of ritual forms over long periods of time. Many of the basic procedures outlined in the Song rules of purity are clearly recognizable today in Japanese Zen training monasteries and in North American and European Zen centers modeled after them. The social, political, and religious meanings given to those ritual forms, however, have changed greatly over time, for they have frequently been subjected to “revivals” and reinterpretations in different historical periods and cultural settings.

#### ABBREVIATIONS

- DZZ *Dōgen zenji zenshū*, ed., Ōkubo Dōshū 7 vols. 1970 and 1971, Tokyo: Chikuma shobō.  
 YZS *Yakuchū Zen'en shingi*, eds., Kagamishima Genryū, Satō Tatsugen, and Kosaka Kiyū Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmuchō, 1972.  
 ZGDJ *Zengaku daijiten*, ed., Zengaku daijiten hensanjo. Tokyo: Taishūkan, 1985.  
 SZ *Sōtōshū zensho*, ed., Sōtōshū zensho kankōkai 1970–73. rev. and enlarged ed. 18 vols. Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmuchō.

#### NOTES

1. For a detailed discussion of kōan collections, see T. Griffith Foulk, “The Form and Function of Kung-an Literature: A Historical Overview,” in Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, eds., *The Kōan: Text and Context in Zen Buddhism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 15–45.
2. For a description of these and other rituals characteristic of Song Chan, see T. Griffith Foulk, “Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch’an Buddhism,” in Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N. Gregory, eds., *Religion and Society in T’ang and Sung China* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1993), pp. 147–208.
3. T. Griffith Foulk, “*Chanyuan qingui* and Other ‘Rules of Purity’ in Chinese Buddhism,” in Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright, eds., *The Zen Canon* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), pp. 275–312.
4. ZZ 2–16–5; SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 867–934; *Kanazawa bunkoshi zensho*, *Zenseki hen*; and for a critical edition and annotated Japanese translation see YZS.
5. T 80:9b, 14b–15b.
6. In his *Tōfukuji jojogoto* (*Articles for Tōfukuji*), written in 1280, Enni stated that “the monastic rules [*sōrin kishiki*] of Zen Master Bukkan [Bukkan zenji] [Wu-chun Shih-fan] should be put into practice and never changed” (cited in Imaeda Aishin, *Chūsei zenshūshi no kenkyū* [Tokyo Daigaku shuppankai, rpt., 1970], 1961).
7. Imaeda Aishin, *Chūsei zenshūshi no kenkyū*, p. 61, note 5.
8. Passages in DZZ 2:295 correspond to passages in YZS 116 and 269; DZZ 2:

296 = YZS 273; and DZZ 2:300 = YZS 276. For these and the following references in this paragraph, I am indebted to Yifa, “The Rules of Purity for the Chan Monastery: An Annotated Translation and Study of the *Chanyuan qinggui*” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1996), pp. 88–90. See also Yifa, *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation of the Chanyuan Qinggui* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2002).

9. DZZ 2:348–9 = YZS 42–43; DZZ 2:350 = YZS 50; DZZ 2:351–352 = YZS 46–48; DZZ 2:352–353 = YZS 52–53; DZZ 2:353–354 = YZS 54–55; DZZ 2: 355–356 = YZS 55–56; and DZZ 2: 356–357 = YZS 58.

10. DZZ 2:331–333 = YZS 105–109; DZZ 2:339–340 = YZS 110–115; DZZ 2:340–341 = YZS 116; DZZ 2:345 = YZS 119; DZZ 2:341 = YZS 269; DZZ 2:341 = YZS 270; DZZ 2:342 = YZS 116; DZZ 2:342 = YZS 273; DZZ 2:343 = YZS 116; DZZ 2: 345 = YZS 119; DZZ 2:345 = YZS 269; DZZ 2:345 = YZS 270; and DZZ 2:345 = YZS 275.

11. DZZ 1:597 = YZS 13.

12. DZZ 1:619 = YZS 13.

13. DZZ 1:617 = YZS 13.

14. DZZ 1:431 = YZS 16.

15. DZZ 1:571 = YZS 85; DZZ 1:574–576 = YZS 86–88; and DZZ 1:580–581 = YZS 91.

16. DZZ 1:470 = YZS 233; DZZ 1:472 = YZS 153; and DZZ 1:473 = YZS 235.

17. DZZ 1:649 = YZS 285.

18. DZZ 1:667 = YZS 285.

19. DZZ 2:3–4 = Carl Bielefeldt, *Dōgen’s Manuals of Zen Meditation* (Berkeley, Cal.: University of California Press, 1988), pp. 279–283.

20. For an annotated translation, see T. Griffith Foulk, “Instructions for the Cook,” in *Nothing Is Hidden: Essays on Zen Master Dōgen’s Instructions for the Cook*, ed. Jisho Warner, Shōhaku Okumura, John McRae, and Taigen Dan Leighton (New York: Weatherhill, 2001), pp. 21–40.

21. Eisai states that the hall was used for the *Lotus samādhi* (*hokke-zanmai*), *Ami-tabha samādhi* (*mida-zanmai*), *Guanyin samādhi* (*Kannon-zanmai*), and so on (T 80: 15a); and for details of these practices see Daniel Stevenson, “The Four Kinds of Samādhi in Early T’ien-t’ai Buddhism,” in Peter N. Gregory, ed., *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), pp. 45–97.

22. Furuta Shōkin, “Nihon Zenshūshi: Rinzaishū,” in Nishitani Keiji, ed., *Zen no rekishi: Nihon, Kōza zen* no. 4 (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1967), p. 22.

23. T 80:15a; and Ishida Jūshi, ed., *Kamakura bukkyō seiritsu no kenkyū: Shunjō risshi* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1972), p. 395.

24. Takeuchi Michio, *Nihon no Zen* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1976), p. 186.

25. The plans are preserved in the *Gozan jissatsu zu*; see ZGDJ 3:12–13.

26. See, for example, Kagamishima, *Dōgen zenji to sono monryū* (Tokyo: Seishin shobō, 1961), pp. 8–27.

27. Kagamishima, *Dōgen Zenji to sono monryū*, pp. 30–56; Takeuchi Dōyū, “Shoki sōdan no tenkai: kyōdan,” in Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōshirō, eds., *Dōgen zen no rekishi, Kōza Dōgen*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1980), pp. 2–5.

28. Nakamura Sōichi, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* (Tokyo: Seishin shobō, 1972) 4:286 (my translation).
29. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 4:110–143; and Yuhō Yokoi, *Zen Master Dōgen: An Introduction with Selected Writings* (New York: Weatherhill, 1976), pp. 113–127.
30. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 2:30–52; and Kosen Nishiyama and John Stevens, *Shōbōgenzō: The Eye and Treasury of the True Law*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Nakayama shobō, 1977), pp. 158–162.
31. DZZ 6:96–167.
32. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 4:61; and Yokoi, *Zen Master Dōgen*, p. 93.
33. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 4:199; and Yokoi, *Zen Master Dōgen*, p. 150.
34. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 1:452–453; and Nishiyama and Stevens, *Shōbōgenzō*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Nakayama shobō, 1975), pp. 98–99.
35. Nakamura, *Zenyaku Shōbōgenzō* 2:72–94; and Nishiyama and Stevens, *Shōbōgenzō*, vol. 1, pp. 8–16.
36. The “Regulations for Jōraku Zen Monastery” (*Jōraku zenji kitei*) that Lanqi left are included in the *Daikaku zenji goroku* (*Discourse Records of Zen Master Daikaku*), *Dainippon Bukkyō zensho*, 112a–b; also quoted in Imaeda Aishin, *Chūsei zenshūshi no kenkyū*, pp. 62–63.
37. They are mentioned in his final admonitions (*yuikai*): *Daikaku zenji goroku*, in *Dainippon Bukkyō zensho*, 112b.
38. For a ground plan of the monastery as it was in Shunjō’s day, see plate 9 in Ishida Jūshi, ed., *Kamakura Bukkyō seiritsu no kenkyū: Shunjō risshi* (Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1972).
39. For Shunjō’s “rules for the pure assembly” (*shinshū kishiki*), “catalogue of the halls and quarters at Sennyūji” (*Sennyūji dendōbōryō shokumoku*), and various other manuscripts that prove this point see, Ishida, *Kamakura Bukkyō seiritsu no kenkyū*, pp. 391–407.
40. Like Dōgen, Shunjō wrote a short *Principles of Seated Meditation* (*Zazengi*); see Ishida, *Kamakura Bukkyō seiritsu no kenkyū*, p. 407.
41. T 80:10b.
42. T 80:7a.
43. T 80:7b.
44. Suganuma Akira, ed., *Dōgen jiten* (Tokyo: Tōkyōdō, 1977).
45. T 45:869a–874a; see ZGDJ 2:805b, s.v. *taitaikohō*.
46. DZZ 2:363.
47. All of these Chinese rules of purity are discussed in detail in Heine and Wright, eds., *The Zen Canon*, pp. 275–312.
48. The text is preserved in the Naikaku Bunko (no. 17873, box 193, shelf 11).
49. T 82:423c–451c.
50. Part of this text appears in T 80:619b–624b under the title *Daikan zenji shō shingi* (*Zen Master Daikan’s Small Rules of Purity*). A manuscript copy of the full text, dated Meiji 37, is held at the Chōshōin, a subtemple of Nanzenji in Kyoto; a photocopy of that is held at the Tokyo Daigaku Shiryō Hensansho.
51. Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Zen Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981), pp. 149–165.
52. Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, pp. 109–115.

53. ZGDJ 1050b–c.

54. At the height of this trend, the number of subtemples reached 66 at Keninji, 76 at Shōkokuji, 95 at Tenryūji, 101 at Nanzenji, and 120 at Tōfukuji, all of which had been important monastic centers under the old “Five Mountains” system. Myōshinji and Daitokuji, two monasteries that had not been favored with “five mountain” status but had emerged after the Ōnin War as powerful new centers, had as many as 165 and 104 subtemples, respectively (Ōta Hirotarō, Matsushita Ryōshō, and Tanaka Seidai, *Zendera to sekitei, Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu*, vol. 10 [Tokyo: Shōgakkan, 1967], pp. 184–185).

55. T 81:624b–687c.

56. One of the chief architects of the shogunate’s control of the civil court aristocracy (*kiūge*) and samurai (*buke*) as well as Buddhist institutions was a Rinzai monk named Sūden (1569–1633), who served as an advisor to the first shogun, Tokugawa Ieyasu, on a wide range of domestic and foreign affairs. Another Rinzai monk, Takuan Sōhō (1573–1645), also served as an influential advisor to the shogunate.

57. T 82:766a–785c.

58. Ogisu Jundō, *Myōshinji, Jisha shirizu*, vol. 2 (Kyoto: Tōyō bunkasha, 1977), pp. 71–87. Ungo’s observation of the precepts included the strict prohibition of alcohol in his monastery and a personal refusal to handle money.

59. The term “saṅgha hall” originally referred to a single, large building in the layout of Song Chinese and medieval Japanese monasteries, where monks sat in meditation, took formal meals, performed various religious services (e.g., chanting *sūtras* to make merit at the request of patrons), and slept at night, all at their “single places” (*tan*) on long raised platforms. In the arrangement of Ming-style Chinese monasteries such as Manpukuji, however, the saṅgha halls of old had given way to smaller meditation halls which still had platforms but were no longer used for meals. In the Tokugawa period any Zen temple that had a meditation hall and a community of monks in training came to be called, in its entirety, a “saṅgha hall.”

60. T 81:688a–723c.

61. The Tokugawa-period manuscript is held at Ryūkoku University library. Reprint edition: Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Chokushū hyakujō shingi sakei, Zengaku sōsho*, vol. 8A–B (Kyoto: Chūbun shuppansha, 1979).

62. The original manuscript in Dōchū’s hand is held at Myōshinji in Kyoto. Reprint edition: Yanagida Seizan, ed., *Zenrin shōkisen, Zengaku sōsho*, vol. 9 (Kyoto: Chūbun shuppansha, 1979); originally published as *Zenrin shōkisen* (Kyoto: Kaiba shoin, 1909). Tokyo: Seishin shobō, 1963 [ZGDJ 709b).

63. Philip B. Yampolsky, *The Zen Master Hakuin: Selected Writings* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), pp. 185–187, 229. Many of his vernacular treatises (*kana hōgo*) aimed at lay audiences, Hakuin held that any form of Buddhist practice could be fruitful provided one engaged in it with single-minded intensity; this belief was similar to the idea that even *nembutsu* recitations could function as a kind of *kōan* practice.

64. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 439–548. The full title of the text is *Shōjurin daijō gokoku zenji shingi shinanbo* (*Rules of Purity Handbook for Shōju Grove Daijō Nation-Protecting Zen Monastery*). Gesshū’s disciple, Manzan Dōhaku, assisted to such a degree in the compilation that he should be considered a co-author.

65. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 1–12.

66. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 29–207. The original full title of the text is: *Tōjō sōdō shingi gyōhōshō* (*Summary of Procedures in Rules of Purity for Sōtō Saṅgha Halls*). The colophon has the date 1741, so the text may have been completed then, but Menzan's preface to its publication is dated 1753.

67. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 209–330.

68. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 815–836.

69. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 837–866.

70. T 82:319a–342b.

71. SZ, *Shingi*, pp. 331–416. The original full title is *Kichijōzan Eihei shōshingi* (*Small Rules of Purity for Kichijō Mountain Eihei Monastery*). Note that the title *Eihei dai shingi* is a nickname for the *Kōtei kanchū Eihei shingi*, which in turn is a revision of the *Nichiiki Sōto shoso Dōgen zenji shingi* (*Rules of Purity by Zen Master Dōgen, First Patriarch of Sōtō in Japan*); the word “Eihei” in *Eihei dai shingi* thus refers to Eihei Dōgen (“Dōgen of Eihei[ji]”). The word “Eihei” in *Eihei shō shingi*, on the other hand, refers not to Dōgen but to the monastery Eihei.

72. In Satsuma, for example, Buddhist institutions and practices were almost entirely eradicated between 1866 and 1870; see James Edward Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990), pp. 54–65. Major attacks against Buddhism also occurred in other domains (Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, p. 78), but in many areas the depredations were less; see Kishimoto Hideo, ed., *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*, trans. John F. Howes (Tokyo: ōbunsha, 1956), pp. 114–120.

73. Martin Collcutt, “Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication,” in Marius B. Jansen and Gilbert Rozman, eds., *Japan in Transition: From Tokugawa to Meiji* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press), p. 162.

74. The nine head monasteries were: Myōshinji, Daitokuji, Tenryūji, Shōkokuji, Kenninji, Nanzenji, Tōfukuji, Kenchōji, and Engakuji. Subsequently, other monasteries that had served as headquarters in the Tokugawa head/branch system broke off from those nine, taking their branch temples with them. Eigenji, which had become a branch temple of Tōfukuji in 1876, declared its independence in 1880. In 1903 Hōkōji broke off from Nanzenji, with which it had been affiliated since just after the Meiji Restoration. In 1905 Buttsūji split off from Tenryūji, its parent temple since 1873, and Kokutaiji declared its independence from Shōkokuji. Finally, Kōgakuji, which had been a branch temple of Nanzenji since Tokugawa times, received permission from the government to split from the parent temple in 1890 and actually took that step in 1908. With this change, the Rinzai school was divided into fourteen independent branches (*ha*). This number remained steady until 1941, when wartime constraints again resulted in the enforced administrative unification of the Rinzai school. Following the war, the fourteen branches again declared their independence, and Kōshōji split off from Shōkokuji, bringing the number of Rinzai administrative branches to the present fifteen.

75. Ketelaar, *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan*, p. 132.

76. Kaiten Nukariya, *The Religion of the Samurai: A Study of Zen Philosophy and Discipline in China and Japan* (London: Luzac, 1913), pp. 50–51.

77. Martin Collcutt, *Five Mountains*, pp. 87, 99.

78. Suzuki later idealized the saṅgha hall at the Shōzokuin in his book *The Training of the Zen Buddhist Monk* (Kyoto: The Eastern Buddhist Society, 1934), using quotations from the discourse records of Tang dynasty Chan patriarchs to explain the monastic routine that took place there, as if the twentieth-century Japanese saṅgha hall were the perfect embodiment of the ancient spirit of Zen, and an ideally “democratic” society to boot!

79. By Meiji 37 (1904) the various Buddhist denominations were operating some 110 schools with a total of 7,293 male and 72 female students (Kanaoka, Kasahara, and Nakamura, eds., *Ajia bukkyōshi, Nihon hen 8: Kindai bukkyō*, 268–269).

80. A photocopy of this document is in my possession.

81. See T. Griffith Foulk, “The Zen Institution in Modern Japan,” in Kenneth Kraft, ed., *Zen: Tradition and Transition* (New York: Grove Press, 1988), pp. 157–177.

82. Sōtōshū Shūmuchō ed., *Sōtōshū shūsei* (Tokyo: Sōtōshū shūmuchō, Heisei 11).

83. Shōbōzan is the mountain name for Myōshinji.

84. Myōshinjiha Shūmuhonsho, ed., *Rinzaishū Myōshinjiha shūsei* (Kyoto: Rinzaishū Myōshinjiha Shūmuhonsho, 1981).

85. I obtained photocopies of the aforementioned manuscripts at Daitokuji in 1982 and 1983.