

Sōtō Zen in Meiji Japan:
The Life and Times of Nishiari Bokusan

a thesis in Buddhist Studies for UC Berkeley,
with a preface for the American Sangha

by
Jiryu Mark Rutschman-Byler

December, 2014



大本山總持寺時代の西有穆山禪師 南部町 法光寺 蔵

Preface for the American Zen Sangha

How did it come to this? How did the Buddhism of Shakyamuni's disciples become the Chan of Huineng and the Zen of Dōgen – and how did Westerners then transform Dōgen's Zen into the novel ways of practice and teaching found at a place like San Francisco Zen Center? I've been long puzzled by this question – especially the last part, of how *we* ended up with *this* – and, like many, I've assumed that the answer lies somewhere in the West. *We* modernized Zen in the many ways that we have, and *we* Westernized Zen in the many ways that we have. In general the books on Western Buddhism give that impression, and there is certainly some truth to it.

But as I began to study the Japanese Zen of the last century and a half, I realized that I'd been asking the wrong question. Shunryū Suzuki, for example, did not bring the Zen of Dōgen to San Francisco, he brought the Zen of early twentieth-century Japan. In particular, he brought the Zen of a scholar-monk named Kishizawa Ian, whom he called his “master” and with whom he studied for twenty-five years. So the right way to understand the Western “transformation” of Buddhism is not to measure it against Dōgen's monasticism but instead to ask: how have we turned *early twentieth-century* Japanese Zen into our contemporary Western practice?

I say this because what I discovered in my study is obvious but important: the world of Suzuki Roshi's Zen training had very little to do with the world of Dōgen Zenji's Zen and Chan training. The Zen world that Suzuki Roshi trained in – a world he shared generally with people like Kishizawa Ian and Kōdō Sawaki and Hakuun Yasutani and Taizan Maezumi and Jōshū Sasaki – was not only centuries removed from Dōgen's monasticism but was in fact a world that had *already* been influenced by the West, had *already* been modernized and to some degree adapted to Western sensibilities and epistemologies.

In other words, much of the transformation of Zen that I have assumed took place in the West in the mid-to-late twentieth-century in fact took place in Japan somewhat earlier. Specifically, it took place over the course of the Meiji Period (1868-1912), a time of intense turmoil and change in Japan as the nation scrambled to deal with the influx of Western “modern” values, thought, technologies, and institutions, and rushed to carve out a place for itself within that. I picture Western modernity as an enormous train hurtling down the track towards Japan in the period; the country could either hop on and outfit a suitable (if second-class) car for itself, or it could be crushed like a twig on the tracks. Much of the debate and

transformation across all aspects of Japanese society at the time – from education and government to culture and religion – can I think be understood through this image. The same image can also illuminate Japan’s turn towards increasing militarization and imperialism in the early-to-mid twentieth century: the mood then, too, was “hop on or be crushed,” colonize or be colonized.

The Buddhist leaders of the Meiji Period had to respond not only to government pressure – like orders to clarify the boundaries and doctrines of their respective sects, or the decriminalization of priests’ marrying – but they were also challenged by the vigorous and vital lay-centered “New Buddhist” movement that was springing up within and around the institutions, pushing them in a various ways to modernize and become more Western-friendly.

I see now that the debates and struggles born of these tensions within Japanese Buddhism in the Meiji Period have at least as much to do with getting us where we are today in American Zen as do any of the insights, adaptations, and departures from tradition enacted by the founders and shapers of American Zen. This is the basic insight that has excited me about the period and that has driven me to study it.

This project began with a suggestion from Charlie Pokorny, my friend and elder brother in Dharma, that I consider studying Kishizawa Ian, the great scholar-monk of the early twentieth-century and long-time teacher to Suzuki Roshi. Suzuki Roshi had a few teachers, including his transmission master Gyokujun So-on, but it becomes clear in his recorded lectures and in David Chadwick’s account of his life that his greatest influence is very likely Kishizawa Ian. As I began to poke around some Japanese sources for information on Kishizawa, I was amazed to discover that he was in fact an influential figure in modern Sōtō Zen, a monk and scholar of some prestige and the author of a well-known and massive twenty-four volume commentary on *Shōbōgenzō* called the *Complete Lectures on Shōbōgenzō* (*Shōbōgenzō zenkō* 正法眼藏全講). I was stunned that a teacher this prodigious and influential would be virtually unknown and largely unacknowledged by most of us in the lineage of Suzuki Roshi.

As I began to study more, however, I realized that Kishizawa, as important a figure as he is, worked largely in the shadow of his teacher, a scholar-monk named Nishiari Bokusan. Nishiari is sometimes called the “father of modern Sōtō” and his own (much shorter) *Shōbōgenzō* commentary is the first and without question the most influential of the modern sectarian works on Dōgen. To understand Suzuki Roshi and contemporary American Zen, I had felt that I needed to understand Kishizawa; to understand Kishizawa, though, it seemed I had to look to Nishiari Bokusan. This does not regress infinitely (although, as the circular lineage

documents show, it kind of does) – Nishiari was a devoted disciple of eventually prominent teachers, but his work was by no means simply derivative from theirs.

As my eyes opened to the importance of Nishiari, I noticed that though he too remains largely unacknowledged in American Zen circles, he is a bit better known than Kishizawa. I noticed, for instance, that Mel Weitsman and Kaz Tanahashi had recently completed a translation of his comments on *Genjōkōan*, published in Michael Wenger's book *Dogen's Genjokoan: Three Commentaries* (2011). I also began to find a few odd references to his life and work in books like Richard Jaffe's groundbreaking *Neither Monk nor Layman*, Kim's *Eihei Dōgen: Mystical Realist*, Heine's collection *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*, and Paul Jaffe's translation of Yasutani's *Genjokoan* commentary, *Flowers Fall*. Still, I could find very little in English about Nishiari's life and even less about his influence on our contemporary understanding of Dōgen's meaning.

While I still hoped to explore the work of Kishizawa, as well as that of Oka Sōtan, another student of Nishiari's and a mentor to Kishizawa, it seemed clear that I needed to start with Nishiari Bokusan. I had hoped in this project to include some translations from Nishiari's work, and had narrowed it down particularly to his lectures on a precept text (the *Busso shōden zenkaishō* 佛祖正傳禪戒鈔) by the eighteenth-century scholar-monk Banjin Dōtan (another major Sōtō figure largely unacknowledged in American Zen!). I first wanted to tell the story of Nishiari's life, however, and as I worked on the background of Meiji Buddhism, and of Meiji Sōtō, that I felt would be necessary to contextualize it, I realized that I had bitten off much more than I could chew. Including a translation with this paper proved too much to manage, as did a study of Nishiari's approach to Dōgen.

What is left then, is less a study than a story: a story of the tumult of Meiji Buddhism, the birth of the modern Sōtō sect, and the life of a man named Nishiari Bokusan. It's a story I had to write in academic-ese, but I hope that you can read through to a picture of the time, and that you may come to share my sense of appreciation and debt to the many Meiji Period voices that shaped modern Sōtō Zen.

This project, as well as the two years of graduate study at UC Berkeley that it represents, would have been impossible without the support of beings too numerous to name. I will nonetheless name a few.

As noted above, I am indebted to Charlie Pokorny for his initial push into this area of study. My own Zen teacher Sojun Mel Weitsman encouraged me in this regard, and I am

grateful for his work on Nishiari and especially for his ongoing teaching and support. He has been vital in keeping me connected with the basic source of my energy for Dharma study.

I would not have begun this project or been able to pursue academic Buddhist Studies at all without the deep and unwarranted support of Prof. Robert Sharf, sometimes chair of the Group in Buddhist Studies at UC Berkeley. His willingness to sponsor me as a student under the umbrella of the Group, and to work with me on my fledgling Asian language skills and my “Zen modernist” assumptions about Buddhism, has been of tremendous benefit. His influence has defined this phase of my life. Many know Prof. Sharf in Zen circles for his sharply critical (and very useful) work on the notion of “religious experience” as the hallmark of Zen, but those who know him only through his writing may not know his personal warmth and genuine sympathy (in all senses of the word) for those of us who practice the forms of Zen and work to develop the modern American Zen institutions. I should acknowledge too that without the example and advice of my long-time Dharma friend Eric Greene, also a student of Prof. Sharf’s, it never would have occurred to me that UC Berkeley could be an option for me or that Prof. Sharf would ever give me the time of day.

Prof. Sharf mentored me over the course of my degree and of this project, but as I began work in earnest on the writing I was also able to enlist the support of Prof. Mark Blum, chair of Japanese Buddhist Studies at UC Berkeley, and Prof. Richard Jaffe of Duke University. Prof. Blum specializes in the Pure Land traditions and is a scholar of enormous range – he has written on modern and pre-modern Japanese Buddhism and is the translator of the *Nirvana Sutra* from the Chinese. I am very grateful for his support, and especially for his generosity in designing a graduate seminar on Meiji Buddhism largely to support me in my research. Prof. Jaffe, who has himself lived and practiced at the San Francisco Zen Center, has done the most work of any scholar in English on Sōtō Zen in the Meiji Period, and his book *Neither Monk Nor Layman* was not only very useful for me personally in my past struggles with the ideal of clerical celibacy, but also opened my eyes to importance of the Meiji Period. I am enormously grateful for his time, insights, and encouragement in this project, and his willingness to sit on my thesis committee despite his full schedule.

By an amazing coincidence, two of the postdoctoral fellows in Japanese Buddhism at UC Berkeley over my time there have been experts in the modern history of Sōtō Zen, and while my time with both of them was too limited, I benefitted enormously from conversations with Dominick Scarangelo and Michaela Mross.

Despite all of the academic support I have received, I am certain that this project is wracked by mistakes, oversights, gaps, and outright misinformation, all of which is entirely my own doing.

That I have been able to undertake this period of academic study while remaining in residence at Green Gulch Farm Zen Center has been an incredible gift, and I am grateful to all of the San Francisco Zen Center community for supporting my absence from the work and practice

life during this time. I am particularly grateful to the support of Abbess Eijun Cutts and Robert Thomas, in his role as President of San Francisco Zen Center, who went out on a limb in allowing me to continue residency while I studied full-time.

Finally, I need to express my gratitude to my boys Frank and Dusty for the joy and sustaining energy they bring into my life, and especially to my wife Sara for her unflagging support of me, spiritually, emotionally, and quite practically as my studies left me at times an absent father, spouse, and housemate.

This project, flawed as it is, is dedicated to the memory of Abbot Myōgen Steve Stücky. His presence and faith in me has been a great blessing in my life, and his encouragement of my studies paved the way for this work. May my life reveal his compassion.

Whatever scant merit this study may generate is turned over and offered for the benefit of living beings.

Jiryu Mark Rutschman-Byler
Green Dragon Temple
December 2014



直心淨國禪師像 (安田靱彦画伯)
焼津市旭傳院蔵

**Sōtō Zen in Meiji Japan:
The Life and Times of Nishiari Bokusan**

by

Mark Ricardo Rutschman-Byler

A thesis submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Asian Studies

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Robert Sharf, UC Berkeley

Professor Richard Jaffe, Duke University

Professor Mark Blum, UC Berkeley

Fall 2014

The thesis of Mark Ricardo Rutschman-Byler, titled
Sōtō Zen in Meiji Japan: The Life and Times of Nishiari Bokusan,
is approved:

Chair		Date <u>December 16, 2014</u>
		Date <u>December 15, 2014</u>
		Date <u>December 16, 2014</u>

University of California, Berkeley

in memory of

Steve Stucky

Daitsū Myōgen 大通明眼

1946-2013

CONTENTS

Introduction

Section I: Buddhism in Meiji Japan

Part I: The Meiji Persecution of Buddhism

Tokugawa Period Roots

Separation and Eradication: Shinbutsu Bunri and Haibutsu Kishaku

The Decriminalization of Clerical Marriage

The Great Teaching Academy

Part II: The Meiji Reinvention of Buddhism

New Buddhism

The Christian Influence: Buddhist Social Work and Lay Buddhism

Sectarianism and Transsectarianism

Western Academics, Sectarian Studies, and the Buddhist Universities

Buddhism and Nationalism in the Meiji

Section II: Sōtō Zen in Meiji Japan

Two Temples, One Sect: Eiheiji and Sōjiji

Standardizing Standards: The Tōjō Gyōji Kihan (1889)

Standardizing Doctrine: The Sōtō Kyōkai Shushōgi (1890)

Dōgen for the Meiji: The Genzōe (1905)

Section III: The Life of Nishiari Bokusan

Part I: Early Life and Zen Training

Childhood and Ordination under Kinryū (1821-1839)

Training with Etsuon (1839-1841)

Training in the Capital and Ascending through the Ranks (1841-1849)

Training with the Genzōka Gettan Zenryū (1849-1862)

Sōsanji Abbacy (1862-1871)

Training and Enlightenment with Morotake Ekidō (1852-1855)

Part II: Nishiari and the Meiji Buddhist Persecution and Reinvention

Evangelizing for the State (1872-1874)

Reforming the Sangha

Nishiari on Clerical Marriage and Buddhist Cosmology

Nishiari on Clerical Dress

Nishiari and Alcohol (“Prajñā Water”)

Nishiari and the Renewal of Sōtō Doctrinal Study

Part III: Later Life

Relics, Deities, Icons: Hōkōji (1874-1877) and Kasuisai (1877-1892)

Between Elections: Denshinji (1892-1901)

At the Pinnacle of the Sect (1901-1905)

Final Years (1905-1910)

Appendix: The Published Works of Nishiari Bokusan

Works Cited

INTRODUCTION

Though well-known in Japanese Zen circles as a father of the modern Sōtō Sect (Sōtōshū 曹洞宗), little has been written in English about the eminent cleric Nishiari Bokusan 西有穆山 (1821-1910). Nishiari rose to prominence in the sect during the Meiji 明治 period (1868-1912), a time of great upheaval in Japanese Buddhism and the period of the institutional birth of the Sōtō Sect. At the peak of his career, Nishiari served as abbot of the Sōtō head temple Sōjiji 総持寺 and, for a time, as chief abbot of the sect (*Sōtōshū kanchō* 曹洞宗管長), and he made a lasting mark on Sōtō doctrinal studies, especially through his studies of the *Shōbōgenzō* (正法眼藏, “Treasury of the True Dharma Eye”) of Japanese Sōtō patriarch Eihei Dōgen (永平道元, 1200-1253).

I aim in the three sections of this paper to present the life and career of Nishiari Bokusan in its context of Meiji Buddhism and, specifically, Meiji Sōtō. In Section One I present an account of the general situation of Buddhism in the Meiji, drawing from a range of excellent English language scholarship on the topic. In Section Two I rely on a more scattered set of secondary sources, largely in English but where necessary in Japanese, to piece together an account of the major elements of Sōtō Zen in the Meiji, an account that—despite a few important contributions—has yet to be coherently or comprehensively presented in English. In Section Three I turn to the life of Nishiari Bokusan. Limiting myself to a biographical treatment and leaving a doctrinal analysis of his influential works like the *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* 正法眼藏啓迪 for another time or to a better qualified scholar, in this section I draw especially from Japanese biographical sources to introduce the life and career of this major Sōtō figure.

SECTION I

Buddhism in Meiji Japan

While Meiji Buddhism was slow to become established as a legitimate topic for Buddhist scholars, in recent decades it has received considerable attention. According to Jaffe and Mohr, the most important scholar in the development of the field was Ikeda Eishun 池田英俊, whose groundbreaking 1976 work, *Meiji no shin bukkyō undō* 明治の新仏教運動, was built upon by scholars like Kashiwahara Yūsen 柏原祐泉, Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄, and Yoshida Kyūichi 吉田久一 (Jaffe and Mohr 1998, 1–2). To Jaffe and Mohr’s 1998 list must certainly be added a number of more recent works in the burgeoning field, like that of Sueki Fumihiko 末木文美士. Though the foundational studies of Meiji Buddhism have naturally been in Japanese, significant English language scholarship on the topic has also been trickling out since the 1980s. While it is far from exhaustive, the English language scholarship is mature enough to provide the basis for a solid overview of the topic, especially when considered in conjunction with the array of general historical studies of the period, among which Jansen (2000) and Gluck (1985) stand out. In this overview I will lean heavily on the works of Staggs (1979), Grapard (1984), Thelle (1987), Hardacre (1989), Ikeda (1998), Mohr (1998), Jaffe (2001), Snodgrass (2003), and Blum (2011). The two works that most neatly serve my purpose, and which are cited extensively in the pages to follow, are Collcutt (1986) and, by far the most cited source in all of the English language treatments, Ketelaar (1990).

Part I: The Meiji Persecution of Buddhism

Tokugawa Period Roots

To understand the basis of the anti-Buddhist policies that characterize the early Meiji government's attitude towards Buddhism, it is useful to look back to the situation of Buddhism in the Tokugawa 徳川 period (1600-1868). There has in the scholarship of the last decades been a backlash against the tendency of earlier historians and Buddhologists to uncritically accept the Meiji account of Tokugawa Buddhism, an account which takes the anti-Buddhist measures of the Meiji as a necessary and purificatory response to the corruption and degradation of the Tokugawa Buddhist clergy and institutions.¹ An 1871 promulgation by the Ministry of the People (*Mimbushō* 民部省) is emblematic of this rhetoric, which was not limited to the government or anti-Buddhist intellectuals but was reproduced even by the Buddhist institutions themselves: "Priests who have long been bastions of decadence... are themselves responsible for the destruction of Buddhism" (Ketelaar 1990, 43). A typical example of the widespread, uncritical reproduction of this discourse in the scholarship is Kishimoto's *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*, a text which is colored throughout by the narrative of the regenerative benefit of the Meiji persecution; one section, in the chapter on "Religion in the Tokugawa," is tellingly titled "Buddhist Spiritual Stagnation" (Kishimoto 1956, 10–13).

But to join recent scholars in withholding judgment on the moral character of Tokugawa period clergy is by no means to deny that the deep interpenetration of the Tokugawa

¹ Ketelaar is highly critical, for example, of the "disappointing regularity" with which are made such "decidedly moralistic conclusions" based on "an idealized conception of Buddhism." He cites as emblematic the essays of Tsuji Zennosuke 辻善之助 on the early modern decline of Buddhism and his assessments of the persecution as "purifying" (Ketelaar 1990, 11–13). Collcutt is a bit more moderate in his assessment, admitting that it is "impossible to deny that institutional Buddhism in the Tokugawa period had lost much of its earlier vitality," but arguing that the widespread popularity of Buddhist festivals, pilgrimages, etc., and the vigor of figures like Hakuin 白隠 (1686-1768), Bankei 盤珪 (1622-1693), and Jiun Sonja 慈雲尊者 (1718-1804), provide a critical counterpoint to the simplistic decline narratives (Collcutt 1986, 146n). Among the recent English language works, Victoria's stands out as least critical of these claims, sympathetically citing harsh assessments of Tokugawa Buddhism by Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1873-1949), Robert Bellah, and Joseph Kitagawa (Victoria 2006, 4). Mohr, on the other hand, in a useful treatment of Zen in the Tokugawa period, finds, "surprisingly for a reputedly moribund tradition," considerable dynamism and diversity within and between Buddhist sects (Mohr 1994, 363).

government and Buddhist institutions created an exceedingly comfortable climate for Buddhism. Whether or not that comfort bred widespread decadence and corruption, it certainly did foster significant anti-Buddhist sentiment, particularly among the *samurai* class. The clearest and strongest aspect of this problematic interpenetration of Church and State was the *danka seido* 檀家制度, a system in which the government, largely as a means to resist Christianity, mandated that each household in the country register with (and financially support) a Buddhist temple.² Flush with the funds extracted from these mandatory relationships, the Buddhist institutions could in turn provide significant financial services to the government.³ While Buddhism was dominant politically, serving in effect as “a religious arm of the system of political controls,” and though it retained significant popular support throughout the period, intellectually Buddhism was “on the defensive throughout the Tokugawa period” in the face of attacks from increasingly powerful anti-Buddhist streams of Confucian, Shintō, and National Learning (*kokugaku* 国学) thought, as well as Western studies (Collcutt 1986, 144–145). Furthermore, while the Tokugawa government never lost its dependence on the Buddhist establishment, it was sensitive to the increasingly anti-Buddhist climate and began in the later part of the era to call for restrictions on Buddhist expansion and authority. Heeding these calls, responding to local sentiment, and serving their own Confucian, Shintō, or Nativist inclinations, administrators in various regions began as early as the mid-seventeenth century to enact local anti-Buddhist purges of varying intensity and efficacy. These persecutions provided the basis, and in some cases even the personnel, for the national anti-Buddhist project that would follow in the first days of the Meiji Restoration of 1868.⁴

These deep roots in the Tokugawa period of the Meiji anti-Buddhist program, and the common Tokugawa and Meiji government objectives of centralization and control of the clergy, lead Mohr to argue for a “shrouded continuity” between the Tokugawa and Meiji regimes. He argues that “the self-proclaimed ‘new’ Meiji government had the same goal as the deposed *Bakufu*” and “merely went on to enforc[e] more radically policies that had been pursued for two hundred and fifty years.” He sees the most extreme anti-Buddhist measures of the early Meiji not as marking a turning point in the dynamics between the government and the Buddhist institutions, but simply as short-sighted and politically immature attempts by the Meiji

² For a historical overview of the *danka seido*, see Hur 2007 and Marcure 1985.

³ The financial support of the Tokugawa government by Buddhist temples was evident to the period’s very last days, as with the case of the Higashi Honganji 東本願寺 giving money and manpower to the *bakufu* armies as late as 1867. This sort of financial assistance from temples to the government continued into the Meiji. See Ketelaar 1990, 71–72.

⁴ The most important of the Tokugawa period Buddhist purges were in the domains of Mito 水戸 and Satsuma 薩摩, but the crackdowns in the domains of Chōshū 長州, Okayama 岡山, Aizu 会津, and Tsuwano 津和野 were also significant both for local Buddhists and in the development of national anti-Buddhist policies. Collcutt and Ketelaar discuss these precursor purges in detail (Collcutt 1986, 146–151; Ketelaar 1990, 43–86).

government to follow Tokugawa era precedent, albeit newly couched in terms of “nation” and national identity (Mohr 1998, 167–168).

While Ketelaar is overall much more committed than Mohr to asserting the discontinuity and novelty of the Meiji period, he too sees some continuities in anti-Buddhist strategies. He outlines a four-part process by which the local eradication of Buddhism was attempted in the Mito Domain in the mid-seventeenth through mid-nineteenth centuries, and argues that its structure was paradigmatic, soon to be replicated not only by other domains but also in the national project. His analysis below thus serves not just to describe the Mito persecution but also the national strategy:

The institutionalization of anti-Buddhist policy during the Meiji era involves a fourfold process: (1) the establishment of a *government office* vested with comprehensive authority over “religious affairs”; (2) the conducting of a precise *survey* to determine the imminent political and economic contours of the institutions in question; (3) the *decimation* of Buddhist temples, rites, and priestly practices and even of the Buddhist priesthood itself; and (4) the *construction* of a system to suppress Buddhism’s differences, particularly those of its forms evocative of the carnivalesque.⁵ (Ketelaar 1990, 54)

Separation and Eradication: Shinbutsu Bunri and Haibutsu Kishaku

The term “eradication” aptly describes Meiji anti-Buddhist policy; it is precisely the sense of the Meiji era slogan “abolish Buddhism and destroy Shakyamuni” (*haibutsu kishaku* 廃仏毀釈), and does likely express the experience of those on both sides of the “eradication” of

⁵ In using the term “carnavalesque,” as he does throughout his study, Ketelaar is explicitly drawing on the work of Mikhail Bakhtin to express the volatile, uncontrolled, liberative potentiality that stands in opposition to attempts to, in Bakhtin’s words, “absolutize the given conditions of existence and the social order.” Demonstrating that not only *Shugendō* 修験道, divination, exorcism, etc., but also public nudity, erotic literature, dramatic lampoons, stand-up comedy, and other non-religious customs and entertainments were banned by the Meiji regime, Ketelaar argues convincingly that it is the carnivalesque quality itself, rather than Buddhist institutional power or Buddhism per se, that was the real threat that the Meiji regime was intent to eradicate. By “the construction of a system to suppress Buddhism’s difference,” Ketelaar is referring to the fabrication of traditions, festivals, observances, spaces, etc. to replace their Buddhist counterparts while serving more neatly the needs of the State ideology, a fabrication culminated in the so-called State Shintō. See Ketelaar 1990, 50–54.

any given temple. The initial, official government policy, though, was ostensibly not of *eradication* but of *separation*, namely the “separation of Shintō and Buddhism” (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離).⁶ Separation is a logical initial step in any process of eradication, however, and it is no surprise that the edicts outlining the policy of *shinbutsu bunri*, issued in the first month of the new Meiji government in 1868, were widely perceived as a harbinger of and license for eradication. It was abundantly clear that Buddhism was to be categorized among the “ancient evils” (*kyūrai no rōshū* 旧来ノ陋習) which the founding document of the Meiji was intent on eradicating (Ketelaar 1990, 86).⁷ It is also likely that the officials responsible for the separation edicts, the staff of the newly formed Office of Rites (*jingi jimukyoku* 神祇事務局, later, Ministry of Rites *jingikan* 神祇官), were, as reform Shintōists and hardline Nativists experienced in the local anti-Buddhist campaigns of the Tokugawa period, did intend and hope to “eradicate” the “ancient evil” of Buddhism. As Collcutt suggests, though, the new regime was sensitive to the possibility that an overt policy of eradication “might have provoked further local opposition and contributed to increased political instability” (Collcutt 1986, 151). The ostensibly neutral language of “separation,” then, should not be understood as expressing an authentically moderate agenda. Masking the more basic effort to “eradicate,” the rhetoric of “separation” is an instance of the kind of discourse analyzed by Ketelaar in his description of the paradigmatic Mito persecution, in which temples are not “destroyed” but “managed” (*shobun* 処分) or “amalgamated” (*gappei* 合併), and in which the forced laicization of priests is not a violence but a “return to farming” (*kinō* 帰農) or a “return to the secular” (*genzoku* 還俗) (Ketelaar 1990, 49).

Furthermore, this “separation” of Shintō and Buddhism (or even the “eradication” of Buddhism) required what proved to be an even more radical project, their respective *definition*. Shintō and Buddhism had been intertwining for well over a thousand years, if they had ever really been distinct at all, and to pull them apart they had to be defined. Grapard’s groundbreaking 1984 article, centered around a study of the typical “syncretic cult center” of Tōnomine 多武峰, is largely devoted to demonstrating the profound extent of Buddhist-Shintō syncretism (and its collective syncretism with Daoism and Confucianism), suggesting that it goes as deep as does “the Sino-Japanese interactions one sees occurring at the level of the Japanese language,” and accordingly arguing that the Meiji era “disruption of the Shintō-Buddhist

⁶ Grapard prefers the more violent connotations of “dissociation” to “separation” for *bunri*; he further argues for the more literal English rendering of *shinbutsu* as “Shintō and Buddhist divinities” rather than the more common “Shintō and Buddhism,” insisting on a crucial distinction between Shintō divinities and the Shintō religious system (Grapard 1984, 241).

⁷ The full passage, Article 4 of the Meiji Charter Oath, is 旧来ノ陋習ヲ破リ天地ノ公道ニ基クヘシ. Jansen translates it, “Evil customs of the past shall be broken off and everything based upon the just laws of Nature” (Jansen 2000, 338). Victoria renders it “All absurd usages of the old regime shall be abolished and all measures conducted in conformity with the righteous way of heaven and earth” (Victoria 2006, 4–5).

discourse was in fact a denial of cultural history” and the substitution of that history with “cultural lies” (Grapard 1984, 242–245). Ketelaar describes the difficulties of the surveyors in the Satsuma domain purge, who relied on the “form of violence” of “arbitrary linguistic discriminations”—like “temple” (*tera* 寺) versus “shrine” (*jinja* 神社)—to determine a given site’s status as Shintō or Buddhist, and he shows how even such emblematic “Shintō” symbols like the *torii* 鳥居 gateway and the *shimenawa* 標縄 rope were, prior to the separation, parts of a “common religious lexicon” (Ketelaar 1990, 57–59). Another example of the deep problem of “separation,” and the superficial fixes applied to it by government agents, is in the renaming of syncretic divinities from the “Buddhist-sounding” to the “Shintō-sounding.” In what Ketelaar calls “enunciatory gymnastics,” for instance, the popular guardian deity (of Buddhist origin) Fudō-son 不動尊 was, at Narita 成田, transformed into a “Japanese *kami*” simply by imposing a re-reading of the same characters as *Ugokazu no mikoto* (Ketelaar 1990, 75).

To note the conceptual incoherence of the separation edicts, though, and even to suggest (as does Ketelaar),⁸ that their greatest legacy was not in their damage to persons and properties so much as in the radical redefinitions they catalyzed, is by no means to suggest that the separation edicts were mere rhetoric: the violence against Buddhists and Buddhist institutions came swift and severe. The central institutions of the Meiji government were still relatively weak, and local autonomy ensured significant geographic variation in the enforcement of the separation program, but nevertheless a vast number of temples, statues, texts, and artifacts were destroyed, and huge numbers of clerics were forcibly laicized. Grapard is typical of many commentators in facing the lack of quantitative data on the damage with recourse to locutions like “innumerable” and “beyond imagination”: “innumerable statues, paintings, scriptures, ritual implements, and buildings were destroyed, sold, stolen, burnt, or covered with excrement”; “the destruction of syncretic art and treatises is beyond imagination” (Grapard 1984, 245). Collcutt is exceptional in the rigor with which he pursues quantitative data, but in his well-informed assertion that a “full accounting... will probably never be made” we fall back again on the vaguely “innumerable.” He finds “dramatic” but only piecemeal regional data on the physical damage of the separation edicts, citing local statistics like the complete absence of temples in Satsuma by 1872, the Toyama 富山 reduction to eight temples from a pre-persecution number of over 1,600, and the Tosa 土佐 eradication of 439 of 615 temples (which included the laicization of their monks). Collcutt thus lacks confidence in any of the pre-1872 national statistics that are cited in the scholarship, but he does find reliable numbers for the 1872-1876 time frame, and shows that the drastic reduction of temples and

⁸ “The enduring legacy of the persecution years is not to be found in the tens of thousands of destroyed and confiscated temples, in the tons of bells melted down for cannon, or in the uncounted numbers of headless statues that can still be found discarded along the roadsides of rural Japan. Rather, it is in the newly created systems of religious education, the construction of Buddhist and Shintō histories, and the post-persecution legislation of precise legal and political contours of all sectarian institutions that the anti-Buddhist movement left its deepest traces.” (Ketelaar 1990, 76)

clerics continued through that period: “According to census data, nearly 18,000 temples were closed between 1872 and 1876 alone. More than 56,000 monks and 5,000 nuns, together with their families and many of their disciples, were returned to lay life.” These statistics disprove the notion that the eradication effort was “as is sometimes suggested, a sporadic or short-lived phenomenon” (Collcutt 1986, 156–163).

The Decriminalization of Clerical Marriage

Closely associated with the physical violence against Buddhist properties was the disestablishment of Buddhist institutions, the new government’s effort to divest them of the social status and legal privileges they had long enjoyed. This disestablishment of Buddhism from its privileged position was a significant reordering of national hierarchies. For example, where prior to 1869 no layperson of any rank could be on horseback or in a carriage on Buddhist temple grounds, after 1869 this sort of insubordination to Buddhism was legally permissible (Ketelaar 1990, 68). Broader measures like universal conscription and compulsory education also had a significant impact in reducing the status and privilege of Buddhist institutions. In short, early in the Meiji period the government “eliminat[ed] all status privileges for the clergy” and “dissolv[ed] many of the institutional arrangements that had governed relations between religious institutions and the state” during the Tokugawa period (Jaffe 1998, 45). These disestablishment efforts went so far as to limit not only institutional power but also popular Buddhist practices, and sweeping restrictions or outright bans were instituted on Buddhist ceremonies, ordinations, festivals, and pilgrimage.

Perhaps the most significant and lasting measure towards the disestablishment of Buddhism were the measures that removed the State from its involvement in and enforcement of Buddhist clerical discipline. Jaffe has given this topic considerable attention and remains the authority on it:⁹

One crucial law, promulgated in 1872, decriminalized a variety of clerical practices that had been illegal according to Bakufu regulations for much of the Edo period. The regulation, commonly referred to during the Meiji period as the *nikujiki saitai* 肉食妻帯 law, ended all penalties for clerics who violated state and clerical standards of deportment by eating meat, marrying, letting their hair grow, or abandoning clerical dress. Although many government officials viewed the regulation as an important component of an overall policy to modernize Japanese society by

⁹ See Jaffe 1998; Jaffe 2001.

abolishing the old Edo status system (*mibun seido* 身分制度), the heads of almost every Buddhist denomination construed the measure as another attempt to destroy Buddhism by undermining their efforts to end the clerical corruption and laxity that had invited the recent violent persecution of Buddhism. The changes in government policies toward precept enforcement sparked a vitriolic debate among clerics, concerned laypeople, government officials, and the laity over the practice of *nikujiki saitai* and the role that the state should play in guaranteeing compliance with the Buddhist precepts. For the rest of the Meiji era the heads of established Buddhist denominations groped for some way to respond to the legal changes instituted by Meiji government leaders and to maintain order within their denominations. (Jaffe 1998, 46)

It should be emphasized that while there were certainly instances of forced laicization over the course of the Meiji persecution of Buddhism, the *nikujiki saitai* law did not constitute a forced, mass laicization by the government, but was on its face merely an assertion of the well-known Western principle of the separation of Church and State. Technically the State was not mandating anything, but was simply stepping back from its previous and problematic role as an authorized enforcer of clerical discipline. Decriminalizing an act is not to mandate it, and there is nothing about the *nikujiki saitai* law that prevented clergy from maintaining the formally established and disseminated celibacy requirement of their respective sects. As the sectarian leaderships themselves argued desperately for a number of years after the 1872 decriminalization order, clerics were in fact still accountable to their sects' regulations. Given the lack of power on the part of the sectarian leaders, however, coupled with the long history of clerical rule-bending and marriage, rank-and-file clergy had little motivation to heed their pleas. These two factors will be explored below.

Firstly, the codification of sectarian boundaries in the Meiji, while giving an appearance of homogeneity and unity within the State-approved "sects," masked intense diversity and factionalism within the sects. As discussed elsewhere in this paper, in every sect just below the surface of sectarian unity were competing lineages and branches and competing responses to the changes of the Meiji. This diversity and tension within each sect complicated the administration of centralized control over the sects' branches and lineages. Had the nominal sectarian heads held genuine, practical authority over the rank-and-file provincial clergy, they could have compelled them to conform with the clerical rules that (in most cases) already clearly forbade marriage. Even in the face of later government assertions that clerics did remain responsible to clerical rules, however, the sectarian leaderships proved simply too weak to maintain clerical discipline. With no effective central administration of the sects, and in the absence of government enforcement, clerical discipline naturally collapsed.

What this account neglects, however, is a second and perhaps more important point: at the time of the *nikujiki saitai* law, “marriage” among the clergy, albeit secret or at least non-public, was long established and widespread. It is difficult to quantify the married clergy and temple families prior to the decriminalization, but it is a well-attested phenomenon throughout Japanese Buddhist history.¹⁰ Jaffe notes, for example, abundant evidence of clerical fornication as early as the Nara 奈良 period (710-794), and shows that the practice of temple inheritance by the son of a cleric “was common enough that during the Heian period [平安, 794-1185] the rights of a blood child to a deceased cleric’s property were legally recognized” (Jaffe 2001, 11). In the Tokugawa period, too, the institution was widespread; Jaffe cites Tamamuro to note that “at least as far as many of the Kogi Shingon [古義真言] clergy are concerned, during the Edo period their way of life differed little from that of the laity,” and he concurs with Faure’s conclusion that “marriage and familial inheritance of temples were commonplace, particularly among those clerics who staffed clan temples and shrine temples” (Jaffe 2001, 34). It should therefore not be assumed that the new government policy caused clerics previously committed to celibacy to reconsider their vows. Rather, the effect was to push those clerics already involved in family life to explore the benefits of doing so openly, taking advantage of the opportunity, for example, to assert the rights of their families. The decriminalization of clerical marriage was a watershed event for Buddhism in the Meiji, then, not because it established a new practice but in large part because it forced a public debate among sectarian leaders, rank-and-file clerics, and parishioners. Jaffe describes this debate in some detail, and shows that the issues it raised of sectarian and clerical identity remain to this day unresolved.

The Great Teaching Academy

Shintō was to some extent a beneficiary of the early Meiji anti-Buddhist policies. Shintō clergy, for example, long second to their Buddhist counterparts, now enjoyed a higher status than Buddhists did (Collcutt 1986, 152). Another major institutional benefit for Shintō was its adoption of funerary responsibilities, both in the court and among the populace, which had long been the domain of Buddhism. These duties held considerable social and economic value, and Shintōists proved willing to go to great lengths to assume them, an effort that required nothing short of a fundamental revision of traditional norms and taboos. As a result, in the court and throughout the country memorial tablets were transferred from Buddhist sanctuaries and temples to Shintō sites, giving Shintō clergy the affiliations and financial support of those successors obliged to their ancestors’ care.¹¹

¹⁰ Clerical families seem also to have been much more prevalent in Indian Buddhist history than is generally assumed. See Clarke 2014.

¹¹ See Collcutt 1986, 159; Ketelaar 1990, 44–45, 60.

To characterize the actions of the early Meiji government as the simple elevation of Shintō at the expense of Buddhism, however, or to suggest that the separation of Shintō and Buddhism was unambivalently “good for Shintō,” is incorrect. For one, in light of the thorough interpenetration of Buddhism and Shintō historically, as noted above, the newly defined “Shintō” to which the benefits of State sponsorship would accrue was a Shintō restricted by its forced alienation from Buddhism. Secondly, many of the edicts regulating Buddhism, even the most extreme ones, were not in fact aimed at Buddhism but rather at a broad range of cultural practices deemed hazardous to the State, and thus affected Shintō as well.¹²

This inclusion of Shintō within broad restrictions on religious or “carnavalesque” practices speaks to the fact that the dominant Nativist faction in the Meiji government, despite its willingness to use Shintō to push a nationalist agenda, was not interested in building the State on a religious basis, Shintō or otherwise.¹³ What the Nativists sought was not a government in the service of established religion but rather a unifying, national ideology which was completely under the control of the State and totally subordinated to its agenda. It is obvious that Buddhism was deemed inappropriate to this task, but it must also be emphasized that neither could “religious” Shintō provide it. Indeed, the religious Shintōists in the government, who had envisioned a purified Shintō religion as the basis of the new State, were soon to discover this fact directly, finding themselves purged from the leadership.¹⁴

This purge culminated in the 1872 reorganization of the Ministry of Rites as the Ministry of Doctrine (*Kyōbusho* 教部省). The central task of this new Ministry of Doctrine, now staffed exclusively with Nativists and less concerned with the creation of “rites” under a philosophy of “unity of rites and rule” (*saisei itchi* 祭政一致) as much as with “doctrine” under a rubric of “unity of doctrine and rule” (*seikyō itchi* 政教一致), was to complete the creation of the new State ideology, the quasi-Shintō “Great Teaching” (*daikyō* 大教) (Ketelaar 1990, 87–121). This Great Teaching would make use of a wide array of resources, including Shintō and Buddhist institutions and personnel, in the effort to resist Christianity and to unify the citizenry around an emperor-centered national identity.

While the aim of the Great Teaching program was clear, however, the doctrinal content of the Great Teaching was rather less so. The Ministry of Doctrine first explained the Great Teaching under the rubric of the “Three Standards of Instruction” (*sanjō kyōsoku* 三条教則):

¹² See Ketelaar 1990, 69.

¹³ Ketelaar elaborates: “From the perspective of the enlightenment thinkers of the Meiji era, ‘faith’ (*shin*) was clearly viewed as disruptive, deceptive, and devolutionary. It was crucial for those who would rule to prevent the state ideological system from being dictated solely by concerns for the conception of ‘divinity.’” See Ketelaar 1990, 67.

¹⁴ These were the “Restoration Shintōists” (*fukko Shintō sha* 復古神道者) (Ketelaar 1990, 66). The details of the Shintō-State relations in the Meiji is largely out of the scope of this overview, but is treated extensively in Hardacre’s excellent monograph (Hardacre 1989).

“(1) comply with the commands to revere the *kami* and love the nation; (2) illuminate the principle of heaven and the way of man; (3) serve the emperor and faithfully maintain the will of the court” (Ketelaar 1990, 106).¹⁵ These three standards proved so vague and broad that the government struggled to maintain control of their interpretation. A proclamation was deemed necessary in 1872, for instance, to clarify that the clergy must refrain from “individual or Buddhistic interpretations” and “lectur[ing] with hidden meanings” (Ketelaar 1990, 123). In further attempts to clarify the Great Teaching, which were likewise not entirely successful, the Ministry in 1873 produced first eleven and then seventeen additional “themes” (*kendai* 兼題) for teaching, along with a stream of pronouncements on the details of the State doctrine.

To disseminate this Great Teaching, the government enlisted the Shintō and Buddhist clergy alike, as well as other figures with local reach and influence (like public entertainers) into a system of doctrinal instructors (*kyōdōshoku* 教導職). These doctrinal instructors, in what Ketelaar calls an attempt to make a *de facto* State priesthood, were to be trained in a network of prefectural and village academies overseen by a national headquarters (Ketelaar 1990, 99). Buddhists were initially enthusiastic about the opportunity provided by the doctrinal instructor system, seeing in it the opportunity to return to the good graces of the State. The sects actively lobbied the government for the right to be included in the system, and once it was established they eagerly enrolled their clergy as doctrinal instructors. Four thousand Shintō priests and three thousand Buddhist priests were initially licensed under the Ministry, and by 1880 there were more than 103,000 certified doctrinal instructors, over 81,000 of whom were members of Buddhist sects.¹⁶

It was soon clear, however, that the Great Teaching Academy was not the opportunity the Buddhist institutions had hoped. In what Ketelaar calls a “true ideological *coup de grace*,” the Great Academy in Tōkyō was installed at Zōjōji, the ancestral Buddhist temple of the Tokugawa family (Ketelaar 1990, 122). As Collcutt describes it:

The first batch of 300 Buddhists soon found that they were being subjected to Shintō indoctrination and used as Shintō propagandists. They were obliged to wear the stiff caps of Shintō priests on their shaven heads and to say prayers and make offerings before the shrine. Although Buddhists were thus involved in the dissemination of what was to be a new national

¹⁵ 一、敬神愛国ノ旨ヲ体スヘキ事

一、天理人道ヲ明ニスヘキ事

一、皇上ヲ奉戴シ朝旨ヲ遵守セシムヘキ事

Collcutt calls them the “Three Injunctions” and renders them: “Revere the *kami* and love the country. Clarify heavenly reason and the way of humanity. Revere the emperor and respect court directives.” See Collcutt 1986, 155.

¹⁶ See Ketelaar 1990, 105; Collcutt 1986, 154.

religion, this state creed made no provision for the teaching of Buddhism. (Collcutt 1986, 155–156)

Not only was there “no provision for the teaching of Buddhism,” in fact the teaching of Buddhism was by this point completely banned in the country.¹⁷

The incorporation of Buddhism into the doctrinal instructor system was thus not a sign of cooperation with the government so much as it represented co-optation by the government. It did not mark a reversal of the *shinbutsu bunri* policy or the end of *haibutsu kishaku*, as shown above by Collcutt’s findings that the persecution of Buddhism continued full-bore through the period of 1872-1876, precisely the years of Buddhist involvement in the Great Teaching. To be sure, some in the Buddhist establishment continued to go along with the program; Mohr, for example, discusses the case of Teizan Sokuichi 鼎三即一 (1805-1892) as evidence of “the willingness of some of the leading Sōtō representatives to support the government’s indoctrination policy,” at least through 1875, and as Section Three will show, Nishiari Bokusan is another example of an apparently willing advocate of the project (Mohr 1998, 177–178). Others, however, formed a growing resistance to the doctrinal instruction system. The most prominent among these was the Jōdo Shinshū priest Shimaji Mokurai 島地黙雷 (1838-1911), who publicly critiqued the Three Standards, argued for the separation of Church and State, and ultimately convinced the Shin sect to withdraw from the Great Teaching Academy. Without the support of the Buddhist establishment, the project collapsed; four months after the Shin sect withdrew in 1875 the Great Teaching Academy closed, and two years later the Ministry of Doctrine was dissolved.

Though the position of doctrinal instructor lasted until 1884, the dissolution of the Ministry of Doctrine in 1877 marks a significant transition point: Nativist “religion” had failed to gain traction as such. Blum notes that the Great Teaching was “widely seen as more political than religious” and Ketelaar sums up the failure by saying that “Nativism was too religious to rule, and Buddhism was too integrated into social fabric to be discarded.”¹⁸ Article 28 of the 1889 Meiji Constitution granted “Freedom of Religion” (*shinkyō no jiyū* 信教の自由), and while this “freedom” may have been so circumscribed as to be rendered functionally meaningless, it did decisively mark the end of the major period of anti-Buddhist policy. As Ketelaar says, “by the close of the 19th century the earlier historical, nationalistic, and socio-economic attacks upon Buddhism had indeed been largely put to rest” (Ketelaar 1990, 171).

¹⁷ This criminalization of Buddhist teaching was a result of the policy that forbade any public teaching outside the umbrella of the Great Teaching Academy. Ketelaar acknowledges that there was little enforcement of this prohibition on Buddhist teaching (Ketelaar 1990, 122).

¹⁸ See Blum 2011, 15; Ketelaar 1990, 130.

Part II: The Meiji Reinvention of Buddhism

Scholars differ in their assessments of the importance of Meiji Buddhist developments, with some, like Mohr, arguing for a “shrouded continuity” between Tokugawa and Meiji Buddhism and others, like Ketelaar, emphasizing the marked discontinuity between the pre- and post-Meiji institutions. There is no question, however, that the tumult of the Meiji inspired a range of Buddhist responses, some of which have come to characterize Japanese Buddhism down to the present. The challenges to which Buddhism was forced to respond were various. From the government, Buddhists met not only the persecution of the early Meiji, the loss of status and property discussed in the previous section, but also to transformative policies regulating the organization and identity of the sects. Outside of the government, too, Nativist, reform Shintōist, and Confucian critics challenged the Buddhist establishment. Exposure to Western religion, science, and the Western University following the so-called “opening” of Japan to the West was also significant, and Western academic fields like philosophy and religious studies inspired and challenged Meiji Buddhist thinkers. Specifically, positivistic and textual critical methods of Western Orientalism and Buddhology impacted the study of Buddhism both within and without of the sectarian institutions, and the Western Buddhological focus on “original” Buddhism led to the Japanese “discovery” of Indian Buddhism and forced a reassessment of the primacy of the Mahayana. Finally, as Blum emphasizes, pressure came from reform movements within the Buddhist institutions themselves, as different individuals and factions struggled to assert conflicting responses to the new realities they faced (Blum 2011, 3).

New Buddhism

The most progressive moves of Meiji Buddhism are often grouped under the rubric of “New Buddhism” (*shin bukkō* 新仏教). Snodgrass defines New Buddhism as:

a philosophical, rationalized, and socially committed interpretation of Buddhism that emerged from the restructuring of Buddhism and its role in Japanese society necessitated by the religious policy of early Meiji government. *Shin bukkō* was the New Buddhism of Japanese modernity, formed in an intellectual climate in which the West was recognized as both model and measure of modernity; shaped and promoted in reference to the West. (Snodgrass 2003, 115).

She further writes:

Following the lead and methods of Western Orientalist scholarship, a Buddhist philosophy was isolated from the ritual, mythology, and folk belief of actual practice. This New Buddhism was a noninstitutional lay practice accessible through the vernacular language. It was nonsectarian, 'progressive, democratic, spiritual, social and rational,' an indigenous alternative to the Western materialist philosophy and Protestant Christianity to which many Western-educated Japanese of this generation had turned. (Snodgrass 2003, 129–130)

Victoria emphasizes that “New Buddhism” does not designate a specific school of thought but more broadly the modernizing elements within Buddhism of the Meiji, and notes that “because it was a movement, not an organization, there were often conflicting, even opposing views as to what changes should be made” to the institutions (Victoria 2006, 198n). As it was a deliberate response to the West, a strong nationalist stream ran through the New Buddhist movement, which came to hold not only that Buddhism was the quintessence of Japan but also that only in Japan was Buddhism truly fulfilled. This perfected Buddhism of Japan was offered by New Buddhists as the right religion for the West: it would be compatible with science and regenerative for Western philosophy, and would be able to support a moral order while avoiding the problems of an increasingly untenable theism.

Many New Buddhists visited the West, and even attended Western universities, and they tried diligently to present Japan and Japanese Buddhism in terms the West would find relevant and compelling. The Japanese Buddhist delegation to the World Parliament of Religions in 1893 in Chicago epitomized the Western-facing character of New Buddhism, branded “Eastern Buddhism” for export.¹⁹ Snodgrass describes the overlapping agendas of the parliamentarians: internationally they hoped to win respect for Japan, domestically they hoped to prove the utility of Buddhism to national interests, and to the Buddhist establishment they hoped to demonstrate the superiority of the “New Buddhist” approach. It could be argued that they were successful on all of these points. A number of useful English language treatments discuss the Japanese Buddhist presence at the World Parliament of Religions; among them Snodgrass is the most comprehensive.²⁰

There are substantial (though by no means overwhelming) English-language treatments

¹⁹ “Eastern Buddhism” was coined as a challenge to the Western academic taxonomy of Buddhist schools as “Southern” or “Northern,” and represented an attempt to assert both the unity of East Asian Buddhism and its legitimacy to a Western academic culture which had defined it as mere degeneration from Pali textual origins and norms. See Snodgrass 2003, 198–199. The parliamentarians included Shaku Sōen and Ashitsu Jitsunen.

²⁰ See also Ketelaar 1990, 136–173; Fader 1982; Kitagawa 1993.

of the life and work of prominent New Buddhists like Suzuki “D. T.” Daisetsu 鈴木大拙 (1870-1966), Shaku Sōen 釈宗演 (1860-1919), Kiyozawa Manshi 清沢満之 (1863-1903), Inoue Enryō 井上円了 (1858-1919), Ōuchi Seiran 大内青巒 (1845-1918), and Murakami Senshō 村上専精 (1851-1929).²¹ While revealing an important piece of the picture of Meiji Buddhism, however, the focus on these figures can mask the importance of conservative elements in the Buddhist institutions, the “Old Buddhism” (*kyū bukkyō* 旧仏教) implied in the project of “New Buddhism” and comprised of institutional leaders and the tens of thousands of ordinary clergy who staffed local temples. We cannot speak of “Meiji Buddhism” without recognizing a wide variation on a continuum of progressive and conservative, and we cannot understand its development without studying the dynamics between these elements. Sawada, who criticizes the Western scholarship in particular for its emphasis on the New Buddhists at the exclusion of the conservative institutions, also takes a nuanced view of the distinct modes of conservatism, arguing the tendency to designate a given Meiji Buddhist figure or trend “conservative” without considering their complexity (Sawada 1998, 142–143). As Davis, Jaffe, Mohr and others have noted, institutional Buddhism in the Meiji remains understudied.²²

It is undeniable that the Meiji period brought significant change to Buddhism and the Buddhist institutions; as Ketelaar puts it, the Buddisms of 1871 and 1889 are “in many senses, two different entities,” in that “Buddhism had managed to transform itself from being perceived as one of the plethora of ‘ancient evils’ into one of the essential repositories of the true essence of ‘Japanese culture’” (Ketelaar 1990, 86). It is possible, however, to question the extent of the real effect the Buddhist modernizers had on institutional Buddhism. Sharf and others have suggested that despite their advocacy of a revolution in Buddhist understanding, the progressive Buddhist intellectuals in fact did not make much of a mark on the Buddhist institutions (Sharf 1995a, 141). Mohr likewise argues for the “shrouded continuity” of the content of institutional Buddhist teachings and practices through the upsets of New Buddhism and the political and organizational changes that characterize the period (Mohr 1998). While Blum does explore some aspects of the shifting understanding of doctrine led by Kiyozawa Manshi and others, and suggests that their deep influence did in fact open up new conceptual avenues, his appreciation of the impact of these thinkers is also moderated by his understanding that “the official doctrines of sectarian Buddhism became central to each sect’s identity, and in the Meiji, Taishō, and early Shōwa periods those doctrines were not substantially changed from how they had been defined in the Genroku period (1688-1704)” (Blum 2011, 21, 30–31). We should be careful, these scholars suggest, not to overstate the impact of New Buddhism on the Buddhist establishment.

²¹ See, for a few examples, Fasan 2012; Kiyozawa 1984; Blum 2011; Besserman and Steger 1991; Ketelaar 1990; Staggs 1979; Josephson 2006; Snodgrass 2009.

²² See Davis 1992, 170–171; Jaffe and Mohr 1998, 1–4.

The Christian Influence: Buddhist Social Work and Lay Buddhism

Christianity loomed large as a foil for the Meiji government's nationalistic policies, and neither the persecution of Buddhism, the creation of State Shintō, nor the Buddhist reforms of the period can be understood without reference to the specter of Christianity.²³ In general Christianity was perceived by Buddhist reformers as a threat to Buddhism, especially to a Buddhism that had been weakened by centuries of Tokugawa period corruption.

It is, however, also possible to discern an increasing tendency in Buddhist circles to imitate Christian activities. Christianity became not only a challenge, but a model.

It seemed to be a common conclusion in Buddhist circles that Buddhism was superior on the doctrinal level but that Christianity could offer guidance concerning methods of propagation, charity, education, and organization. In the words of Shaku Sōen, they should learn from Christians 'the necessity of coming into contact with the people.' (Thelle 1987, 197–198)

The New Buddhists consciously associated themselves with the Protestant Reformation, a movement they studied "fervently"; this association went so far as to lead to the epithet "Japanese Luther" for Mizutani Jinkai (水谷仁海, 1836-1896), a prominent New Buddhist and founder of the flagship *Shin Bukkyō* journal (1888). Even the terms "old" and "new" in *kyū bukkū* and *shin bukkū* implied the Reformation: *kyūkyō* 旧教 was a popular name for Roman Catholicism and *shinkyō* 新教 for Protestantism: "it can be concluded that the very concept of a New Buddhism was formed by the popular image of the Reformation, the model for religious renewal that involved a radical rejection of the old."²⁴ They also observed and imitated other aspects and modes of Christian teaching that they perceived, in Heine's words, as successful in "allowing the lay community greater access to salvific truth." Observing the appeal to laypeople of the Roman-Catholic emphasis on the redemptive power of confession, for example, Ōuchi Seiran reproduced it.²⁵ Also duly noted and imitated was the Protestant reliance on the single, authoritative text of the Bible (as contrasted with the vast Buddhist canon), and learning this power of what Ketelaar calls "textual unity," they composed doctrinal summaries and catechisms. Snodgrass adds that the liberal Protestant example also underlay the "scientific" New Buddhist opposition to folk beliefs and practices and to the supernatural (Snodgrass 2003, 149).

Perhaps the two most important areas in which Meiji Buddhists imitated Christians were

²³ The full extent of the influence of Christianity on Meiji Buddhism and Buddhist reformers is a complex issue treated in detail in Thelle's excellent monograph (Thelle 1987).

²⁴ See Thelle 1987, 195–196, 306n.

²⁵ See the discussion below of the *Shushōgi* 修証義.

in their turn towards charitable works and their reevaluation of the role and practice of the laity. While it is arguable that there is an authentic pre-modern Buddhist tradition of social welfare work, the movement in Meiji Buddhism to engage in social welfare was clearly a response to the perceived success of Christianity.²⁶ This sense was widespread even by contemporary observers, as the Buddhist observer who noted bluntly, “What is presently being done of charitable work in society is for the most part due to the influence of Christianity” (Thelle 1987, 198). In doing so, Buddhists sought in part to fend off a central critique of Buddhism that is as old as the East Asian tradition itself: the socio-economic uselessness of priests and temples.

Ketelaar outlines the range of Buddhist charitable works in the Meiji:

Each of the sects became engaged in long-term projects for the aid of the destitute as well as in short-term relief in times of famine, disaster, or economic hardship. Numerous hospitals and clinics were constructed along with centers to train “Buddhist doctors and nurses” to staff them. Schools for the blind and physically disabled soon followed, as well as hostels for the aged and infirm. Special lectures were conducted among prisoners; rehabilitation centers were established to aid those recently released. Social movements, or advertising campaigns, covering a wide variety of issues including public health, temperance, anti-abortion, and anti-capital punishment, and extending even to the prevention of cruelty to animals. Initially, these were largely domestic actions; international projects, however, were also launched. During massive starvation and death by cholera in India in 1896-1897, even Ōkuma Shigenobu, then Foreign Minister, followed the Buddhist transsectarian organizations’ lead in sending large amounts of food and medicine to the stricken areas. (Ketelaar 1990, 132–133)

The effort to “contact the people” through a revival and reimagining of the role of lay (*zaike* 在家 or *koji* 居士) Buddhists is a strong trend in the Meiji that without question took inspiration from Christian models. Other motivations also operated, however. Ikeda, for example, notes that the increased pressure on Buddhist institutions to engage creatively with laypeople was related to the sense that “after being released from the bondage of the old temple registration system,” they had gained the privilege of “independently choosing their own faith” (Ikeda 1998, 33). Whatever their motivations, the role of lay people in this movement is notable; important lay Buddhist activists like Ōuchi Seiran made an enormous

²⁶ On pre-modern Buddhist “social welfare” work, see, for example, John Nelson (Nelson 2013, 70–86).

impact on the Buddhist establishment.²⁷ Another giant of lay Buddhism was Inoue Enryō 井上 円了 (1858-1919), a Jōdo Shinshū cleric who felt so negatively about the clergy that he renounced his clerical status in order to better promote Buddhism, and taught even that Buddhism might be better realized with the elimination of the priesthood altogether (Staggs 1979, 177–178; Snodgrass 2003, 148).²⁸

It was not only laypeople who advocated for a lay-oriented Buddhism; many eminent clerics, too, like Hara Tanzan 原坦山 (1819-1892), Fukuda Gyōkai 福田行誠 (1809-1888), Shaku Unshō 釋雲照 (1827-1909), Shimaji Mokurai, and Ashitsu Jitsuzen 蘆津實全 (1850-1921), actively promoted the movement, lending it critical institutional momentum (Snodgrass 2003, 126). Some active clerics, like Tanaka Chigaku 田中智學 (1861-1939) and Kawaguchi Ekai 河口 慧海 (1866-1945), even went as far to join the layman Inoue in proposing the abolition of the priesthood itself. The Rinzai Zen monk Nakahara Tōjū 中原鄧州 (better known as Nantenbō 南天棒, 1839-1925) offered a nationalistic rationale for the importance of the concerted effort to reach laypeople: “Monks, too, are important, but if one does not first take care of laypeople and strengthen Japan with Zen, should there be a crisis leading to war with foreign countries, Japan will lose against the hairy white foreigners because of the number of our citizens, our economic power, and our physical size” (Mohr 1998, 199). The New Buddhist cleric and World Parliamentarian Shaku Sōen, dedicated to continuing “his teacher’s practice of welcoming lay practitioners into the monastery,” put off assuming an abbacy for many years after his 1906 return from international travels so that he could instead “devote his full energies to teaching Zen to laymen” (Sharf 1995a, 113).

This turn toward the laity in the Meiji period led the proliferation of official and unofficial lay societies (*kessha* 結社) and teaching assemblies (*kyōkai* 教会) dedicated to supporting and serving their needs. Ikeda has worked extensively on these organizations and argues that “teaching assemblies and lay societies that were formed during [the early Meiji] played a leading role in establishing the structure of the modern Buddhist institutional system.” These lay organizations emerged as “the smallest organizational elements preserving the popular faith that supported the foundations of the twelve sects and thirty-seven branches” and served an important function in the management and preservation of the sects during this

²⁷ See Section Two, for example, on Ōuchi’s formative role in the drafting of the *Shushōgi* 修証義, a text that would thereafter define Sōtō orthodoxy for clergy and priests alike.

²⁸ I am indebted to Richard Jaffe for advising me of the anti-clerical stance of Tanaka and Kawaguchi. Ketelaar’s work would suggest that the Sōtō cleric Takada Dōken 高田道見 (1858-1923) should be included in this list; Sawada, however, takes issue with the suggestion that Takada advocated the elimination of the priesthood, acknowledging that Takada did lionize lay Buddhism but arguing that he was “far from doing away with the distinction between lay practitioners and clergy.” See Sawada 2004, 181–183; Ketelaar 1990, 184–185.

period of institutional reorganization and upset.²⁹

Sectarianism and Transsectarianism

An important characteristic of New Buddhism was its assertion that the many schools and nationalities of Buddhism in fact constituted a single religion, transsectarian and transnational, that was perfectly suited for the age. This universal Buddhism was not limited to any particular cultural expression and yet it was expressed quintessentially in Japanese Buddhism. This was Suzuki Daisetsu's "Eastern Buddhism," defined explicitly for Western consumption as a counterpoint to the "Northern" and "Southern" Buddhisms of Western Buddhology, and it was the "United Buddhism" (*tsū bukkyō* 通仏教) of the Sōtō cleric Takada Dōken 高田道見 (1858-1923), which would return Buddhism to its essential, non-institutional simplicity after its long and unfortunate devolution into complexity.³⁰ The search for precedents for this transsectarian Buddhism led modernizers to texts like the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* (*Daijō kishin ron* 大乘起信論), about which D. T. Suzuki's patron Paul Carus wrote, it "follows none of the sectarian doctrines, but takes an ideal position upon which all true Buddhists may stand upon a common ground" (Ketelaar 1990, 186–187). Another central text for the movement was the *Essentials of the Eight Sects* (*Hasshū kōyō* 八宗綱要) of Gyōnen (凝然, 1240-1321), a text that organized Buddhist doctrines in the tradition of the doctrinal classification systems of Chinese Buddhism (Ch. *panjiao*; J. *hankyō* 判教), but in a way that resisted the "hierarchical determination" inherent in those systems and instead "sought to *maintain* the plurivocal nature of the Buddha's teaching," that is, to assert "the appropriateness of each teaching and the superiority of none" (Ketelaar 1990, 177–184). An important function of the transsectarian movement was to provide a venue for Buddhists to multiply their influence by engaging with the government as a united front; this use of transsectarian Buddhist organizations like the nationalist "Alliance of United Sects for Ethical Standards" (*Shoshū dōtoku kaimei*, 諸宗同徳会盟) will be noted below.

The movement towards a transsectarian "United Buddhism" is especially noteworthy in light of the parallel development, driven by the Meiji government, to formalize each sect's organizational structure and to codify its doctrines and practices. There were certainly sectarian boundaries in pre-Meiji Japanese Buddhism: Sharf mentions the sectarian standpoints of Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) and Ekō 慧光 (1666-1734), for example, in this regard, and Mohr discusses intense sectarianism in the Tokugawa period (Mohr 1994; Sharf 2002b). The rigid modern Japanese sectarian categories, however, owe much to the mandatory codification of sectarian boundaries in the Meiji period. As Ketelaar puts it, "The once-

²⁹ See Ikeda 1998, 11.

³⁰ See Ketelaar 1990, 174–212; Snodgrass 2003, 198–221.

amorphous division between specific ‘sects’ (*shū* 宗) and ‘schools’ (*ha* 派) was, during this period and for the first time, solidified and constituted as a legally binding hierarchy of difference” (Ketelaar 1990, 76).³¹

This clarification of sectarian differences was spurred by government attempts in the 1870s and 1880s to bring an ordered and manageable structure to the diversity of Buddhist sects and branches. These policies included the mandates that each sect establish a single head temple (*honzan* 本山), a single head abbot (*kanchō* 館長), and the submission of “sectarian prescriptions” (*shūsei* 宗制) and “temple regulations” (*jihō* 寺法) for government approval. Ikeda shows that the chief abbot position was primary in enabling “the formation and appellation of the modern Buddhist sects,” and that the sectarian prescriptions and temple regulations then followed to define and distinguish the sects and to “situate the groups within the modern legal framework.” Attempts early in the 1870s to divide Buddhism into only seven sects proved untenable, and by the end of the decade the rearrangement, separation, and amalgamation of factions had resulted in twelve recognized sects and thirty-seven independent branches.³² While the sectarian chief abbot position had been initially conceived as a way to support the Great Teaching Academy system, which had registered a “chief abbot of doctrinal instructors” (*kyōdōshoku kanchō* 教導職館長) for each sect, the position outlived the doctrinal instruction system itself. Even after the 1884 abolition of the Great Teaching system, the chief abbots retained the status of “semi-government officials,” empowered with “full authority over the sect or branch” and, by government proclamation, considered of equal status to other imperially appointed officials. In effect, by 1884 the government, though it had made a lasting mark in the reorganization of the sects, had realized its inability to manage the sects directly, and had delegated oversight of the Buddhist institutions to the chief abbots, who enjoyed broad and more or less independent authority over the activities of their sects.³³

³¹ Buddhist scholars who have been insensitive to the essentially modern character of the rigid Japanese sectarian boundaries have tended to misinterpret the historical record. Sharf, for example, has demonstrated how assumptions of the historicity of Japanese sectarian categories has clouded the field of Chinese Buddhist Studies (Sharf 2002a; Sharf 2002b). Not only are these rigid categories inappropriate in assessing Chinese or Indian Buddhism, Mohr argues that they obscure even the nature of the Japanese sects themselves, tending to “obliterate the direct exchange of ideas between individuals belonging to different traditions and to pass over discrepancies found within a single denomination” (Mohr 1998, 204).

³² The initial seven sects combined Sōtō, Rinzai 臨濟, and Ōbaku 黃檗 into a single Zen sect, which, as noted below in Section Two, proved unworkable. By the end of the decade the twelve recognized sects were: Tendai 天台, Shingon 真言, Jōdo 淨土, Rinzai, Sōtō, Ōbaku, Shin 真, Nichiren 日蓮, Ji 時, Yūzū Nembutsu 融通念仏, Hosso 法相, and Kegon 華嚴.

³³ See Ikeda 1998, 13–18.

Western Academics, Sectarian Studies, and the Buddhist Universities

The increasing exposure of Japan to Western science and academic institutions and methodologies also impacted the development of Buddhism over the Meiji period.

First, it is first important to note the impact of Western science on Buddhists' understanding of cosmology. Lopez and Snodgrass remind us that the notion of the compatibility of Buddhism and science is a product of the Meiji, a conscious rejection of long and deeply held Buddhist cosmological views. New Buddhists, who had their eyes on an increasingly secular, rationalist West, saw the discourse of Buddhist-scientific compatibility as a powerful way to distinguish Buddhism from Christianity in the appeal to Western intellectuals. Not only did these New Buddhists see Buddhist cosmology as an obstacle to being taken seriously by the West, as Snodgrass points out, the irrationality and incompatibility with science of Buddhism had become a focal point of domestic anti-Buddhist rhetoric as well. Thus reformers like Shimaji Mokurai and Inoue Enryō argued against points of Buddhist cosmological orthodoxy, like the literal existence of Mt. Sumeru, refuting the work of clerics like Fumon Entsu 普門円通 (1755–1834) in what remained an active debate in the Meiji (Lopez 2008, 46–51).³⁴

Secondly, the exposure of Japanese Buddhists to the specific Western academic fields of Orientalism, religious studies, and Buddhology also had deep ramifications. Among the most important of these was the influx into Japan of non-Chinese Buddhist texts, and along with them the philological tools that would allow the Japanese for the first time to interpret them. In light of these Indian texts, and the normative force with which Western Buddhology had endowed them, at the turn of the twentieth century the long-standing Japanese Buddhist bias against the Hīnayāna began to drop away and scholars like Anesaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1873-1949) and Murakami Senshō began to argue that the Mahāyāna had not been taught by the historical Buddha (Blum 2011, 28). More broadly, the very notion of “religious studies” and textual critical methodologies—and even, as Josephson argues, the category of “religion” itself—was a result of this contact with Western academics.³⁵ In this period, “religion in general, and Buddhism in particular, was being constituted as a discipline, as a field for scientific inquiry,” and a new picture emerged of Buddhism as “something that can be objectified for purposes of analysis in the public sphere” (Blum 2011, 37; Ketelaar 1990, 172).

While the contact with Western philosophy, textual studies, Orientalism, and Buddhology impacted the way that Japanese Buddhists looked at and studied their traditions, it also shaped the institutions in which they did so. With the intent “to train the priests necessary

³⁴ Nishiari Bokusan, too, was aligned with the orthodox Sumeru-centered Buddhist cosmology; see Section Three.

³⁵ On the emergence of the category of “religion” in the Meiji, see Josephson 2012.

to the production of a ‘modern Buddhism,’” the Buddhist institutions expanded existing Tokugawa period seminaries and academies into the great universities of the Meiji. These included the many universities of the Nishi Honganji 西本願寺, including the Daigakurin 大学林 (1868); the Daigakuryō 大学寮 (1882) of the Higashi Honganji 東本願寺; the Shingonshū Daigaku 真言宗大学 (1886); and, the Sōtō sect’s Daigakurin Senmon Honkō 大学林専門本校 (1882).³⁶ Sectarian and doctrinal history influenced by the transsectarian approach constituted a major aspect of the curriculum in the Buddhist universities, but there was also instruction in history, religious studies, philosophy, and other Western academic fields (Ketelaar 1990, 134, 179–181).

Ishikawa adds an important caveat to the rise of the Buddhist universities:

The academic study of Buddhism in post-Tokugawa Japan quickly incorporated the textual studies and methods of Western Buddhology and made great strides in developing modern Buddhist research. The doctrinal and sectarian studies of the sectarian Buddhist organizations, however, continued to languish. (Ishikawa 1998, 88)

Blum defines this sectarian studies (*shūgaku* 宗学) as “the academic study of scriptures based on established sectarian interpretation that continued (and continues) as a legacy of Edo-period orthodox doctrine” (Blum 2011, 18).³⁷ This distinction between sectarian studies and academic research, the recontextualizing of Buddhist history and doctrine in the university setting, raised a critical distinction between what Anesaki described as “students of religion and religionists,” and led to serious questions about sectarian control of the study and interpretation of Buddhism (Ketelaar 1990, 172). Scholar-clerics like Nishiari Bokusan were forced to work creatively in this tension, trying to catch up with the universities without ceding ground to them. Blum offers Kiyozawa Manshi’s distinction between *shūgaku* and *shūgi* 宗義 as one attempt to schematize the difference: for Kiyozawa, a “core truth of a Buddhist school established by its founder” could be maintained as *shūgi* and subject to the orthodoxies of the institutional leadership, while the “tradition of critical inquiry” or “the process of how individuals made sense of this creed-like *shūgi*” was *shūgaku*, the rubric under which could be tolerated some measure of intellectual diversity and critical methodology (Blum 2011, 34).

³⁶ The Sōtō sect’s Daigakurin Senmon Honkō was the precursor of the modern Sōtō flagship Komazawa University. It was established on the precincts of the Sendanrin 梅檀林 a seminary on the grounds of Kichijōji 吉祥寺 in Edo, founded in 1592. It became Sōtōshū Daigakurin (1904) and Sōtōshū Daigaku (1905) before moving in 1913 and taking its current name Komazawa Daigaku (1925). See Heine 2003, 174, 189n; Reader 1985, 35–36.

³⁷ Ishii notes that in Sōtō, the term used prior to 1932 for sectarian studies was “sect vehicle” *shūjō* 宗乘 (Ishii 2012, 226).

Buddhism and Nationalism in the Meiji

There is a broad consensus in the scholarship that nationalistic and militaristic rhetoric and activism suffused the Buddhist establishment from the early Meiji through the early Shōwa 昭和 period (1926-1989), spanning the Satsuma Rebellion (1877), the (First) Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), and the Fifteen-Year War (1931-1945). This posture of the Buddhist establishment, while intensifying through the Taishō 大正 period (1912-1926) and peaking in the early Shōwa period, unquestionably has its roots in the Meiji. From the first stirrings of Meiji anti-Buddhist policy, there was a concerted attempt on the part of the Buddhist institutions to regain their lost favor with the State, and a general trend in the public statements of Buddhist leaders was to assert the perfect alignment of the goals of Buddhism with the goals of the emperor and the Meiji government. These fervent Buddhist assertions of “the unity of imperial and Buddhist law” (*ōbō buppō ichinyo* 王法佛法一如) were closely related to the rhetoric of Japanese Buddhism as both the essence of Japan and the evolutionary pinnacle of world religious history, and to the parallel discourse of innate Japanese military superiority based on the *yamato damashii* 大和魂 and *bushidō* 武士道.³⁸ Statements, ceremonies, pledges, and material contributions in support of the Japanese military and imperialist projects by Buddhist leaders were the norm, and many went as far as to enlist outright in the army. Brian Victoria is among the most active scholars on this theme, and his controversial books on the topic are largely compilations of the most striking of these expressions.³⁹

The emerging role of the “United” or transectarian vision of Buddhism in the Meiji has been noted above, and it should be emphasized again that the function of the many Meiji pan-Buddhist organizations was not merely to profess doctrinal unity or to assert New Buddhist inclinations but to express and manifest the unity of the Buddhist institutions in their loyalty to the emperor. The Meiji era saw a multitude of Buddhist nationalist organizations and publications expressing just that, as well as robust Buddhist participation in broader nationalist

³⁸ On *ōbō buppō ichinyo* 王法佛法一如, see, for example, Ives 2009. On Japanese Buddhism as the essence of Japan and pinnacle of religious evolution, see, for example, Snodgrass 2003. For Buddhism and the *bushidō* 武士道 discourse, see, for example, Sharf 1995a.

³⁹ See Victoria 2006; Victoria 2003. Other treatments include Ives (Ives 2009, 13–53) and Davis (Davis 1992, 174–175). While Victoria’s important work has raised the prominence of the issue in the scholarship and also within the Buddhist establishment, it has also been the subject of significant critique. Some, like that of Satō (Satō and Kirchner 2008; Satō and Kirchner 2010) is marred by a defensive and apologetic tone, while others, like that of Ives (Ives 2009, 102–107) and Faure (Faure 2010, 216–217) are more level-headed.

organizations.⁴⁰ Many of these organizations were transsectarian and comprised of both laypeople and clergy, and they shared an emphasis on patriotism, militarism, and defense of the State. This flourishing of pan-Buddhist organizations, Victoria notes, was “unprecedented,” as “under the previous Tokugawa regime all intrasectarian Buddhist organizations had been banned” (Victoria 6). Two of the most important of these organizations are discussed below.

The first, the 1868 “Alliance of United Sects for Ethical Standards” (*Shoshū dōtoku kaimei*) attempted to win the sympathy of the new government by asserting their loyalty to the principle of the inseparability of imperial and Buddhist law (*ōbō buppō ichinyo*) and a commitment to aid in the expulsion of Christianity.⁴¹ While some elements of the government seemed to appreciate the thought, it did not prove effective in forestalling the momentum of the anti-Buddhist *haibutsu kishaku*.⁴² The early Meiji government did, though, in what Ketelaar calls “the only public approbation accorded Buddhist at this time” place pragmatism above rhetoric and accepted the offer from the Buddhist institutions to serve the State in the colonization of the northern territories (modern day Hokkaidō) and in the pacification of condemned prison laborers stationed there. The sects, grasping at whatever scraps they could find from the Meiji government’s table, took on task with gusto, putting substantial material and personnel resources into the evangelization-colonization effort.⁴³

In 1889, after the early Meiji anti-Buddhist surge had abated, Ōuchi Seiran and others like Shimaji Mokurai and Inoue Enryō formed the “Federation for Venerating the Emperor and Repaying the Buddha” (*Sonnō hobutsu daidōdan* 尊皇奉仏大同団) in conjunction with the publication of a treatise by Ōuchi entitled, “A Treatise on Venerating the Emperor and Repaying the Buddha” (*Sonnō hobutsu ron* 尊皇奉仏論). Victoria says of this organization that it “represented the organizational birth of a Buddhist form of Japanese nationalism that was exclusionist and aggressively anti-Christian in character,” lending support to the imperialist and militaristic project while reasserting the status of Buddhism as the foundation of Japan.⁴⁴

This pro-imperialist Buddhist trend continued throughout the Meiji, for instance in the Wartime Conference of Religionists (*senji shūkyōka kondankai* 戦時宗教家懇談会) of 1904, in

⁴⁰ See, for example, Ives 2009, 22.

⁴¹ See Ketelaar 1990, 73; Ives 2009, 21.

⁴² In an example of government moderation, Nishi Honganji, a strong supporter of the organization, received a private communique in the fall of 1868 from government officials distancing themselves from the persecution and attributing it to “foul-mouthed rebels claiming to speak for the imperial court.” See Victoria 2006, 6; Ketelaar 1990, 12–13.

⁴³ See Ketelaar 1990, 68–69, 248n. Important work on Meiji Buddhist missionizing in colonial Korea has been done by Hur (who focusses on Sōtō sect involvement) and Kim (Hur 1999; H. I. Kim 2012). Nishiari Bokusan had connections with *Shoshū dōtoku kaimei*, and he played an important role in the evangelization of Hokkaidō; see Section Three.

⁴⁴ See Ives 2009, 22; Victoria 2006, 18.

which Buddhists joined Shintō, Confucian, and Christian leaders to proclaim “that the Russo-Japanese War was being waged for ‘eternal peace’”; and in the government-sponsored “Conference of the Three Religions” (*Sankyō kaidō* 三教会同) of 1912 in which Buddhist institutions again asserted their unity with imperial goals.⁴⁵ The Buddhist establishment also took the opportunity in the final years of the Meiji period to reassert its loyalty to the state by unequivocally condemning the “High Treason Incident” (*taigyaku jiken* 大逆事件), an alleged (and possibly fabricated) assassination attempt on the emperor which resulted in a political crackdown. Several Buddhist clergy were convicted in the incident, and one of the only publicly leftist and anti-war Buddhists of the time, Uchiyama Gudō 内山愚童 (1874-1911) of the Sōtō sect, was executed for it. Buddhist institutions, lay leaders, and scholars unanimously lent their full support to the government around the incident, distancing themselves from the accused so thoroughly as to erase them from the clerical ranks.⁴⁶ The Sōtō sect went so far as to call Uchiyama’s involvement the “most serious crime in the sect’s last one thousand years” (Victoria 2006, 50).⁴⁷

Despite broad agreement in the scholarship about the pervasiveness of nationalistic and militaristic ideology in Meiji Buddhism, there is also considerable debate about the extent of any given individual’s “actual” support for the wars. While the details of these disagreements vary, Mohr indicates a common thread in divergent readings of Meiji Buddhists, namely the difficulty in properly contextualizing any given statement. Objecting to Sharf’s characterization of Nantenbō, a major Meiji Rinzai Zen figure, as “a staunch nationalist and partisan of the Japanese military,” Mohr notes that while Nantenbō’s invocation, for example, of “the Japanese Spirit” (*yamato damashii*) “instantly evokes dark associations with the military dictatorship of the Shōwa era,” for a person like Nantenbō “raised during the Tokugawa period and steeped in the principle of *bushidō*, however, it was probably as ordinary as the phrases ‘the American Spirit,’ or ‘*l’esprit français*’ in today’s world” (Mohr 1998, 199). Even when such “dark associations” are warranted, however, the question remains of the extent to which they reflect an individual’s position above and beyond “the national mood” and the constraints of the authorized discourse.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ See Ives 2009, 21; Victoria 2006, 53.

⁴⁶ Uchiyama, for example, was not restored to the Sōtō clerical ranks until over 80 years after his death, in a long posthumous announcement issued in 1993 (Victoria 2006, 46).

⁴⁷ For good discussions of the incident, and Uchiyama’s role in it, see Ishikawa 1998; Victoria 2006, 38–54; and Ives 2009, 24–25.

⁴⁸ In my own reading of Nishiari Bokusan, for example, I have felt this problem acutely. While it seems clear that he is a staunch nationalist, it is hard if not impossible to tease out his personal opinions from the national mood, indeed the national *language* of imperialism, that pervades the writings of the time. How are an individual’s opinions coded within a very narrow sphere of acceptable speech, and can those codes be cracked outside of the context of their delivery? These problems seem to underlie the wide divergence in scholars’ and sectarians’ interpretations of the motivations of Meiji Buddhist figures.

This interpretive divergence is most pronounced, and most emotional, in the debates around Suzuki Daisetsu, the assessment of whose wartime position has become something of a cottage industry. The vastness of Suzuki's work seems to enable any scholar to find material that aligns with their argument, but it also severely hinders a definitive assessment of his perspective about the imperialist fervor of wartime Japan. Ultimately, it is clear that there are both highly nationalistic and militaristic instances of his writing as well as much more moderated ones. How one assesses these, in light of the baseline rhetorical noise of the time, seems a rather subjective matter and lends itself over-well to the agendas of any given scholar.⁴⁹

It is arguable that for much if not all of Buddhist history the benefits to the State of sponsoring Buddhism have been exploited by the Buddhist institutions. Self-serving notions of a Buddhism for the protection of the State, and of the unity of imperial and Buddhist law, has roots early in the Chinese and Japanese Buddhist traditions.⁵⁰ It is therefore doubtful that the Japanese Buddhist establishment support for early twentieth century Japanese imperialism constitutes a particularly "modern" or even noteworthy phenomenon. Ives, for example, argues that such moves are a little more than modern instance of the time-honored discourse of "Buddhism for the protection of the realm" (*gokoku bukkyō* 護国仏教) (Ives 2009, 101–127). As Sharf puts it in his attempt to contextualize the issue, the "masters of old" or a "medieval Zen abbot" would not necessarily "have taken what we believe to be the moral high ground on the issue of Japanese imperialist aggression during the first half of the twentieth century. The real question, as I see it, is why we would expect him to" (Sharf 1995b, 51). Just as establishment Buddhist support for Japanese imperialism does not stand out in Buddhist history, it is also not exceptional within Meiji Japanese culture: nationalist sentiment (or at least rhetoric) extended throughout virtually every secular and religious institution and locale in Japan. A useful case in point of how deeply such sentiment pervaded Meiji Japan may be found in Thelle's account of nationalism during the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95):

"[E]ven the Japanese Society of Friends (Quakers), for whom pacifism had been a central concern, supported the war by allowing its members to join the army. When the American Friends criticized their Japanese colleagues and expelled four students from their school for abandoning pacifism, they were accused of failing to combine love of one's fellow men with love

⁴⁹ Victoria and Satō have fought some of this out in the pages of *The Eastern Buddhist* (Satō and Kirchner 2008; Victoria 2010; Satō and Kirchner 2010), and Victoria has gotten the last words (for now) in *The Asia-Pacific Journal* (Victoria 2013a; Victoria 2013b). Sharf, Kirita, and others have also weighed in (Sharf 1995a; Sharf 1995a; Kirita 1995).

⁵⁰ For a history of the theme in China see, for example, Hirata 1995, 4–8; for Japan, see Ives 2009, 107–111.

of one's country. The conflict finally ended with a split within the Society of Friends, and the American Quakers withdrew their support of the Japanese work of the society." (Thelle 1987, 171)

While I maintain that Buddhist nationalism remains an important and interesting object of study, I must agree with Sharf that it is only when these contexts of Buddhist history and Japanese nationalism are ignored that the issue can be met with the kind of surprise and indignation that characterizes, for instance, Victoria's work.

SECTION II

Sōtō Zen in Meiji Japan

The Sōtō sect was among the largest of the Meiji religious organizations, with 14,310 temples and 12,467 abbots in 1882, and it was well represented in the pan-Buddhist developments of the Meiji (Jaffe 1998, 78). The role of Sōtō figures like Ōuchi Seiran, Takada Dōken, and others in the general developments in Meiji Buddhism have been briefly noted in Section One. But while similar pressures and trends affected each sect, their responses differed, and a more narrow treatment of the Sōtō Meiji situation in particular will be necessary to complete the picture of the context in which Nishiari Bokusan lived and operated. In what follows, I will draw on a selection of the scattered English and Japanese language sources on the topic to outline a few of the major developments within the Sōtō institution in the Meiji.

The fact that the term Sōtōshū (Ch. *Caodong Zong* 曹洞宗) is attested as far back as Song 宋 China (960-1279) might lead one to imagine that it represents a continuous institution or at least a discrete and distinct set of practices, doctrines, and institutional forms. The birth of the Sōtōshū as a unified institutional entity, however, is a product of the Meiji era—Foulk dates its birth specifically to 1874, the year of its legal incorporation as a religious entity in Japan.⁵¹ What is now taken to be a unified sect was prior to that period a loose set of individuals, lineage relationships, and temple affiliations dispersed across diverse regions and sharing little more than the rhetoric of a common ancestor, Dōgen. A singular Sōtōshū did not emerge from that diversity until the early Meiji period, a time at which all the sects and branches of Buddhism were in their own ways scrambling to negotiate the rapidly changing political and social landscape and to respond to increasing demands for unification, standardization, and centralization across all aspects of society.

The pressure exerted by the Meiji government to clarify sectarian identities has been noted in Section One, and it has been noted that the pressures towards both sectarianism and transsectarianism pulled on the sects in the Meiji. As Jaffe puts it, the Meiji government demanded, as it did of all sects, that the Sōtō leadership

codify an institutional structure, sect law, and an overarching formal Sōtō identity. Eliding the regional, sectarian, and

⁵¹ *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, “曹洞宗,” article by Griffith Foulk.

hierarchical variations in practice that had existed in the past, the Sōtō leaders adopted uniform rules and institutional arrangements for all members of the denomination (Jaffe 1998, 78).

There was indeed much to “elide.” While the impulse to centralize and standardize made sense from the point of view of the government and was consistent with its efforts to centralize and standardize all social institutions, and while furthermore such organization certainly facilitated the government’s ability to manage religion and society, it posed a significant problems for the “sects” themselves, which were forced to define, or even to invent, homogenous and discrete entities where no such things had necessarily existed. The construction of a singular and homogenous Sōtō sect in the Meiji was in this sense as problematic—and as much a facet of what Grapard has called a “cultural lie”—as was the broader project of the separation and clarification of Shintō and Buddhism in *shinbutsu bunri*.⁵²

To define the Sōtō sect posed the twin challenges of, on the one hand, distinguishing itself among the matrix of Zen and Buddhist branches, and, on the other, unifying its internal lineages and branches, especially the Eiheiji 永平寺 and Sōjiji 総持寺 temple branches.⁵³ This process resulted in the institutional birth of the sects as they are known in the modern period, but it is important to emphasize that this birth was not a matter of pulling a preexistent and unified “Sōtōshū” from a larger matrix, but rather of hacking out a special identity within Buddhism and fabricating a unity across temples and branches. Though the Sōtōshū endeavored to express itself as the intrinsic nature underlying these various lineages and temples, it is perhaps better conceived as a hastily constructed umbrella over them.

Admittedly, this account of the “birth” of Sōtō risks overstating the novelty of Meiji Buddhist sectarianism. Indeed, there is ample evidence for Buddhist sectarianism in the Tokugawa period, and even in Song or Tang 唐 (618-907) China.⁵⁴ Just as Shintō and Buddhism were in some general sense “distinguishable” in the pre-modern period—a Buddhist monk, for example, thought of himself as a Buddhist monk—so too it is misleading to suggest that the distinction between Zen and other schools of Buddhism, or between the Rinzai, Sōtō, and

⁵² For Grapard on *shinbutsu bunri* as a “cultural lie,” see Section One and Grapard 1984, 242–245.

⁵³ Michaela Mross has kindly reminded me that while the Eiheiji and Sōjiji branches did constitute the main fault line of Meiji (and Tokugawa, and contemporary) Sōtō, it is important not to take these branches as monoliths; each was itself comprised of dynamic and conflicting factions.

⁵⁴ As noted, with respect to Chinese Buddhist history, Sharf and others have argued that it is generally misleading to apply modern sectarian categories, and it is certain that at least in the Tang there were not institutionalized sects as we would understand them today (Sharf 2002a; Sharf 2002b). The scholarship, however, by no means suggests that there were not Chinese Buddhist monks who identified themselves with or against the rhetoric of certain schools of teaching. For one example, see Schlütter on the vociferous Linji-Caodong (Rinzai-Sōtō) disputes in twelfth century China (Schlütter 2008).

Ōbaku 黄檗 schools, is entirely a product of the Meiji period. Mohr, for example, who, as noted, convincingly argues for a “shrouded continuity” between Tokugawa and Meiji Buddhism, has specifically explored the deep sectarianism of Rinzaï, Sōtō, and Ōbaku in the Tokugawa period (Mohr 1994; Mohr 1998). The *institutional* sectarian developments in the Meiji are indisputable, however, and, as also noted above, Ketelaar puts it succinctly, “The once-amorphous division between specific ‘sects’ (*shū* 宗) and ‘schools’ (*ha* 派) was, during this period and for the first time, solidified and constituted as a legally binding hierarchy of difference” (Ketelaar 1990, 76).

In the study of the Sōtō sect in the Meiji, then, as with the study of Buddhism in the Meiji more broadly, this question of continuity or change looms large. While the *Shushōgi* 修証義 and the *Gyōji kihan* 行持軌範, for example, explored below, are notable expressions of the standardization of doctrine and practice in the Sōtō sect, Jaffe reminds us that the question of allegiance to these newly centralized standards over local traditions has yet to be investigated (Jaffe 1998, 78). Furthermore, it has yet to be established how radical a departure from past precedent was the newly established Sōtō orthodoxy and orthopraxis. Sōtō sectarians certainly argue for a continuity of doctrine and practice, and it is commonplace to hear, for example, that the monastic forms of modern Sōtō are precisely those practiced in the thirteenth century.⁵⁵ While such claims must be taken skeptically, a full account of the modernization of Sōtō, and the extent to which it can be seen as rupture or continuity, remains to be written.

As discussed in Section One, the first and most important mandate from the Meiji government to clarify sectarian boundaries and unify diverse branches was the establishment of the “chief abbot” (*kanchō*) system, a process that began in 1872 with the establishment of the position “chief abbot of doctrinal instructors” (*kyōdōshoku kanchō*) to serve the Great Teaching Academy. Ikeda translates an announcement from the Ministry of Doctrine (*Kyōbushō*) from the sixth month of that year:

Every temple in each jurisdiction must be notified, in accordance with the stipulations provided on the attached sheet, of the fact that hereafter each sect will have one chief doctrinal instructor, [a measure taken] for the purpose of regulating the respective sects and branches. (Ikeda 1998, 13–14)

⁵⁵ A recent movie about the life of Dōgen is an extreme example of this pervasive element of modern Sōtō rhetoric (Takakashi 2009).

This first iteration of the *kanchō* policy recognized only seven Buddhist sects, mandating a single chief abbot to preside over the “Zen sect,” but this attempt to combine all the branches of Rinzai, Sōtō, and Ōbaku into a single institution proved unworkable. Therefore, “on 22 February 1874 [the Ministry of Doctrine] reversed this policy, disbanding the new, unified ‘Zen sect’ and allowing the Rinzai and Sōtō organizations to register separately,” and “[o]nly then did the Rinzai and Sōtō traditions appoint their own chief abbot and reorganize themselves into modern sectarian institutions” (Ikeda 1998, 14).⁵⁶

This 1874 birth of the Sōtōshū as a legal institution did not mark a completion but rather a beginning of a process of self-definition, centralization, and standardization in the sect. Some elements of this process as it unfolded throughout the Meiji will be discussed in this section as follows:

- 1) The development of the tenuous institutional relationship between the head temples Eiheiji 永平寺 and Sōjiji 総持寺, especially their collaboration around two major textual projects, namely,
 - 2) the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* 洞上行持軌範 ritual manual for clerics (1889), and
 - 3) the lay-oriented *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* 曹洞教会修証義 catechism (1890), which came to define orthodoxy for lay and cleric alike. Finally,
 - 4) the new emphasis on the study of the *Shōbōgenzō*, and the emergence of the *genzōe* 眼藏会 format for its exegesis.

Two Temples, One Sect: Eiheiji and Sōjiji

Apart from the renewed need to distinguish itself from the other Zen sects, the major task of the early Meiji Sōtō institution was to unify its internal divisions and homogenize its diverse temples. As noted, the strongest internal division within the field of Sōtō-affiliated temples was the division between the Eiheiji and Sōjiji branches. Since early in the seventeenth century the two temples had been affirmed by the emperor and *shogun* as dual head temples (*honzan* 本山) of the Sōtō sect, the result of what Mross has noted was a deliberate strategy applied across Buddhist sects by the *shogun* Tokugawa Ieyasu 徳川家康 (1543-1616) to prevent the accumulation of power in the hands of any single head temple (Mross 2009). This arrangement was convenient for the government, but it led naturally to power struggles between the two temples, and conflicts between Eiheiji and Sōjiji were continuous through the

⁵⁶ The Ōbaku sect remained a legal branch of the Rinzai sect until an 1876 order recognized it too as institutionally independent.

Tokugawa period and continued in full force into the Meiji. Bodiford describes the temples' relationship succinctly:

“Throughout [the Tokugawa] period, Sōjiji and Eiheiji were rivals in the true sense of the word. In each of the major Sōtō controversies of the Tokugawa period—on questions ranging from Dharma succession to the proper manner of wearing the Buddhist robe—Eiheiji and Sōjiji staked out opposing positions on the issues” (Bodiford 1993, 81–82).⁵⁷

Whatever the content of a given dispute, the underlying institutional dynamic was clear: the vast majority of Sōtō temples, the economic and institutional base of the sect, were branch temples (*matsuji* 末寺) of Sōjiji, whereas the doctrinal and patriarchal center of the sect, claiming exclusive access to the sect's Japanese founder Dōgen, lay at Eiheiji.⁵⁸

This old rivalry was, in Mohr's words, “reawakened” at the start of the Meiji era in 1868, when Eiheiji officials proposed to the new government a reformation of the Sōtō organization that would establish Eiheiji as the single head temple (*sōhonzan* 総本山) (Mohr 1998, 174–175). There is no doubt that the self-serving Eiheiji proposal of 1868 did intensify the conflictual dynamic between the head temples, but it should not be inferred that the rivalry was in any way dormant immediately prior to it. Indeed, the most recent active dispute between the two head temples (“the three robe controversy”) had been nominally settled only in 1861, just seven years prior, and according to Riggs, “tensions continued over this issue” until at least 1872 (Diane Elizabeth Riggs 2010, 253–256).

The government, after realizing the depth of Sōjiji's opposition to the idea of promoting Eiheiji to sole head temple status, ultimately rejected the 1868 Eiheiji proposal and took steps to force the temples to cooperate with one another. The first of these attempts was an 1870 imperial order to appoint a “first independent abbot of Sōjiji” (*Sōjiji dokujū isse* 総持寺獨住一

⁵⁷ See, for example, David Riggs and Bodiford on the succession controversies (David E Riggs 2002, 131–176; Bodiford 1991) and Diane Riggs on the robe controversies (Diane Elizabeth Riggs 2010).

⁵⁸ Bodiford reports that circa 1750, Eiheiji branch temples constituted a mere 1,300 of the 17,500 Sōtō temples, the rest of which were Sōjiji branch temples (Bodiford 2012a, 208). The ascension of Sōjiji as the “institutional center” of the Sōtō sect has roots in the 14th century, particularly the efforts of Gasan Jōseki 峨山韶碩 (1276-1366), and is detailed by Bodiford (Bodiford 1993, 95–139). This dynamic of institutional and doctrinal centers is sometimes described in terms of Sōjiji being the head of Sōtō temple lineages and Eiheiji being the head of all Sōtō Dharma lineages, a claim that seems to level the field but which Bodiford rightly finds incoherent, as the idea of a “head temple” (Eiheiji) of “lineages” is a confusion of terms (Bodiford 2012a, 209). Bodiford argues compellingly that Eiheiji's success in maintaining its status as equal to Sōjiji at the top of the institution despite having virtually no affiliated temples has been the result of persistent and aggressive campaigns to preserve the “memory” of Dōgen and to identify itself as the main caretaker of his legacy (Bodiford 2012a).

世), which achieved “a semblance of a solution... to acknowledge the claims of Sōjiji for independence” (Mohr 1998, 174–175). The more significant step, however, was a government-mandated compact between the two temples signed in 1872 stating that their past differences and disputes would be resolved in accordance with the teachings of both Dōgen, the founder of Eiheiji, and Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾 (1268-1325), the founder of Sōjiji (Bodiford 1993, 82).

In the several years following the 1872 compact, the two temples collaborated on a number of things. The sect opened administrative headquarters (*shūmuchō* 宗務廳) in Tōkyō in 1872, an institution which, Reader notes, “served at first simply as a coordinating center through which the sect could keep abreast of political developments and also disseminate information, but, in the manner of all bureaucracies, grew into a powerful and dominating organ at the core of Sōtō, becoming the driving force behind its modern evolution.” A first sect-wide assembly (*kaigi* 會議) for centralized decision making was subsequently held under the auspices of the *shūmuchō* in 1875.⁵⁹ Bodiford’s list of the post-compact cooperative endeavors includes, “rules for the operation of temples” (*jihō*) (1876), sponsorship of “a formal Sōtō church (*kyōkai* 教会)...[as] an attempt to bypass the rigid hierarchy of temple factions” (1876), the adoption of a ritual calendar which for the first time elevated Keizan (and thereby Sōjiji) (1877), a Sōtōshū constitution that, among other things, “defined the relationship between head and branch temples” (1882), and the registration with the government of the sect’s unified “governing organization and administrative rules (*shūsei*)” (1885) (Bodiford 1993, 81–82). Perhaps most important of all were the joint editing and authorizing of the standardized ritual manual, the *Tōjō gyōjo kihan* (1889); and, secondly, the catechism *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* (1892), affirmed by joint Sōjiji and Eiheiji edict as the orthodox summary of the sect’s teachings (*shūkyō no taii* 宗教ノ大意) (Watanabe 1983, 137). This cluster of foundational developments in the Sōtōshū deserves more study than it has received in the English language literature.

The 1885 administrative rules (*shūsei*) are especially interesting among these because of their role in the relations between Eiheiji and Sōjiji. These rules were drafted and registered in response to an 1884 government order in which the Council of State (*Dajōkan* 太政官), as part of abolishing the “failed” doctrinal instructor system, and “relinquish[ing] any remnants of direct central government control of what were now deemed internal sectarian affairs,” mandated that each sect submit “sectarian prescriptions” (*shūsei*) and “temple rules” (*jihō*) for authorization by the Ministry of Domestic Affairs (*Naimushō* 内務省) (Jaffe 1998, 61).⁶⁰ Though

⁵⁹ See Reader 1985, 35–36. Reader suggests that this “sect council... reflect[ed] the development of democratic trends within Japan brought about by the new contacts with Western culture.”

⁶⁰ Jaffe translates *shūsei* as “denomination-wide regulations” and comments on the terms further: “*Shūsei* are the fundamental rules to be followed within a particular denomination. *Jihō* are the basic regulations to be followed at the individual temples of the denomination. In practice, however, the regulations issued by various denominations rarely distinguish the two types of statutes.” The *Naimushō* oversaw the “Shrine and Temple Bureau” (*Shajikyoku* 社寺局), which was assigned

this mandate led to “internal difficulty in the attempt to balance the needs of different branches,” it was taken on enthusiastically. A further order in 1885 raised the stakes by stipulating that these new documents would supplant all previously authorized sectarian prescriptions and temple rules (Ikeda 1998, 27).

The 1885 *shūsei* submitted by the Sōtō sect is an interesting document on several counts, and is discussed in detail by Kawaguchi.⁶¹ “Other-power” (*tariki* 他力) language in the fourth section, for instance, “Outline of the Principles and Teachings of the Sōtō Sect” (*Sōtōshū shūkyō taii* 曹洞宗宗教大意) set off considerable controversy in the putatively “self-power” (*jiriki* 自力) sect.⁶² In terms of the viability of the coalition between Eiheiji and Sōjiji, though, the 1885 *shūsei* was critical in that it included the terms of their 1872 truce. This ensured that when tensions flared up between partisans of the temples, what Bodiford calls the “force of law” that the truce had acquired by its registry with the government could keep the institution from being torn apart.

The fragile unity of the two head temples was especially challenged in the years 1892-1894, the peak of the Sōjiji independence movement and a time of such great discord that Michaela Mross, one of the few Western scholars to have worked on the conflict, has called it “probably the deepest crisis in the history of the Sōtō school.” She suggests that Sōjiji in those years in fact came extremely close to realizing its goal of independence (Mross 2009). Two major catalysts for the Sōjiji independence movement were the 1885 poaching for the Eiheiji abbacy of a Sōjiji branch temple abbot, Takiya Takushū 瀧谷琢宗 (1836-1897), and the 1891 election to succeed him, in which a priest who served at Sōjiji itself, Morita Goyū 森田悟由 (1834-1915),⁶³ defeated Nishiari Bokusan, whose supporters contested the results and decried the election as illegitimate.⁶⁴ Sōjiji partisans complained that the election of Morita, like that of Takiya, “deprived Sōjiji of its best personnel while giving Eiheiji too much authority over Sōjiji branch temples” (Bodiford 1993, 83). Competing associations representing the two temples sprung up in the late 1880s and in 1892 a Sōjiji faction persuaded the Sōjiji abbot Azegami Baisen 畔上榊仙 (1825-1901) to declare Sōjiji’s independence, withdrawing recognition of

management of sectarian affairs upon the 1877 elimination of the Ministry of Doctrine (*Kyōbushō*). See Jaffe 1998, 61, 61n.

⁶¹ See Kawaguchi 2002, 638–651.

⁶² See Lobreglio 2009, 86–87; Ikeda 1998, 36–37; and Scarangelo 2012, 297–304.

⁶³ Riggs notes that Morita “held several high level administrative positions at both Eiheiji and Sōjiji.” She cites his work on the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* (see below) as evidence that, borrowing the phrase from Bodiford, he “worked hard to calm relations between these two head temples” (Diane Elizabeth Riggs 2010, 258; Bodiford 1993, 83). For a list of his posts at Eiheiji and Sōjiji, see ZGD, 1229b.

⁶⁴ See Section Three below; the hagiographies of Nishiari claim that Nishiari lost only because ballots on which the difficult character *boku* 穆 were miswritten were invalidated. (See for example NBZ, 31).

Eiheiji and its branch temples and nullifying all past agreements between the temples.⁶⁵ This declaration could not stand, however, in light of the Ministry of Home Affairs' ruling that the 1885 *shūsei*, and by extension the terms of the 1872 truce, were legally binding. Azegami was thereupon dismissed by the government from his concurrent post as president of the Sōtō headquarters (*shūmuchō*), and Nishiari and Morita were ordered to share the post. The intervention of the government and the demotion of Azegami further riled up the advocates of Sōjiji's independence, and by 1893 the threat of a splintering was so acute that the Ministry intervened again, this time forcing Azegami to resign the Sōjiji abbacy. In 1894, in a symbolic show of reconciliation and unity, the Eiheiji abbot Morita also resigned. Shortly thereafter, new Sōtōshū regulations were established to clarify the abbatial election process and to affirm the temples' unity, and Azegami and Morita both resumed their head temple abbacies. Bodiford writes:

At this time, Sōtō leaders proclaimed the compromise doctrines of “two head temples, one sect” and “two patriarchs, one essence.” Officially, any independent veneration of Sōjiji or Eiheiji was to serve as veneration of both. Likewise, any differences between the doctrines were to be viewed as alternate expressions of the same religious teaching. (Bodiford 1993, 82–84)

Standardizing Standards: The Tōjō Gyōji Kihan (1889)

A major aspect of the collaboration between Eiheiji and Sōjiji, as noted, was the composition of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* 洞上行持軌範 (“The Standard Observances of the Followers of Tōzan”), a text that made great strides towards the unification and homogenization of the Sōtō sect.⁶⁶ There is no English account of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* as a Meiji

⁶⁵ Azegami, who trained alongside Nishiari Bokusan under Gettan Zenryū 月潭全龍 and preceded him as Sōjiji abbot, is major figure in Meiji Sōtō institutional history. For a brief biography, see ZGD 7a.

⁶⁶ The term I have hesitantly translated “followers of Tōzan,” Tōjō 洞上, is used commonly in early Meiji writing to refer to Sōtō 曹洞, and all English translations of the term that I have come across simply render it “Sōtō.” I object to this primarily because I find it incoherent for an English translation to render one Japanese word with another Japanese word. I also, suspect, however, that those using the term in the Meiji were making a conscious decision to avoid the term Sōtō. While the character *Tō* 洞 is universally understood to refer to Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (807–869, J. Tōzan Ryōkai), Kawaguchi describes early Meiji debates on the question of whether the *Sō* 曹 character refers to the sixth ancestor Huineng 慧能 (638–713, J. Enō), known also by the place name Caoyi 曹溪 (J. Sōkei), or to a later

era document; even Foulk, who has commented on and translated a later edition of the text in full, does little to situate its roots in the Meiji or to describe it as expressive of the aims and exigencies characteristic of that period.⁶⁷ The *Tōjō gyōji kihan* is not simply an objective or common-sense compilation from an array of prior rules texts, however, and I believe that it is best understood in its Meiji context of Sōtō unification and identity creation.

On the heels of the 1885 *Sōtōshū shūsei*, and at a critical point of cooperation between Eiheiji and Sōjiji, the abbots Azegami Baisen of Sōjiji and Takiya Takushū of Eiheiji announced their collaboration on a rules text. Watanabe cites the text of the 1886 announcement:

一宗一躰ノ法規ヲ確定センコトヲ要ス然ルニ行法ハ規式多端ニシテ咄嗟ニ両一ヲ講シ難シ自今凡ソ五ヶ年ヲ期シテ改正規則ヲ編纂セシム可シ (Watanabe 1983, 134)

Despite the need to define the procedures and regulations of ‘a single sect with a single body,’ the practices in the procedural codes are numerous, and it is difficult to quickly organize them into one. We will compile revised standards within approximately five years.

Two years later this promise yielded the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*. The preface to the text names the editors, all high level Sōtō sect officials with connections to Sōjiji, Eiheiji, or both: Morita Goyū, Kitano Genpō 北野元峰 (1842-1933),⁶⁸ and Ōtori Shungei 鴻春倪 (d. 1926).⁶⁹ They were

ancestor, the disciple of Dongshan named Caoshan Benji 曹山本寂 (840–901, J. Sōzan Honjaku) (Kawaguchi 2002, 373–377). I can’t help but to speculate that the choice of Tōjō was a way for a Meiji author to skirt the controversy and to avoid using a term whose referent was contested. While it is tempting to further speculate that the term Tōjō faded as did the Meiji iteration of the controversy over the referent of Sō (Foulk makes reference to a more recent iteration), it may in fact be less a question of “Tōjō” fading so much as “Sōtō” ascending as the sect was increasingly codified under the official designation “Sōtōshū.” Foulk notes that “the members of this tradition in China are also referred to as 洞家, 洞上; and 洞下,” which indicates that Meiji authors had ample precedent for the use of Tōjō (*Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, “曹洞宗,” article by Griffith Foulk).

⁶⁷ Foulk’s translation is called *Standard Observances of the Sōtō Zen School*, based on the 1966 revision, *Shōwa shutei Sōtōshū gyōji kihan* 昭和修訂曹洞宗行持規範 (Foulk 2010a).

⁶⁸ Kitano, like Morita, is remembered for his hard work towards stabilize the sect during the Eiheiji-Sōjiji conflicts, and in 1918 he became the sixty-seventh abbot of Eiheiji. See ZGD, 202b.

⁶⁹ References to Ōtori are scarce, but Scarangello provides his death date and identifies him as the third post-reconstruction abbot of Sōjiji. He notes that “despite his importance to Meiji period Sōtō, [he] left few independently authored texts to posterity” (Scarangello 2012, 320). (Scarangello’s research has led him to read the name as Kō, while I follow a reference in the supplement to the 1966 *Shōwa shutei Sōtōshū gyōji kihan* and prefer Ōtori [Sōtōshū shūmuchō 1988, 1].)

said to have begun their work in the first month of 1888 and to have completed it by the eleventh month of the same year (Sōtōshū shūmuchō 1889, 1).

The next year, 1889, the abbots Azegami and Takiya made an official declaration of the orthodoxy of the text:

明治校訂洞上行持軌範編纂完成ヲ告ケタルニ由リ茲ニ之ヲ
頒布セシム宗内僧侶一般ニ修習シテ従前区々ノ行持ヲ廃止シ
明治廿四年一月一日以後同一ニ此ノ軌範ヲ遵行スヘシ
(Tokuno 2010, 22)

We hereby announce the completion of the compilation of a Meiji edition of the *Standard Observances of the Followers of Tōzan* and distribute it, abolishing the various observances that have previously been ordinarily practiced by the clergy within the sect. These standards must be observed effective the first of the year of Meiji 24 [1891].

As Jansen has observed of the Meiji “restoration” of political and cultural traditions in general, here too we can see that “‘tradition’ itself was declared finalized” (Jansen 2000, 493). Rhetorically at least, the announcement abolishes in a single stroke what was centuries of diversity in regional and temple-specific observances, as well as a slew of practices transmitted independently in master-disciple lineages, like now-lost esoteric *kirigami* 切紙 and mantra practices (Watanabe 1983, 132).⁷⁰ I thus take this announcement to be among the defining moments of Sōtō history.

The *Tōjō gyōji kihan* that from that moment superceded all prior practices is a manual of ritual and observances organized around daily, monthly, annual, and occasional observances. Foulk notes the limitations of the English term “ritual” in the discussion of such observances, and while he notes that *gyōji* is the Sino-Japanese term that “comes closest in semantic range” to the English word, in fact *gyōji* “encompasses a very broad range of activities that Zen clergy engage in.” These include sleeping, bathing, eating, and study—“everyday activities” the etiquette and procedures for which are detailed in a text like the *Gyōji kihan* but would likely fall outside of a casual English sense of “ritual” (Foulk 2010b, 23). Following previous textual precedents like *Keizan’s Rules of Purity* (see below), all editions of the text have included what Foulk calls “social rituals and bureaucratic procedures,” like the composition of formal invitations and the appointment of monastic officers, as well as more “religious” and “didactic” elements, like sermons by the abbot, consultations with the abbot, sitting in meditation, chanting, and memorial services (Foulk 2010b, 15–17).

It should be emphasized that there is little doctrinal content to the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* apart from its terse scripts for ritual exchanges and ubiquitous verses for transferring merit (*ekō*

⁷⁰ For a good treatment of *kirigami*, see Ishikawa 2000.

回向). Some doctrinal stances could likely be interpreted or inferred from the choreography and liturgical priorities of the monastic life prescribed, but the text is not the place to look to establish the Meiji Sōtō sect understanding of the function or efficacy of ritual observances or the point of monastic life itself. It is first and foremost a technical manual, and for the orthodox meaning of the observances described in the text, one must look elsewhere, to the *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi*, for instance, which speaks in detail about the efficacy of the formula of repentance (*sange* 懺悔) or the ritual of precept taking (*jukai* 授戒).

The sources and editorial values of the text are succinctly expressed in the words of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* introduction itself:

一 本規ノ必要ハ従前洞上ノ行持法式区々ニ渉レルモノヲ一定セント欲スルニ在リ故ニ其大綱ヲ椶樹林指南記僧堂清規小清規ノ三ニ資ルコノ三規ハ洞上現行ノ法式ニシテ区々ニ渉レルノ根原ナルニ由ル而シテ之ヲ照スニ禪苑清規大清規瑩山清規校定清規備用清規入衆日用清規幻住菴清規勅修百丈清規等ノ諸規ヲ以テシ更ニ各地方叢林ニ別行スル規式並末派僧侶中ノ建言上申及現今不文慣習ノ法ヲ顧ミテ得失ヲ参考シ専ラ時機ニ適応スル行持法ヲ差定セリ

- The need for the present standards comes from our desire to standardize the wide range of observances and ceremonial practices of previous followers of Tōzan. The present standards are drawn from the *Guidelines for the Shōju Grove*,⁷¹ the *Rules of Purity for Sangha Halls*,⁷² and the *Small Eihei Rules of Purity*.⁷³ These three rules texts include a wide range of observances and ceremonial practices of the followers of Tōzan, and we took these as our basis. We also consulted many other standards texts, like the *Rules of Purity for Chan Monasteries*,⁷⁴ the *Large Eihei Rules of*

⁷¹ 椶樹林指南記 *Shōjurin shinanki*, compiled in 1674 by Gesshū Sōko 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696) and his disciple Manzan Dōhaku 卍山道白 (1636-1715) (Foulk 2010b, 8).

⁷² 僧堂清規 *Sōdō shingi*, by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769), published in 1753 (Foulk 2010b, 8).

⁷³ 小清規 *Shō shingi* (abbreviation of 永平小清規 *Eihei shō shingi*), written by Gentō Sokuchū 玄透即中 (1729–1807), published in 1805 (Foulk 2010b, 9).

⁷⁴ 禪苑清規 *Zen'en shingi/Chanyuan qinggui*, compiled in 1103 by Changlu Zongze 長蘆宗曠 (Foulk 2010b, 10). Yifa has produced a full English translation (Yifa 2002).

Purity,⁷⁵ *Keizan's Rules of Purity*,⁷⁶ *the Revised Rules of Purity*,⁷⁷ *the Auxiliary Rules of Purity*,⁷⁸ *the Rules of Purity for Daily Life in the Assembly*,⁷⁹ *the Rules of Purity for the Huanzhu Hermitage*,⁸⁰ and *the Imperial Edition of Baizhang's Rules of Purity*.⁸¹

Moreover, we considered the specific rules and ceremonies of the monasteries of each region, the reported opinions of rank-and-file monks, and those customary procedures which are unwritten. We examined the relative merits of [all of] these and selected only those observances that accord with the times.

一 諸清規ノ異同及ヒ本規ノ採ル処ニシテ尤モ必要ノ箇所ハ本文中ニ挿注シ又ハ其ノ項ノ末尾ニ事由ヲ記シテ得失ヲ示ス (Sōtōshū shūmuchō 1889, 1–2)

- For the present standards we have adopted the most essential passages from these many and divergent pure standards texts. At the end of each passage we note the reason [for its selection] and indicate its relative merits.

Foulk offers a thorough introduction to the *Gyōji kihan* source texts and their intertwining histories, and I will not reproduce his work here (Foulk 2010b, 8–22). The genre of “pure standards” or “rules of purity” (*shingi* 清規) has been discussed especially by Yifa, who,

⁷⁵ 大清規 *Dai shingi* (abbreviation of 永平大清規 *Eihei dai shingi*), also known simply as the 永平清規 *Eihei shingi*, edited in 1794 by Gentō Sokuchū from an earlier 1667 work by Kōshō Chidō 光紹智堂 “who compiled it by piecing together six separate works pertaining to monastic practice that had originally been written by Dōgen” (Foulk 2010b, 9). Leighton and Okumura have translated this text in full (Leighton and Okumura 1996).

⁷⁶ 瑩山清規 *Keizan shingi* (abbreviation of 瑩山和尚清規 *Keizan oshō shingi*), originally composed in 1324 by Keizan and edited by Gesshū Sōko and Manzan Dōhaku in 1678 (Foulk 2010b, 15).

⁷⁷ 校定清規 *Kōtei shingi/Jiaoding qinggui* (abbreviation of 叢林校定清規總要 *Sōrin kōtei shingi sōyō/Conglin jiaoding qinggui zongyao*), compiled in 1274 by Jinhua Weimian 金華惟勉 (Foulk 2010b, 16).

⁷⁸ 備用清規 *Biyō shingi/Beiyong qinggui* (abbreviation for 禪林備用清規 *Zenrin biyō shingi/Chanlin beiyong qinggui*), completed in 1286 by Zeshan Yixian 澤山式咸 and published in 1311 (Foulk 2010b, 16).

⁷⁹ 入衆日用清規 *Nyusshu nichiyō shingi/Ruzhong riyong qinggui*, written in 1209 by Wuliang Zongshou 無量宗壽 (Foulk 2010b, 18).

⁸⁰ 幻住菴清規 *Genjūan shingi/Huanzhu an qinggui*, written in 1317 by the Zhongfen Mingben 中峰明本 (1263-1323) (Foulk 2010b, 15).

⁸¹ 敕修百丈清規 *Chokushū hyakujō shingi/Chixiu baizhang qinggui*, compiled by Dongyang Dehui 東陽德輝 between 1335 and 1338 (Foulk 2010b, 18–19).

following Foulk in disputing traditional notions of a characteristically “Chan” form of monastic life, argues for the genre’s continuity with Chinese Vinaya texts (Yifa 2005; Foulk 1993). Reading the *Gyōji kihan* in this context, Foulk takes the perspective that “the text is heir to a long and varied tradition of adapting and augmenting rules and procedures for Buddhist monastic practice that can be traced all the way back to the earliest Chinese attempts to interpret and implement the Vinaya transmitted from India” and argues that “in surveying the long history of Buddhist monastic practice in East Asia, the continuities with the past that one finds in the *Gyōji kihan* far outweigh the innovations” (Foulk 2010b, 21). Without disputing these continuities, it should be clear that both the production and the content of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* can be understood in terms of the construction of sectarian identity in the Meiji, and that scholars of Meiji Buddhism should take seriously the text’s innovations, or more precisely, its omissions.

One omission in the text to which Foulk does call attention is the conspicuous absence of any reference “in any edition of the *Gyōji kihan*” to the text’s debt to Ōbaku Zen standards. As noted above, Ōbaku Zen, an import from Ming 明 dynasty (1368–1644) China arriving to Japan in the seventeenth century, was first classified by the Meiji government as part of the Rinzaï sect before achieving status as an independent sect. Given the sectarian sensitivities of the time (sensitivities that have persisted to the present edition of the *Gyōji kihan*), it is unsurprising that this major textual source has gone unacknowledged. The large Ming-style monastery Manpukuji 萬福寺, founded with help from the Tokugawa shogunate by Yinyuan Longqi 隱元隆琦 (1592-1673, J. Ingen Ryūki), deeply impressed Japanese Buddhists at the time, and “leaders of the Sōtō and Rinzaï schools of Zen were stimulated to initiate reforms that resulted in the reinstatement of many of the forms of communal monastic training that had been lost in the intervening centuries.” Foulk notes that two of the three primary rules texts taken as the source for the *Gyōji kihan*, the *Shōjurin shinanki* and the *Sōdō shingi*, drew on Yinyuan’s Manpukuji ritual manual, the 1672 *Ōbaku Shingi* 黄檗清規.⁸²

Along with this unacknowledged source detailed by Foulk, the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* preface also includes what Watanabe argues are falsely acknowledged sources. Though in the preface excerpted above the authors claim that “regional,” “reported,” and “unwritten” sources were consulted along with the orthodox textual standards, Watanabe finds very few unwritten customs included in the text, and he dismisses the assertion that regional rules were seriously considered at all. Whatever the preface’s rhetoric of inclusion, it seems that many practices failed to meet the standard of “according with the times.”⁸³

The most striking omission in the text, given the overwhelmingly funerary flavor of contemporary Japanese Buddhism, is the absence of any reference to funeral services. Watanabe and Tokuno, both concerned explicitly about the modern development of funerary

⁸² See Foulk 2010b, 19–20.

⁸³ See Watanabe 1983, 133.

ritual, explore the fact that although some provision remained for memorial observances for Sōtō patriarchs like Dōgen and Keizan, there is no mention at all of funerary rituals, lay or monastic, in the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* (Tokuno 2010; Watanabe 1984). Funeral rituals, though, have undeniably deep roots in the Zen tradition.⁸⁴ Indeed, this area of ritual practice was so central to the Buddhism of the Tokugawa period that some Nativists “perceived Buddhist-style funerals to be the central axis of the Buddhist institutional framework as well as of its social organization” and thus deliberately targeted them, promoting Shintō rituals and in some locales banning Buddhist funerals outright (Ketelaar 1990, 44–45). As Nativist voices dominated the early Meiji government, policies limiting Buddhist funerals and promoting Shintō ones were also adopted at the national level.⁸⁵ The exclusion of funerals from the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*, then, is best understood not as a statement of intrinsic Sōtō sect values but as an attempt to conform to the exigencies of the period. That these rites were among those added in the first revision of the text, in 1918, indicates that they had been waiting just below the surface, and there is little doubt that funerary observances had continued in practice despite their implied proscription by their absence from the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*.

There are other instances of alteration of the *Gyōji kihan* source texts in light of the government policy of religious separation and the national proscriptions of a range of practices Ketelaar calls “potentially subversive” or “carnavalesque.” Among a few examples offered by Watanabe are the *Ryūten* 龍天, the dharma protecting deities honored especially in the New Year, who are deemed overly Shintō and replaced in the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* by Jōhō Shichirō Daigen Shuri Bosatsu 招宝七郎大権修利菩薩, a bodhisattva protector of monasteries introduced to Japan by Dōgen.⁸⁶ Watanabe also looks at the proscription in the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* of the traditional Chinese ceremonial practice of burning paper money and paper horses, which is prohibited on the grounds of being occult (*onmyōteki* 陰陽的).⁸⁷ Further, traditional Japanese observances like year-end mochi pounding (*saimatsu mochitsuki* 歳末餅搗) and the winter’s end bean scattering (*setsubun makimame* 節分撒豆) were deemed “worldly affairs” (*zokuhō* 俗法) and likewise prohibited by the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ For one example among many, see the *Chanyuan qinggui*, a major source for the *Gyōji kihan*, which treats monastic and abbatial funeral services in detail (Yifa 2002, 206–211; 217–219).

⁸⁵ At the national level, the prohibition of Buddhist funerals only ever extended to shrine attendants and their families (Ketelaar 1990, 44–45; 241n1). Even in the absence of a broad legal prohibition, though, there was clearly tremendous pressure from the State to adopt Shintō funerals. See also Collcutt 1986, 149.

⁸⁶ Watanabe notes that later in the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* text a reference remains to the *ryūten*, which he takes as evidence of the unresolved, indeed irresolvable, problem for the text as it struggled to balance Chinese precedent with Meiji political reality.

⁸⁷ The term refers specifically to Onmyōdō 陰陽道 or Tsuchimikado Shintō 土御門神道, occult syncretic systems proscribed early in the Meiji period.

⁸⁸ See Watanabe 1983, 135–136.

For Watanabe, these specific alterations and prohibitions are emblematic of a basic stance in the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* against practices deemed mundane or non-Zen. Those are the very cultural practices, however, that were most important to the laity and indeed constituted what they expected religion to provide. In the case of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*, how could a “restoration” of “pure” Sōtō Zen observances be appealing to a laity accustomed to dealing with religion in terms of this-worldly benefit (*genze riyaku* 現世利益)?⁸⁹ Even though such practices clearly continued post-*Tōjō gyōji kihan*, Watanabe is struck by the inability of the text to compromise on such practices or to reinterpret them in Sōtō terms. Watanabe suggests that later editions of the text are able to strike a more compelling balance, couching funeral practices and lay ceremonies, for example, in terms that conform to Sōtō orthodoxy. He concludes that accommodating the needs of the laity was simply not an aim of the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*. Instead, the text was first and foremost dedicated to the consolidation of the sect as “a single sect of a single branch” (*isshū ippa* 一宗一派) and “a single sect of a single body” (*isshū ittai* 一宗一躰); that is, it aimed for nothing more or less than the creation of an independent, coherent, and singular Sōtōshū.⁹⁰

Standardizing Doctrine: The Sōtō Kyōkai Shushōgi (1890)

This same tension between monastic orthodoxy and popular needs also lies at the heart of the *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* 曹洞教会修証義 (“The Meaning of Practice and Realization in the Sōtō Fellowship”), the other Sōtō text that has lasted well beyond the Meiji.⁹¹ Whereas the *Tōjō gyōji kihan* faces the lay-clerical tension and errs completely on the side of maintaining monastic purity at the cost of the laity, the *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* falls at the opposite extreme, effacing basic Sōtō monastic practice in an attempt to connect with the needs of the laity. Somewhere between the two may lie a sustainable balance, and despite the inability of each of these core texts to capture the entirety of what Meiji Sōtō needed to offer, it was perhaps in the stability of the tension between the two that the sect was able to craft an identity and thrive through the Meiji period and beyond.

The *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* is perhaps the single most important Sōtō document of the modern period and without question remains the best known doctrinal statement in the sect. Heine, for example, calls it the “crucial factor in the continuing popularity of Sōtō Zen,” suggests

⁸⁹ For an account of the kinds of “this worldly” services provided to the laity in Tokugawa Sōtō Zen, see Williams 2005. For the centrality in “Japanese common religion” of “this worldly benefit” see Reader and Tanabe 1998.

⁹⁰ See Watanabe 1983, 136–138.

⁹¹ Many English translations of this text exist, including a version by Foulk 2001.

that it is the primary means by which the work of the Sōtō patriarch Eihei Dōgen 永平道元 (1200-1253) has been known in modern times, and shows that leading sectarian scholars consistently attribute the text to much of the success and popularity of the Sōtō sect in modern Japan (Heine 2003, 170–172, 188n).⁹² Ikeda usefully situates the *Shushōgi* in the context of the lay Buddhist movement, calling the text the primary legacy of the formative period of teaching assemblies and lay societies in Meiji Sōtō (Ikeda 1998, 39). Following that lead, I will leave aside the vexed questions of the text’s fidelity to Dōgen or “Dōgen’s intent,” and in what follows I will consider the text in its context as a Meiji composition and show that it is a result of the various pressures characteristic of Meiji Buddhism, including, among others, the need to craft a compelling path of lay understanding and devotion, the political imperatives to clarify sect doctrine, and the sense among Buddhist leaders that the success of Christianity was related to its “textual unity” and repentance mechanisms.

The Sōtō sect in the early Meiji struggled to effectively reach laypeople, who were vulnerable to the general anti-Buddhist mood of the time, and who, as noted in Section One, with the collapse of the *danka* system of mandatory temple registration, were increasingly less of a captive audience and more like the religious consumers of the modern period, exercising freedom to choose between the many sectarian brands of *anjin* (安心, “peace of mind” or, more freely, “spiritual assurance”). While Sōtō was not the only sect to face this challenge, it was hampered by the strictures of its own tradition, as Scarangelo describes:

Some sects were fortunate enough to have inherited the worship of a paradigmatic Buddha possessing extremely inclusive forms of corporeality, or founder figures who had enumerated teachings that more easily facilitated the incorporation of diverse practices and practitioners into the sect. Modern Sōtō’s traditional resources made it difficult to appeal to the laity or a wide range of diverse practices. Its paradigmatic Buddha embodied an ascetic ideal, and when plumbing the founder’s ideas for the

⁹² Dumoulin and Kim have also weighed in on the centrality of the text in modern Sōtō; see Dumoulin 2005, 414; H.-J. Kim 2004, 6, 254n12). Reader writes: “The text was the product of a particular era... but it has continued to function to this day as the sect’s standard teaching. Many sect publications nowadays are based on the *Shushōgi* and the gradual, precept-oriented path it represents lies at the heart of modern Sōtō outlooks” (Reader 1985, 34). Lobreglio notes that indeed, the four themes of the *Shushōgi* and the dual teachings of *zenkai ichinyo* and *shushō funi* (see below) remain to this day enshrined as the core of Sōtō orthodoxy in the Sōtōshū Constitution (*Sōtōshū shūken* 曹洞宗宗憲) (Lobreglio 2009, 90n28). I would add that the text itself ranks just below the primary works of Keizan in the modern Constitution’s list of definitive texts. As Heine points out, and my own experience corroborates, it is significant that this major text of Sōtō Zen has had a barely discernable impact on “convert”/non-Asian Western Zen (Heine 2003, 188).

enumeration of a coherent lay soteriology early Sōtō leaders found little to work with. Nevertheless, the preservation of identity and uniqueness vis-à-vis other sects demanded an orientation towards Śakyamuni and the teachings of the monk Dōgen Kigen. (Scarangelo 2012, 45)

While the Sōtōshū headquarters had in 1876 and 1885 alike included regulations for teachings assemblies (*kyōkai* 教会) and lay societies (*kessha* 結社) in their formal sectarian prescriptions (*shūsei*), and had made efforts to increase their involvement in and oversight of their lay base, Ikeda has found that between 1872 and 1888 the vast Sōtō establishment of over 14,300 temples could claim only 113 official teaching assemblies and lay societies (Ikeda 1998, 35–36). The official attempts to propagate a central Sōtō doctrine and devotional path to the laity were badly failing.

At the same time, lay Buddhist movements, understanding themselves as outside of the religious institutions and to some degree nonreliant on clergy, were thriving. Snodgrass calls this *zaike bukkyō* a “non-institutional lay practice” and suggests that, despite some strong anti-clerical and anti-establishment rhetoric, “the thrust of the movement should be understood as providing lay access to Buddhism parallel to the continuing institutional forms rather than replacing them” (Snodgrass 2003, 126). A giant among these lay activists was Ōuchi Seiran, some of whose efforts have been noted above, a Sōtō sect layman whose father was a Sōtō sect member and whose mother followed the Jōdoshinshū. Ōuchi asserted that the Buddhist laity were “the same as their *shukke* [出家] masters,” and “seriously suggested that lay Buddhism be made the main thrust of the religion to replace clergy-centered Buddhism.”

Ōuchi’s involvement in the text that would become the *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* began in 1887 when he founded the “Association for the Support of Sōtō” (*Sōtō fushūkai* 曹洞扶宗会). This umbrella organization came to have over 1,100 confraternities, and by 1889 over 80% of Sōtō sect abbots were members. Ōuchi started this organization “as a league and lay society with the objective of designing a clear method for teaching lay persons, a task that had already been identified as a central issue in the ‘Sōtō Sect Regulations for Teaching Assemblies’ enacted in 1876.”⁹³ As Reader has pointed out, the Sōtō lay organizations like the *fushūkai* were modelled on the strong lay organizations of the Pure Land schools, which activists noted were also the sects which were faring best in “weathering the trials of the Meiji period.” He also notes that while the primary aim of the society had been “to provide basic guidance for the laity” eventually, “with the involvement of leading priests, and in light of the need for some guidance for priests as well, this organization... soon began to influence the overall teaching notions of the sect.”⁹⁴

⁹³ See Ikeda 1998, 35-39.

⁹⁴ See Reader 1985, 36. He translates the name “Sōtō Aid Society.”

Under Ōuchi's leadership, the *Sōtō fushūkai* sponsored the compilation, distribution, and publicization of a text called the *Tōjō zaike shushōgi* 洞上在家修証義 ("The meaning of Practice and Realization for the Lay Followers of Tōzan"). According to Heine, Ōuchi is said to have prepared for the task of composing the *Shushōgi*, which involved editing Dōgen down to the size of a short doctrinal summary, by reading the full *Shōbōgenzō* seven times; whatever the basis of that claim, there is no doubt that considerable scholarship went into the text's production. Heine further writes that "the publication of the *Shushōgi* was the result of a complex process of editing that actually evolved over a period of seventy years based on consulting forty to fifty medieval and early modern commentaries on the *Shōbōgenzō*," and he notes the text's debt to prior compilations of lay-friendly Dōgen excerpts.⁹⁵ Appreciating the extraordinary scholastic effort involved in the composition, Kim follows Kagashima Hiroyuka in assigning the creation of the text a role in the development of scholarly methodologies in the school:

The task of making the work required some unexpectedly painstaking efforts relative to linguistic, textual, and literary studies of *Shōbōgenzō*. These efforts gave an impetus in subsequent years to genuinely scholarly and systematic endeavors for basic research. (H.-J. Kim 2004, 254n12)

However deep the grounding of Ōuchi's scholarship and sources, however, he was not primarily concerned with staying consistent with the overall thrust of Dōgen's work or with honoring the precedents of Dōgen interpretation. His clear and overriding aim was rather to provide a platform for Sōtō lay propagation and to represent Sōtō orthodoxy and orthopraxis as congenial to the needs and capacities of the laity. As Scarangelo notes in the passage cited above, the mainstream of traditional Sōtō rhetoric revolved around the practice of *zazen* 座禪 and monastic conduct, points unlikely to generate much enthusiasm in the lay community. Reader draws on Ōuchi's own writings to illustrate his attitude about the project:

[According to his comments on the *Shushōgi*, Ōuchi] was convinced that it was essential to focus on areas which would not cause the laity too much difficulty: anything problematic would have the effect of driving potential followers away to Christianity or the Pure Land sects, which he considered provided easy and accessible teachings that were certain to attract lay support. He therefore rejected *zazen* as a major plank in the Sōtō sect's lay teaching: although he recognised that it was fundamental to Dōgen's Zen as well as being an activity he personally regarded as

⁹⁵ These include Menzan Zuihō's eighteenth century *Eihei Kakun* and its early nineteenth century successors, the *Tōjō Shōshūketsu* 洞上正宗訣 and the *Eihei Shōshū kun* 永平正宗訓 by Honshū Yūran 幽蘭本秀 (d. 1847). See Heine 2003, 178; ZGD, 1246a.

beneficial, he felt it demanded too much effort, time, pain, and commitment for the average layman to want to become involved in its practice. It was omitted because it was felt to be a liability towards attracting followers.

Indeed, there is strong evidence that Ōuchi pressed for the adoption of a nembutsu-style recitation, along the lines of that used by Pure Land sects, as the basis for Sōtō lay practice, on the grounds that it was easy to perform, but had to abandon the idea as he could not find any justification for such a practice in Dōgen's writings. However, he did manage to find adequate justification for a practice based on the taking of precepts (*jukai*). (Reader 1985, 37)

Its departures from Sōtō precedent notwithstanding, Ōuchi's *Tōjō zaïke shushōgi* succeeded in outlining an approach that resonated with the lay Sōtō community. The immediate popularity of the text and the growing influence of Ōuchi's *Sōtō fushūkai* was not lost on the Sōtō establishment, which moved to coopt the process by incorporating the organization into the official sect teaching assemblies and by adopting the *Shushōgi* as an official Sōtō text, both of which were achieved at the general sect assembly (*kaigi*) of 1889 (Ikeda 1998, 38–39).

After adopting Ōuchi's text, however, the sect leaders set out to edit it. Understanding that the text would come to define Sōtō orthodoxy, its content was fiercely debated. There was no consensus even at the top of the sect hierarchy, and Scarangelo, for example, has shown how even so deeply embedded an institutional figure as Nishiari Bokusan could find himself at odds with the emerging orthodoxy (Scarangelo 2012, 315–316). Just as with the *Tōjō gyōji kihan*, this involved a categorization of previously accepted Sōtō doctrines and practices into what Lobreglio has called “orthodox,” “heterodox,” or “heretical,” as “a multiplicity of beliefs and practices was reduced to a singular, official statement of Sōtō doctrine.” Involved in a “conscious distancing both from traditional ideas and practices deemed overly elitist, as well as from popular practices long associated with Sōtō that risked transgressing contemporary epistemic sensibilities,” the sectarian leadership in editing the *Shushōgi* deemed, for instance, the practices of *Shaka nembutsu* 釈迦念仏 and *Amida nembutsu* 阿弥陀念仏 heterodox, and the worship of the Bodhisattva Kannon 観音 heretical.⁹⁶

Lobreglio details some of the intense debates in the sect of how to move forward with a statement of Sōtō doctrine, how to deal with the distinction between monastic and lay, and which practices and doctrines to deem heretical and which to deem orthodox. Like other commentators, he sees in the *Shushōgi* a definitive move towards the effacing of the monastic-lay distinction, a move most blatant in the striking deletion of the term “laity” (*zaïke*) from the

⁹⁶ See Lobreglio 2009, 77.

title of the text, a revision made by Eiheiiji abbot Takiya Takushū that in a stroke removed the text from its original lay context and set it up to define orthodoxy for clerics and laity alike.⁹⁷ He also discusses the establishment of Shakyamuni and the Three Treasures themselves over Amida or Kannon as the main object of reverence in the sect, reflecting the modern needs for historical verifiability and the understanding of religions as based in a “historical founder.” In addition to eschewing popular practices like *nembutsu*, the text also abandoned themes deemed overly elitist, striking all mention of *zazen* or *satori* 悟 and affirming the identity of Sōtō as “self-powered” (*jiriki*) rather than “other-powered” (*tarikiki*). In place of the practices, doctrines, and objects of worship that the text rejected was installed an “ethics-centered” manifestation of Western scientific and Protestant “epistemic values.”

In the end, after the contested process of revision, especially at the hand of Eiheiiji abbot Takiya Takushū, “in all, about half of Ōuchi’s text was changed” (Reader 1985, 38). While Reader is relatively cavalier about the implications of these changes, suggesting that “some more philosophical aspects [were] added, but the basics remained the same,” Lobreglio’s more thorough work is adamant at their importance, going so far as to call the revisions by Takiya a “Copernican Revolution” in Sōtō.⁹⁸

The final, authorized edition of the text was published as the *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* in 1890 by the Sōtōshū, and the orthodoxy of the new text for lay and cleric alike was affirmed by a joint edict issued in 1892 by the abbots of both head temples, Takiya and Azegami. Coming as it did near the peak of the Sōjiji independence movement of 1892-1894, this joint edict was a major, if insufficient, show of cooperation between the rival temples.

The *Sōtō kyōkai shushōgi* presents “a progressively-structured, ethics-centered religious path that focuses upon the practices of repentance, taking precepts, vowing, and regular expressions of gratitude” (Lobreglio 2009, 90). The text is organized into five sections, largely keeping the form of Ōuchi’s text: a “General Introduction” (*sōjo* 總序) that emphasizes impermanence and the certainty of karmic retribution as an impetus to engage in good action; “Repenting and Eliminating Bad Karma” (*sange metsuzai* 懺悔滅罪); “Receiving Precepts and Joining the Ranks” (*jukai nyūi* 受戒入位); “Making the Vow to Benefit Beings” (*hotsugan rishō*

⁹⁷ Lobreglio also argues that given the evaporation of a meaningful distinction already between clerical and lay in the aftermath of *nikujiki saitai*, the *Shushōgi*’s effacement of the difference between the two can be seen as “an attempt to craft a religious teaching that reflected this new *de facto* clerical reality” (Lobreglio 2009, 96)

⁹⁸ See Reader 1985, 38; Lobreglio 2009, 90–95.

發願利生); and “Practicing Buddhism and Repaying Blessings” (*gyōji hōon* 行持報恩).⁹⁹ Much could be said about the content of the text, but here I will limit myself to an account of a few of its most striking features.

Lobreglio calls the *Shushōgi* a “patchwork” from the *Shōbōgenzō*, noting that the text’s “surface integrity belies a remarkable collage of sentences, indeed even phrases, that have been stitched together from chronologically and thematically distinct loci in Dōgen’s extensive corpus” (Lobreglio 2009, 90). Indeed, in reading the *Shushōgi* with reference to its *Shōbōgenzō* sources, it becomes clear that these “patches” are in some cases cut so small that virtually anything at all could have been constructed from them; the *Shōbōgenzō* here is not a root text being abridged, but is instead a kind of alphabet with which a nearly limitless range of doctrines could be composed from the words of the founder. Heine derides the claim, persisting even among contemporary scholars, that the *Shushōgi* serves as a good synopsis and introduction to the *Shōbōgenzō*, and recalls the warning of Ōuchi Seiran, who himself cautioned against trying to understand the *Shōbōgenzō* through the *Shushōgi* (Heine 2003, 172, 188n9).

As noted, a striking feature of the text is the absence of any reference to *zazen*, or, as Lobreglio notes, the use of the character *Zen* 禪 at all. The central practice of Sōtō in the *Shushōgi* is precepts: “the whole text of the *Shushōgi* represents an alteration of the focus of Dōgen’s Zen, setting out a structured, gradual path in which the taking of Buddhist precepts (by implication under the auspices of the Sōtō sect) has become the central and most vital stage” (Reader 1985, 34). This effacing of the practice of *zazen* from Dōgen’s teachings is based on the principle of *zenkai ichinyo* 禪戒一如, the oneness of Zen and precepts, a notion found in Dōgen but foregrounded in the work of the influential Tokugawa period Sōtō exegete Banjin Dōtan 萬仞道坦 (1698-1775). The *Shushōgi* blends the logic of *zenkai ichinyo* and the doctrine of *shushō funi* 修証不二, the non-distinction of practice and realization, to assert the identity of precepts with enlightenment. That is, that practice—*zazen*—which is for Dōgen *the* practice that is nondual with realization, is here replaced with the practices of receiving precepts and ritual confession, but this replacement is made without disrupting the underlying logic of the identity of practice and enlightenment. The text thus preserves the logic of Dōgen but replaces his core terms, creating a novel doctrine of precept ritual as Buddhist awakening.

⁹⁹ Chapter titles are drawn from Sōtō Zen Translation Project (Foulk). Ikeda renders *sange metsuzai* as “annihilation of faults by repentance”; *jukai nyūi* as “entrance in to the position [of a Buddha] by taking the precepts”; *hotsugan rishō* as “benefiting sentient beings by formulating vows; and *gyōji hōon* as “repaying gratitude by steadfast practice” (Ikeda 1998, 39). Heine describes the sections as follows: “understanding the Problem of life-and-death and the universality of karmic retribution”; “penitence leading to the eradication of evil karma”; “receiving the sixteen precepts”; “benefiting others through a vow of benevolence”; and, “expressing gratitude by means of constant practice” (Heine 2003, 171).

Along with precepts, in the “ethics-centered” approach of the text there is a strong emphasis on karma and repentance.¹⁰⁰ It is not merely the emphasis in the *Shushōgi* on repentance that strikes Heine, “rather, the point is that the *Shushōgi* emphasizes a specific and perhaps rather extreme approach to repentance, that is, the notion of the eradication or elimination of sins, transgressions, or defilements according to the notion of [*s*]ange metsuzai.” He notes that this power of a mechanical ritual of repentance to automatically eradicate evil karma is the object of much of the contemporary critique leveled against mainstream Sōtō by so-called Critical Buddhism (*hihan bukkyō* 批判仏教). Heine also distinguishes this brand of *sange metsuzai* from Dōgen’s well-attested sense of a more “stern, puritanical, and unforgiving attitude consistent with the earliest Zen Buddhist monastic rules” as well as from the “formless repentance” of the Platform Sutra and the “metanoesis” (*sangedō* 懺悔道) of Tanabe Hajime’s postwar philosophy.¹⁰¹

Where then, does this “rather extreme approach” to repentance come from? While it is possible to find inklings of the approach in Dōgen, Heine argues instead that “Ōuchi Seiran and other Meiji lay leaders created a view of repentance in *Shushōgi* based in large part on the challenge of Christianity during the Westernization process.” He describes how the successes of both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism were imitated in the conceptualization and composition of the *Shushōgi*. Drawing on Christian strategies that, as noted above, allowed the lay community “greater access to salvific truth,” the text reflects the Protestant use of decontextualized Biblical quotation in sermons and rituals, as well as the Roman Catholic emphasis on the “redemptive power of confession.”¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Heine’s analysis of the *Shushōgi*, drawing on substantial Japanese scholarship on the text, demonstrates that it is primarily drawn from, and reflects the teachings of, the so-called “twelve fascicle *Shōbōgenzō*,” from what Heine has called the “late-late” period of Dōgen. This correlation is particularly striking in that the existence of the twelve fascicle *Shōbōgenzō* as such was not verified until 1930, well after the publication of the *Shushōgi*. (For more on Heine’s periodization of Dōgen, see Heine 2006.) As the character of the fascicles of that late edition, however, cluster around issues of karma and repentance, it is not coincidental that the compilers of the *Shushōgi* were drawn to those fascicle in their search for Dōgen excerpts to express their emphasis on the same themes. In light of the clear emphasis in the *Shushōgi* from texts in the twelve fascicle edition, Heine expresses dismay that “many commentators continue to echo a fallacious idea that the *Shushōgi* contains passages from each and every one of the ninety-five *Shōbōgenzō* fascicles.” See Heine 2003, 180–183, 191n.

¹⁰¹ See Heine 2003, 173, 184–186.

¹⁰² See Heine 2003, 174. Robert Sharf has reminded me, however, that there is likewise a long Buddhist tradition of extracting and decontextualizing scripture, and that to associate such moves exclusively with Protestantism may be to overlook that Buddhist exegetical heritage.

Dōgen for the Meiji: The Genzōe (1905)

While the *Shushōgi* was a novel development that went far afield of the themes of *Shōbōgenzō* even while it used the text's own words, another expression of the renewed interest in Dōgen in the Meiji emerged later in the form of the institutionalization of the characteristic modern Sōtō exegetical format known as the *genzōe* 眼藏会 (“[True Dharma] Eye Treasury Assembly”). The *genzōe* consists of a series of formal lectures (*teishō* 提唱) delivered by a Sōtō cleric who, in a formal temple context and to an audience of clergy, laity, or both, reads and comments line-by-line on a given fascicle of Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*. This format is a significant Meiji development in the Sōtō sect that must be understood in the context of the growing identity of the Sōtō sect with Dōgen and the *Shōbōgenzō*, the rise of the Buddhist universities, and the nascent secular study of Dōgen.

It must be emphasized that the commonplace equations of Sōtō Zen with Dōgen and of Dōgen with the *Shōbōgenzō* are both modern phenomena. Dōgen did of course play an important role in Sōtō identity long before the Meiji period, especially, as Bodiford notes, at Eihei-ji, where his prestige and legacy was actively, consciously, and self-servingly promoted (Bodiford 2012a). The resurgence of his teaching and his increased importance in the coalescence of Sōtō identity in the Meiji was the result not only of the broader movement to clarify and codify sectarian boundaries but also, as Heine argues, a parallel trend of the time towards the renewed glorification of the traditional sect founders (Heine 2003, 175).

For Bodiford, the centrality of Dōgen to the Sōtō sectarian identity is largely the result of several hundred years of concerted public relations efforts by Eihei-ji, whose status and very survival in its rivalry with Sōjiji depended upon its ability to maintain the prominence of Dōgen as the chief patriarch of the sect and to preserve the status of Eihei-ji as the “sacred locus” for his veneration (Bodiford 2012a). The identity of Dōgen, in turn, with the *Shōbōgenzō* is a particular Meiji version of this long-standing Eihei-ji tradition of Dōgen promotion, and Bodiford emphatically reminds us that “the Dōgen of the *Shōbōgenzō*, the Dōgen who is held up as a profound religious philosopher, is a fairly recent innovation... Instead, it is the Dōgen of sectarian agendas, the Dōgen who stands above Keizan, the Dōgen who works miracles, and so forth, who commanded the memory of earlier generations of Japanese” (Bodiford 2012a, 222). He furthermore notes that, “[s]ince the early 20th century, the *Shōbōgenzō* has become the preeminent source for Dōgen's teaching” whereas, “prior to the 20th century, the general public knew of Dōgen's teachings primarily on the basis of his recorded sayings (*goroku* 語録)” (Bodiford 2012b, 20,22).

In fact, Bodiford shows that prior to last decades of the Tokugawa period, the *Shōbōgenzō* was largely unread. This was the result of a process by which access to Japanese Sōtō texts was increasingly restricted, valued as secret transmissions rather than public

teachings. Bodiford suggests that this process began as early as the late fourteenth century and culminated in the early sixteenth century, by which time “Dōgen *Shōbōgenzō* had become more important as a symbol of religious authority than as a religious text” (Bodiford 1993, 135). Chinese texts remained publicly available, forming the basis of Sōtō sermons, but Japanese texts had become temple treasures to be “hoarded,” and it was their possession, rather than their exegesis, that granted religious authority. Bodiford summarizes the subsequent status of the *Shōbōgenzō* into the Tokugawa period:

Even after textual learning was revived during the early Tokugawa period, most Japanese Sōtō monks studied only well-known Chinese Buddhist scriptures or classic Chinese Zen texts. Eventually, a few scholarly monks like Menzan Zuihō [面山瑞方, 1683-1769] began to study Dōgen’s writings, but they were the exception. Even when scholarly monks read Dogen’s writings, they usually did not lecture on them to their disciples. In fact, from 1722 until 1796, the government authorities actually prohibited the publication or dissemination of any part of Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō*.” (Bodiford 2012a, 220)

The first publication of the *Shōbōgenzō* after the ban was lifted in 1796 was not completed until 1815, by Eiheiji, and with its publication the *Shōbōgenzō* began gradually to gain momentum as a text a Sōtō cleric might study rather than simply covet and revere.

The renewed interest in the Meiji period on Dōgen, with its new emphasis on the *Shōbōgenzō*, and the view of emerging view of Dōgen as a “religious philosopher,” can be understood in the context of the rise of secular study of Buddhism and the influence of Western academic methodologies, as discussed in Section One. While the explosion of secular interest in Dōgen and the emergence of Dōgen Studies as a secular field in its own right dates from the Taishō period work of Watsuji Tetsurō 和辻哲郎 (1889-1960), from early in the Meiji period Western critical methodologies were impacting Sōtō, and the Sōtō approach to Dōgen, just as they were influencing sectarian studies across all of the sects in the Meiji. Indeed it was a Sōtō priest, Hara Tanzan, who gave the first university lectures on Buddhism, at Tōkyō University in 1879 (Snodgrass 2003, 139). He “was convinced, as were others, that Buddhists had to adopt some of the textual and scientific methods of Western religious scholarship in their own study and teaching” (Collcutt 1986, 166). Sōtō clerics like Nishiari Bokusan and Teizan Sokuichi 鼎三即一 (1805-1892) were, in Mohr’s words, “trying to raise the level of Sōtō scholarship” through textual critical and exegetical work. The publication in 1879 of Teizan’s emendation of Koun Ejō’s 孤雲懷奘 (1198-1280) *Kōmyōzō zanmai* 光明藏三昧 marks what Mohr calls “the beginning of a new wave of publications aimed at fostering Sōtō sectarian studies (*shūgaku*)” (Mohr 1998, 178–179). It is in this context of sectarian scholarship that the *genzōe* was established and thrived.

Tradition holds that the origins of the *genzōe* lay in the concern felt by the Eiheiiji abbot, Morita Goyū, over the neglect of the *Shōbōgenzō* by Sōtō scholars. In this 1905 statement from the first *genzōe*, Oka Sōtan 丘宗潭 (1860-1921) expresses the *genzōe* origin tradition:

高祖は五百生の善知識たり。六代以上の人。其の著す所の正法眼蔵、仏知見を開発し復た余蘊なし。維新以後、宗門の学徒、専ら天台華嚴等の教乗を攻め、復た正法眼蔵を顧みず、高祖の宗風、將に地を払わんとす。永平現董勅特賜性海慈船禪師久しく之を憂え、常に墜緒を挽回せんと欲す。今茲に山野をして、高祖真前に就いて、正法眼蔵を提唱せしむ。(Fueoka 1972, 4)¹⁰³

The eminent ancestor [Dōgen] is a wise friend and guide to many beings. He surpasses the emperors of old. His *Shōbōgenzō* reveals Buddha's wisdom, with nothing extraneous. After the [Meiji] Restoration, sectarian scholars worked exclusively with the teachings of the Tendai and Kegon schools, ignoring the *Shōbōgenzō* such that the winds of Dōgen's teaching were on the verge of being lost from the world. Eihei Gentō, of the imperially-bestowed name Zen Master Shōkai Jisen, [Morita Goyū] has long lamented this, wishing to recover the dropped thread. Here, now, bumpkin that I am, sincerely following the eminent ancestor [Dōgen], I lecture on the *Shōbōgenzō*."

As can be seen from this passage, the study of the *Shōbōgenzō* for Oka, Morita, and other leaders was inexorably tied to the success of the Sōtō sect. The *Shōbōgenzō* here is a rallying point, a text that could be used to establish a common Sōtō sectarian identity that cut across the factions, lineages, branches, and regions to pull together the diverse "Sōtō" teachings and establish the "a single sect of a single body."

This first *genzōe*, offered by Oka Sōtan at Eiheiiji, spanned a seventy day period from the fifth to seventh months of 1905. The following year, the time allotted was reduced to a sixty day period, concluding in the sixth month, and the lecturers were to vary among disciples of Nishiari Bokusan.¹⁰⁴ According to Bodiford, this first "*Shōbōgenzō* conference," though just another move in a long public relations campaign by Eiheiiji, was an extremely successful one, indeed one which would set the course for modern Sōtō teaching:

Eiheiiji not only published Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*, but also promoted its study by Sōtō monks and laypeople. Beginning in 1905, Eiheiiji

¹⁰³ This rendering Fueoka's translation from the Classical Japanese (*kanbun* 漢文). According to Fueoka, the original text appeared in a *genzōe* record called *Jishinroku* 磁針録, in the fifth month of 1905.

¹⁰⁴ See Kurebayashi 1972; ZGD, 291d.

organized its first *Shōbōgenzō* conference (*genzōe*). This first *genzōe* was successful beyond all expectations. Since 1905 it has become an annual event at Eiheiiji, and over time, it gradually changed the direction of Sōtō Zen monastic education. In earlier generations, only one Zen teacher, Nishiari Bokusan, is known to have even lectured on how the *Shōbōgenzō* should be read and understood. One of Bokusan's disciples, Oka Sōtan, served as the first leader of the *genzōe*. Sōtan's lectures provided a model that could be emulated by each of the other Zen monks who came to Eiheiiji. This model has become the norm, not the exception. Today every Sōtō Zen teacher lectures on Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*. (Bodiford 2012a, 221)

Attending and presenting these lectures become a standard practice for elite clerics. They also appear to be the primary venue by which eminent clerics like Akino Kōdō 秋野孝道 (1858-1934) and Kishizawa Ian 岸澤維安 (1865-1955) would craft and expound their interpretations of doctrine. While the *genzōe* was technically limited to *Shōbōgenzō* exegesis and referred originally to the Eiheiiji event only, its sensibility and ritual format spilled over into the presentation of other Sōtō texts as it became the preferred mode for doctrinal exegesis generally and spread widely throughout the Sōtō temple network.

SECTION III

The Life of Nishiari Bokusan

Nishiari Bokusan 西有穆山 (1821-1910) is among the preeminent Sōtō Zen clerics of the modern period, best known for his enormously influential three-volume study of Dōgen, the *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* 正法眼藏啓迪.¹⁰⁵ This work, transcriptions by Tomiyama Soei 富山祖英 (1876-1929) of *genzōe*-style lectures Nishiari delivered between 1897 and 1910, is the first and arguably the most important *Shōbōgenzō* commentary in modern Sōtō. With this text, “the basic approach to the interpretation of the *Shōbōgenzō* was settled” and the course was set for the Sōtō sectarian studies (*shūjō* or *shūgaku*) of the twentieth century, establishing an orthodoxy that has only recently begun to be challenged.¹⁰⁶ While doctrinally important, the work is also engaging and readable; in the words of Bielefeldt, it “combines scholarship with a spirited colloquial style and a practical, practice-oriented approach” and “is surely the most popular commentary within the Sōtō school today” (Bielefeldt 1972, 11).

As Scarangelo notes, however, while Nishiari is “sometimes considered the father of the modern sectarian tradition of studying Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō*,” coming to prominence as he did during a vital period in the formation of the Sōtōshū, he is also regarded as an *institutional* “father of the modern Sōtō sect” (Scarangelo 2012, 158, 162). This reputation is deserved: he was a professor at the Sōtō Daigakurin 大学林 that would become the Sōtō studies flagship university Komazawa, abbot (*kanshu* 貫首) of Sōtō head temple Sōjiji, recipient of an imperial name, and for a time the chief priest (*kanchō*) of the entire Sōtō sect. Furthermore, Nishiari’s students became major Sōtō figures in their own rights. His most prolific disciple and Dharma heir, for example, was Kishizawa Ian, author of the massive twenty-four volume commentary *Shōbōgenzō zenkō* 正法眼藏全講, a well-known Dōgen specialist (*genzōka* 眼藏家) whose own

¹⁰⁵ His name occasionally, and I think incorrectly, appears romanized as “Nishiari Bokusan.”

¹⁰⁶ See Ishii 2012, 224–225. This “basic approach” is characterized by the *Shōbōgenzō keiteki*’s emphasis on the lines of interpretation presented in the *Shōbōgenzō kiki-gakishō* 正法眼藏聞書抄 (abbr. *Goshō* 御抄), a commentary written in Dōgen’s lifetime by Senne 詮慧 (d.u.) and compiled by Senne’s disciple, Kyōgō 經豪 (d.u.).

students in turn came to fill prominent positions at the Sōtō head temples and Komazawa University. The list of clerics and scholars trained by Nishiari includes many others who rose to great prominence, including abbots of both Sōjiji and Eiheiji (Akino Kōdō and Hioki Mokusen 目置黙仙 [1837-1920]) as well as academic presidents of the Sōtō Daigakurin and Komazawa University (Tsutsugawa Hōgai 筒川方外 and Oka Sōtan). Nishiari's tremendous impact has accordingly extended not only over a broad swath of Japanese Sōtō but to Western Sōtō as well. In fact, Nishiari serves as a kind of nexus for Western Sōtō: his student Oka Sōtan's own student Sawaki Kōdō 澤木興道 (1880-1965) in turn had disciples like Deshimaru Taisen 弟子丸泰仙 (1914-1982) and Uchiyama Kōshō 内山興正 (1912-1998) who have been tremendously influential in the development of European, Latin American, and North American Zen; Oka's student Hashimoto Ekō 橋本恵光 (1890-1965) was an important teacher for Katagiri Dainin 片桐大忍 (1928-1990), founder of the Minnesota Zen Meditation Center; and the Japanese missionary Suzuki Shunryū 鈴木俊隆 (1904-1971), author of the popular *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind* (1970) and founder of the San Francisco Zen Center, studied for twenty-five years with Nishiari's heir Kishizawa. Even the *Sanbōkyōdan* founder Yasutani Hakuun 安谷白雲 (1885-1973), whose lasting influence in the West comes especially through the lineages of Taizen Maizumi 前角博雄 (1931-1995) and Phillip Kapleau (1912-2004), for all his eventual critique of Nishiari, in fact studied extensively in his youth with both Nishiari and Kishizawa.¹⁰⁷

Despite Nishiari's importance to Sōtō Zen worldwide, he has been the subject of very little Western scholarship.¹⁰⁸ This marks a significant contrast with other Meiji Buddhist figures

¹⁰⁷ Paul Jaffe translates the following passage to express Yasutani's mixed feelings about Nishiari:

Beginning with Nishiari Zenji's *Keiteki*, I have closely examined the commentaries on the *Shōbōgenzō* of many people in modern times, and though it is rude to say it, there are an exceedingly large number of places where they have failed to grasp its meaning.... It goes without saying that Nishiari Zenji was a priest of great learning and virtue, but even a green priest like me will not affirm his eye of satori.... The resulting evil of his theoretical Zen became a significant source of later degeneration.... So it is my earnest wish, in place of Nishiari Zenji, to correct some degree the evil he left, in order to requite his benevolence, and that of his disciples, which they extended to me over many years.

(Yasutani 1996, xxii).

¹⁰⁸ The few treatments of Nishiari in English-language scholarship are fragmentary and tend to be limited to his involvement in a single text or temple. The most detailed work is by Jaffe and Scarangelo (Jaffe 2001; Scarangelo 2012); passing mentions are found in Nishijima, Heine, Paul Jaffe, Ishii, and elsewhere (Nishijima 1997; Heine 2012a; Yasutani 1996; Ishii 2012). The only full English translations of his work are "A Refutation of Clerical Marriage" by Jaffe and his commentary on *Genjōkōan* 現成公案 by Weitsman and Tanahashi (Jaffe 1999; Weitsman and Tanahashi 2011).

like Suzuki Daisetsu, who have received substantial (if still not exhaustive) treatment in Western scholarship. As discussed in Section Two, though it is natural that Suzuki and other innovators associated with the Meiji “New Buddhism” have received the lion’s share of scholarly attention, at this point Meiji Buddhist studies have progressed sufficiently even in the West that the institutional, establishment side of the picture must be given its due. Jaffe and Mohr, citing Davis, have succinctly expressed this need:

If we are to understand the formation of modern Japanese Zen, we must begin to research the thought and actions of the leaders who controlled the established Zen denominations and the ordinary clerics who ran the thousands of Zen temples. In his study of Buddhism and modernization, Winston Davis has stressed the importance of these clerics and their temples, arguing that to truly comprehend the various Buddhist responses to the challenges of modernity, we must look at established temple Buddhism, which—rumors of its demise after the medieval period notwithstanding—remained during the Meiji era the “numerically, socially, and politically dominant” form of Buddhism in Japan. (Jaffe and Mohr 1998, 3)

It is in this spirit that a study of Nishiari is warranted: he represents a conservative, institutional, even reactionary side of Meiji Sōtō, and is someone whose impact on modern Japanese Buddhist history is, in my estimation, at least as significant as that of the better known Buddhist reformers.¹⁰⁹ While I hope that the present project marks a first step in that study, its limitations are many, and a thorough English-language treatment of Nishiari’s life, thought, and impact must await a later time.

In contrast to the scant references in English, there is no paucity of Japanese language biographical materials on Nishiari. A bibliography composed by members of the Hachinohe 八戸 City-sponsored *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai* 西有穆山禪師顕彰会 research group and appearing in their substantial commemorative volume *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo hyakunen o mukaete* 西有穆山禪師：没後百年を迎えて (2009) (hereafter abbreviated NBZ), lists nearly twenty dedicated biographical pieces plus another thirty or so works that make substantial reference to him. To this list must be added the autobiographical sources that inform many of the biographies, especially the *Keireki dan* 経歴談, which appears in the collection *Nishiari Zenwa* 西有禪話 (1905). These sources are generally hagiographic in nature, and I have relied heavily on some of them cognizant of the fact that, with a critical biography

¹⁰⁹ Nishiari can without question be generally characterized as a strongly conservative institutional voice, but it is important to heed the warnings of Sawada and others, noted in Section Two, against the tendency to designate some Meiji Buddhist figures as “conservative” without considering their complexity (Sawada 1998, 142–143).

outside my present scope, I can offer little more than a version of the “authorized” account of Nishiari. In particular I have made use of his disciple Kishizawa’s reverential, anecdotal, free, and far-ranging *Senshi Nishiari Bokusan Oshō* 先師西有穆山和尚 (1938) and the detailed chronology compiled by the Hachinohe Municipal Library (*Hachinohe shiritsu toshokan* 八戸市立図書館) for the book *Kyōdo no meisō: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji sono hito to nenpu* 郷土の名僧「西有穆山禪師その人と年譜」(1972) and excerpted in full in NBZ. This chronology is based on a range of biographical materials and is rich in direct citations from Nishiari’s own works as well as secondary studies of him, and I have drawn not only much of my data from this source but have also borrowed a few of its well-selected citations.¹¹⁰ I have also included some of the full-blown hagiographic highlights from the illustrated *Itsuwashū* 逸話集 (1938) commissioned by Nishiari’s eponymous Saiyūji 西有寺 and also reprinted in NBZ. Given the repetition of most of the basic biographical material across multiple sources, I have in general elected to cite specific sources only when distinguishing or directly quoting from them.¹¹¹

In this paper I refer to Nishiari Bokusan simply, and arbitrarily, as Nishiari. There are, however, many other names associated with him. Prior to his ordination at the age of twelve, he was known alternately as Sasamoto Kazuyoshi 笹本万吉 and Nishimura Kazuyoshi 西村万吉. At ordination he received the name Kin’ei 金英, the characters of which were changed by a subsequent teacher to read 瑾英 (also Kin’ei). The second part of his ordination name is Bokusan 穆山.¹¹² As abbot of the prestigious prayer temple Kasuisai 可睡齋, Nishiari borrowed a temple character to become known as Kaō 可翁, and the names Muian 無為庵, Uan Rōjin 有安老人, and Uan Dōnin 有安道人 are also recorded as aliases.¹¹³ His most formal name, attached to some of his published works, is his imperial name, Jikishin Jōkoku Zenji 直心淨国禪師, conferred by the Meiji emperor in 1901 at the height of Nishiari’s prestige and power.

Kishizawa reports that the legal name Nishiari 西有 was selected by Nishiari himself as an adult, in response to a Meiji government mandate that priests adopt legal family names. Jaffe discusses the issues of clerical surnames in the Meiji in some detail, identifying Council of

¹¹⁰ For convenience, when citing the chronology, I will use the pagination of the edition in NBZ.

¹¹¹ An additional source, and perhaps the most comprehensive of all of the works on Nishiari, is *Bakumatsu/Meiji no meisō Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: sono shōgai to shōseki* 幕末・明治の名僧西有穆山禪師：その生涯と勝蹟 by Yoshida Ryūetsu 吉田隆悦 (1976). I was unfortunately unable to procure this obscure resource until late in my research and have not been able to make full use of it for this paper.

¹¹² Kishizawa notes an oddity of Nishiari’s official name in the Sōtō registries: at the time of his *sandai* 参内 promotion in 1845 (granting him the privilege to wear a non-black *kesa* 袈裟) his name character Ei 英 was taboo by virtue of its use in the imperial household. The promotion was recorded under the name “Bokusan Bokusan.” Kishizawa writes that this unusual circumstance was also shared by the great Sōtō reformed Manzan Dōhaku 卍山道白 (1635-1715), who for the same reason was registered as “Manzan Manzan.” See Kishizawa 1938, 576–577.

¹¹³ See ZGD, 1148a; Jaffe 2001, 116.

State Proclamation 265, of October, 1872, as the mandate “that all Buddhist clerics adopt a surname and register it with the government by the end of the year.” This policy, which Jaffe cites Masutani as calling tantamount “to an end to government recognition for ordination” was met with resistance by most Buddhist clergy, who had traditionally abandoned the surname at ordination. While Jaffe describes the return by some clerics to their family names, many chose new names, like *Shaku* 釋, denoting the historical Buddha’s Śākya Clan, or invented a name, like “the famous precept advocate Fukuda Gyōkai [福田行誠] (1809-1888), [who] reputedly made the Buddhist term *fukuden* [福田], ‘field of merit’ (Sk. *puṇya-kṣetra*) the basis for his surname.” Jaffe notes that the government tried briefly to rein in these creative and overly Buddhist naming decisions, but its attempts to do so were largely ineffective.¹¹⁴

Nishiari, ever conservative with respect to monastic deportment and the renunciation of family ties, was naturally unwilling to return to his birth name and, like Fukuda and the many Shakus, he assigned himself a new surname. It is tempting to speculate that he borrowed the *Nishi* 西 character from his mother’s family name Nishimura 西村, which he himself carried for a part of his childhood, but I have not found this suggested in the biographies. Kishizawa suggests that Nishiari drew the name, which literally means “is in the West” not from the Western Paradise of the Pure Land Sutras as one might assume, but rather from the *Busso Tōki* 仏祖統紀 account of the first contact in China with the Buddha’s image, the story in which Emperor Xiaoming 孝明帝 (r. 516–528) is told by a minister that “there is in the West a sage who has come forth and is called the Buddha.”¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ See Jaffe 2001, 73–78.

¹¹⁵ “西方有聖人者出其名曰仏。” See Kishizawa 1938, 575–576. The *Busso Tōki* is a Tiantai history by Zhipan 志磐 (1220–1275), and the section of the text cited by Kishizawa is drawn in turn from the Emperor Xiaoming 孝明帝 (r. 516–528) section of the Chinese historical text *Hanshu* 漢書. The same story is told in the Sutra of Forty-Two Sections (*Shijūnishō kyō* 四十二章經):

“In ancient times Emperor Xiaoming of the Later Han had a dream one night in which he saw a heavenly being with a golden body and a bright halo on its head fly into the palace. He was greatly delighted by this. The following day, the emperor asked his ministers, “Which heavenly being was that?” Fuyi, a man of vast learning and experience, said, “I have heard that in India there was a person who had attained the Way, called ‘Buddha,’ who could fly easily. The heavenly being must be him.” (Cleary 2005, 31)

Part I: Nishiari's Early Life and Zen Training

Childhood and Ordination under Kinryū (1821-1839)

The man who came to be known as Nishiari Bokusan was born Sasamoto Kazuyoshi 笹本万吉, on October 23, 1821, nearly fifty years prior to the end of Tokugawa Period. He was born in the harbor area of Hachinohe City 八戸市 in what is now Aomori Prefecture 青森県, the northernmost Japanese mainland province. His mother (1794-1879) was of the Nishimura 西村 family, the second wife of Nishiari's widower father, a small-time tofu merchant named Sasamoto Chōsaborō 笹本長次郎 (d. 1850). The hagiographies report that Nishiari was as an infant found to have a glowing soybean in the shape of the Bodhisattva Kannon clenched in his fist; this auspicious sign is consistent with his life-long devotion to Kannon in particular among the Bodhisattvas and Buddhist deities.

Because Nishiari was the second son of his father Sasamoto, and because the family of his mother Nishimura had no male heirs, at two years old Nishiari was adopted into his mother's family and took up residence with his maternal uncle a few miles away from his parents.¹¹⁶ Three years later, however, a male heir was born to the Nishimura family and the five year old Nishiari was sent back home. He was thereafter raised a Sasamoto, where according to Kishizawa he was accorded the privileges of a first son due to a mental disability on the part of his elder brother (Kishizawa 1938, 577).

Nishiari's aspiration to become a monk began early in his life. Nishiari's mother was affiliated with the Shin Sect and had family graves at a nearby Shin temple called Gan'eiji 願栄寺, and Nishiari's aspiration to become a monk is said to have begun on a visit to this temple at the age of eight. Walking around the temple with his mother, the boy Nishiari asked about the depictions of hells and pure lands he saw adorning the temple walls. His mother replied that the pictures of the hells showed where she herself would go after death unless one of her children were to become a monk. She further explained that, on the other hand, if one of her children would become ordained, the whole family would be assured rebirth in the pure lands pictured. Nishiari was moved by this sentiment, and it is said that from the age of ten he repeatedly implored his parents to grant him permission to ordain.

At the age of twelve Nishiari finally received his parents' blessing to ordain. With their blessing came their stern warning that he not become simply an ordinary country monk, and Nishiari himself wrote that this admonition to become extraordinary remained a powerful

¹¹⁶ References to Nishiari's age follow the Western, not the Japanese, counting system.

motivator for him throughout his life (NBZ, 16). With their blessing, Nishiari left home and was ordained on June 21, 1833. His ordination took place at the local Sōtō temple with which his Sasamoto family was affiliated, Chōryūji 長流寺, and was conducted by a priest named Kinryū 金龍. Kinryū bestowed upon Nishiari the clerical name Kin'ei 金英.¹¹⁷

In 1834, the year after his ordination, Nishiari's teacher Kinryū was promoted to the abbacy of a prominent temple in the region, Hōkōji 法光寺 in nearby Nakui 名久井, where he became the twenty-sixth generation abbot. Nishiari accompanied him there, and in the winter of that same year, Kinryū assigned the thirteen year old Nishiari to fill the role of temple superintendent (*kansu* 監寺) of a Hōkōji subtemple called Kōryūji 光龍寺.¹¹⁸

(I will note here that Hōkōji and Kōryūji remained important temples to Nishiari throughout his life, and that the later prominence of these temples seems to owe much to the stature of Nishiari. For instance, when at the age of thirty-seven in 1858 Nishiari completed a Kannon pilgrimage, he reserved one third of sacred earth he had collected to inter at the Kannon worship site of Hōkōji.¹¹⁹ Subsequently, a full forty years after his first residence, Nishiari returned to serve as Hōkōji abbot, a post he held from 1874-1877. During that time the temple was promoted in status to a high temple rank.¹²⁰ Nishiari's most powerful contribution to the temple was his offering of three Dōgen relics, and Hōkōji today boasts a statue in his honor, and along with the relics of Dōgen also claims to house a relic of the Buddha himself. As for the Hōkōji subtemple Kōryūji where Nishiari as a teenager had held his first official post, in 1878 it shed its subordination to Hōkōji and was named an independent temple with Nishiari as its founder. Nishiari installed there an icon of the syncretic Shintō-Buddhist fire-protecting deity known as Sanshakubō 三尺坊, a powerful religious artifact that led to the further promotion of the temple and established it as a site for pilgrimage and deity cult worship.¹²¹)

¹¹⁷ It is interesting to note here that in the early biography of this great Sōtō sectarian, he shows no special or personal inclination for the sect; the selection of a Sōtō temple is simply the fact of his father's family affiliation. The story of his first "arousing of *bodhi* mind" (*hotsu bodaishin* 発菩提心), too, as has been seen, is not at all couched in Sōtō but only in generic Buddhist terms, and was said to have taken place in a Pure Land temple.

¹¹⁸ It is not entirely clear what this position would have entailed at a small temple in the late Tokugawa period. It was likely a ceremonial role, although it might also have entailed responsibilities for the maintenance of the temple supplies and grounds. See, for example, *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*, "監寺," article by Griffith Foulk & Charles Muller.

¹¹⁹ The other parts he interred at the grave sites of his parents and his Dharma transmission (*shihō* 嗣法) teacher, respectively. See NBZ, 28.

¹²⁰ The rank was *jōgōe* 常恒会, a temple for "regular gatherings" in which winter and summer trainings periods are held annually. See ZGD, 543a.

¹²¹ For more on the Dōgen relics and Nishiari's relationship to Sanshakubō and deity cults in general, see the section below on Kasuisai. See also Faure 1991, 143n36-37.

Nishiari trained under Kinryū for six years, ages twelve to eighteen, from 1833 until the teacher's death in 1839 after a period of partial paralysis. The biographies all celebrate the young Nishiari's devotion to his teacher in undertaking a twenty-one day fast and prayer period before Kannon for Kinryū's recovery, though the accounts differ with respect to the length of Kinryū's illness, and whether he ultimately succumbed a few years or only a few months after Nishiari's austerities and Kannon devotions.

Training with Etsuon (1839-1841)

Soon after the death of his ordination master Kinryū, the eighteen year old Nishiari left Hōkōji, Kōryūji, and the relative backwater of the far north of the Japanese mainland for an urban temple, Shōonji 松音寺, in the large city of Sendai 仙台. He lived there for two years, reportedly undergoing intense and severe training under a priest named Etsuon 悦音. It is also said that during this period Nishiari completed his reading of the entirety of the Chinese Classics and Buddhist canon, a project he had begun early in his teenage years.

During Nishiari's stay at Shōonji in Sendai, he was exposed firsthand to the devastation of the Great Tempō Famine (*Tempō no daikikin* 天保の大飢饉). The brunt of the famine hit in 1837 and 1838, but Nishiari's story of the famine is dated to 1841. The famine was among the most severe of the Tokugawa period; Jansen notes that in Ōsaka the crisis took the lives of ten percent of the population.¹²² The death and devastation of the period made a profound impact on Nishiari, as described below in his own words:

余は天保十二年の凶歳に遭遇して生涯の大幸福を得たのである。此年の飢饉は非常なもので何分にも食物が不足であるために餓死した者が無数であった。その惨状今からこれを思ふと実に肌に粟を生ずるの感がある。一寸近所を歩行しても僅かに十町か十五町の間には餓死行斃れの五六人もみると云ふほどで、なかなか惨状を極めたものである。

I received one of the greatest blessings of my lifetime when I experienced the crop failures of Tempō 12 (1841). The famine of that year was extraordinary, and in the total scarcity of food countless people died of starvation. To this day it give me chills to think of the terrible scene. It was indeed devastating: even in just

¹²² See Jansen 2000, 225–226. Jannetta, though focused on the Hida region, details the magnitude of the mortality crisis, and concludes that famine, not epidemic, was indeed the primary factor (Jannetta 1987, 178–187).

a little stroll through the neighborhood, over only ten or fifteen blocks one would see five or six dying people or starved corpses.

(中略) 其の餓死や行斃れが貧窮人ばかりかと云ふに、決してそうではなく、身に絹布をまとひ頭に鼈甲の櫛をいたゞき、懐中には澤山の金銭も所持しつゝ餓死した者が澤山あつたのぢや。余は生得臆病の性質であつたが、此の凶年に際して、一町に一餓死、十町に十行斃れ、夜行すれば死人の頭を踏むと云ふ惨状を目撃したから、最初の中は氣味も悪く、なんだか恐ろしいと云ふ、いはゞ臆病神に誘はれつゝあつたが、毎日毎夜のことであるから、つひには死人の恐るべからざることを心底から合點して臆病の性質が變化して餘程大膽になつたので、決して死人を恐怖せぬばかりでなく、一切の事物に驚かぬやうになつたのぢや。これは疊の上の水練でなく實地に經驗した學問だから、理窟や議論を離れて物に恐怖する念が薄くなつたのぢや。

... It is not at all the case that these dying or starved people were only the poor; many of the dead bodies were draped with silks, with tortoise-shell combs on their heads and plenty of money still in their pockets. I have an inherently cowardly nature, and when one walked at night in that terrible year—with a starved corpse on each block, and with ten dying people on every ten blocks—one would step on the heads of the dead. Seeing this terrible situation, my cowardice got even worse—one might say I was tempted by god of cowardice! But since this went on every single day and night, finally at the bottom of my heart I realized that I must not be afraid of dead people. My cowardly nature thus changed, and I became quite courageous. Not only was I totally unafraid of corpses, but nothing at all surprised me anymore. This was not the practice [of *zazen*] on the *tatami* mat but was the realization of the teachings in real life. Transcending theory and opinions, fearful thinking wanes.

(中略) 余が晩年まで苦學を厭はぬのは此年の凶歳の經驗が多少の力となつて居るので、余の經歷中には忘るべからざる高恩のあつた年と云ふべきである。

... Into my final years I have not averted from the study of suffering, and that power comes largely from that year of my

experience with the terrible harvest. In my whole life I have never forgotten the great blessings of that year.¹²³

Training in the Capital and Ascending through the Ranks (1841-1849)

In 1841, at the age of twenty, Nishiari resumed his migration southward, and towards increasingly urban areas, leaving the city of Sendai for the metropolitan capital, Edo 江戸 (modern day Tōkyō), where he enrolled at the prestigious Sendanrin 梅檀林 seminary in the area of Komagome 駒込, on the grounds of Kichijōji 吉祥寺 Temple.¹²⁴ Nishiari is said to have done begging rounds (*takuhatsu* 托鉢) in the city every day to cover his educational expenses, and he is described as approaching his study with great vigor. One prominent Edo bookstore grew so used to his loitering there that they began letting him take home books for the night. At the Sendanrin he continued his study not only of Sōtō doctrine but also of Confucian classics, and he was especially influenced by a Confucian-turned-Buddhist named Kikuchi Chikuan 菊地竹庵 (1829-1868).

It was in 1842 that Nishiari was first exposed to the *Shōbōgenzō*, a fact that is highlighted in all of the biographies given his later ascension to become the preeminent Dōgen scholar-monk of the period. That year, the abbot of Kichijōji, a Dōgen scholar named Daitotsu Guzen 大訥愚禪 (1786-1859), was invited by the abbot of Shinshūji 真宗寺 in distant Echigo Uonuma 越後魚沼 to lecture there on *Shōbōgenzō* over a three month retreat (*ango* 安居). Guzen accepted, and Nishiari accompanied the abbot, carrying his books and luggage—said to weigh something like one-hundred fifty pounds—on the walking trip of some two-hundred miles from Edo to Echigo, via the Usui Pass 碓氷峠, and then back again at the close of the retreat. Another contact of Nishiari's with the *Shōbōgenzō* was through a guest lecturer on Dōgen at the Sendanrin, Bōkō Eryō 忘光慧亮, who was said to have been in the teaching lineage of Banjin Dōtan. These exposures to Dōgen were seminal in the career of Nishiari, but it was not until 1845, upon his return from a summer training period at Daijōji 大乘寺, that Nishiari fully took up his study of Dōgen with the abbot-scholar Guzen. In the years that would follow of Nishiari's doctrinal training with Guzen, he is said to have concentrated on Dōgen's non-*Shōbōgenzō* works like the *Dai shingi* 大清規 (also known as the *Eihei Shingi* 永平清規), *Hōkyōki* 宝慶記, and *Gakudō yōjin shū* 学道用心集, and also to have studied the broader

¹²³ I have drawn this text from Nishiari's *Keireki dan*, but I have preserved the placement of the redactions from the edited and modernized version in NBZ (Nishiari 1905, 11–12; NBZ, 19).

¹²⁴ See Section One on the relationship of the Sendanrin to the Sōtō Daigakurin and Komazawa University. Kishizawa notes that the Sendanrin was one of two Sōtō seminaries, and that it emphasized doctrinal studies while the other, at Seishōji 青松寺, emphasized *zazen* (Kishizawa 1938, 584).

Buddhist doctrinal background, namely the *Hokkekachū* 法華科註 and the *Tendai shikyōgi* 天台四教儀.

In 1842 and 1843, in advance of Nishiari's first abbacy, an appointment to Hōrinji 鳳林寺 in 1843, Nishiari was quickly promoted through the requisite clerical ranks. These promotions were facilitated by Taigen Soryū 泰巖曹隆, who was the abbot of the nearby, Kichijōji-affiliated Sōsanji 宗參寺, and who, like Nishiari, was from the small and distant hometown of Hachinohe. Information is scarce on Soryū, but it seems that he was a teacher of some prominence who had trained at Daijiji 大慈寺 before going to Edo, had conferred Dharma transmission (*shihō* 嗣法) upon eleven disciples, and was publically recognized as a virtuous monk by the Tokugawa government's temple and shrine administrator (NBZ, 22). Nishiari during his time at the Sendanrin was in and out of Sōsanji visiting Soryū, and in 1842 Soryū appointed him "head seat" (*shuso* 首座) for a three month retreat at the temple, during which time the twenty-one year old Nishiari was cloistered at Sōsanji and assisted Soryū in leading the training. Kishizawa notes that Nishiari was able to accept the post in part because his prior teacher from Sendai, Etsuon, in a visit to the Sendanrin had given his blessing for Nishiari to train with Soryū, dissolving him of his prior commitment to return to Sendai after his time in the capital (Kishizawa 1938, 589–590).

While Nishiari did not receive Dharma transmission (*shihō*) directly from Soryū, Soryū facilitated his transmission by directing a disciple of his own to perform the ceremony for Nishiari. In Kishizawa's telling, this disciple of Soryū, Ansu Taizen 安窓泰禪, the abbot of Honnenji 本然寺, also in the vicinity of Edo, had a difficult temperament and no disciples of his own, and Soryū's directing him to perform the transmission for Nishiari comes across as something of a favor to Taizen. Not only did Soryū direct Taizen to conduct the transmission for Nishiari, but he then advised Nishiari not to train with Taizen at all, but to leave him after receiving the transmission.¹²⁵ Whatever the complex relationships in play, on the tenth day of the eighth month of 1843, at the age of twenty-two, Nishiari completed Dharma transmission under Taizen. With this, he achieved the rank of *oshō* 和尚 and became eligible to be made an abbot.

An abbacy was quick to come: soon after his Dharma transmission in 1843, Nishiari became the fifteenth abbot of Hōrinji 鳳林寺, near Soryū's temple Sōsanji, filling a vacancy left by the death of the prior abbot, a cleric who had no disciples. Nishiari had for some time been assisting regularly at that temple, providing services for the laity and maintaining the temple grounds and cemetery, and he is said to have earned the respect and admiration of the parishioners even in advance of his installation as abbot. He is said here again to have done daily begging to support himself and the temple, as well as to repay debts the temple had incurred prior to his appointment.

¹²⁵ See Kishizawa 1938, 591–592.

Based at Hōrinji from 1843-1849, Nishiari continued to ascend through the clerical ranks and, reportedly, to gain a widespread reputation in Edo as a prominent young scholar-monk. In 1845, as noted above, he performed *sandai* and gained the privilege to wear non-black *kesa*. The same year he also participated in the prestigious summer training period at Daijōji 大乘寺 in Kaga 加賀. In 1847, at twenty-six years old, the Kichijōji abbot Guzen invited him to host a three-month retreat assembly (*gōko-e* 江湖会) at Hōrinji, and while Guzen did much of the teaching, Nishiari shared the responsibility and was accordingly promoted to the rank of “Great Teacher” (*daioshō* 大和尚).

This rapid ascension as a teacher was said to have led to some pride on the part of Nishiari, and in his own autobiographical remarks he highlights an instance when, in 1849 at the age of twenty-eight, he attempted to visit his mother in Hachinohe only to be humbled by her refusal to grant him entry and her insistence that he continue to practice diligently for the sake of the rebirths of his family members. This story, and its retelling throughout the literature, attests to Nishiari’s sense of the finality of “home-leaving” (*shukke*).

Training with the Genzōka Gettan Zenryū (1849-1862)

While Nishiari was involved with various temples from 1849 to 1862, ages twenty-eight to forty-one, this time in his life is best defined as his period of training with the Dōgen scholar-monk (*genzōka*) Gettan Zenryū 月潭全龍 (d. 1865).¹²⁶ Gettan was abbot of a reputedly severe training monastery called Kaizōji 海蔵寺, in Odawara 小田原 in what is now Kanagawa Prefecture. According to Kishizawa, the temple housed just a few monks in training when Nishiari first arrived, but grew as Gettan’s reputation gradually spread, such that by the time Nishiari left the region the monastic assembly had grown to fifty and had included later prominent Sōtō figures like the great Sōtō scholar Hara Tanzan, who stayed for at least a single three-month retreat, and the long-time colleague of Nishiari and second independent Sōjiji

¹²⁶ Gettan is known both as Gettan Zenryū and as Zenryū Gettan, as well as by the names Shiyūan 至游菴 and Rokutan 六湛. Born in Kumamoto 熊本, Gettan first studied classics and then went on to train in Tendai at Mt. Hiei before taking up Zen and training with Mokushitsu Ryōyō 黙室良要 (1779-1833) and at Ryūtakuji 龍澤寺 with a teacher named Yōju (?) 養寿. He received *shihō* either from Yōju or Daihō Giseki 大方義碩, and he later became the thirteenth abbot of Hōjuin 宝珠院 and the fortieth abbot of Kaizōji. In addition to the [*Tōjō*] *hōbuku kakushō* [洞上]法服格正 co-written with Mokushitsu and entrusted to Nishiari (discussed below), Gettan authored the *Daikai yōmon* 大戒要文 (printed in Volume Three of the *Sōtōshū zensho* 曹洞宗全書) and the *Sandōkai hōkyō zanmai kōgi* 參同契寶鏡三昧講義. See ZGD, 708a. An extensive collection of his recorded sayings was recently published as the *Gettan Zenryū Oshō goroku* 月潭全龍和尚語錄 (2012).

abbot (discussed in Section Two), Azegami Baisen (Kishizawa 1938, 598–600). Gettan was a primary mentor for Nishiari, likely his single most important intellectual influence. Though Nishiari was not a disciple of Gettan by ordination or transmission, it is clear that Gettan treated him as such. For example, in his first year with Gettan in 1849, the teacher changed the characters of Nishiari’s clerical name from Kin’ei 金英 to Kin’ei 瑾英, substituting the pedestrian character “gold” with the homophonous but more obscure and elegant character “gem,” one further loaded by association with the name of the Sōtō patriarch and Sōjiji founder, Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾 (1268–1325).

Nishiari joined the relatively unknown Gettan in 1849 after leaving Hōrinji, Guzen, and the capital Edo. Given the emphasis on *Shōbōgenzō* in Nishiari’s teaching career, it is likely that Nishiari’s move to Kaizōji was motivated by his growing interest in the study of Dōgen, but there are of course any numbers of reasons he would have made the move, including the possibilities that he had tired of urban life, felt constrained by his responsibilities as an abbot accountable to parishioners, or felt he had exhausted Guzen’s teaching. In any case, the biographers point out that his choice was remarkable: leaving Edo as a well-regarded alumnus of the Sendanrin, Nishiari would have been welcomed at more prominent monasteries, like the one-hundred monk training hall Ryūkaiin 龍海院 in Maebashi 前橋, the eighty-monk training hall Shuzenji 修禪寺 in Izu 伊豆, or the hundred-plus monk training hall Kōshōji 興聖寺 in Uji 宇治. In fact, Nishiari did later spend significant time training Ryūkaiin and, to a lesser extent, at Shuzenji, but Nishiari’s primary choice to train at the lesser-known Kaizōji, where in contrast to these monasteries the study of *Shōbōgenzō* was prioritized over *zazen*, crystallized his identity as first and foremost a *genzōka*. This is not to imply that Gettan exclusively taught *Shōbōgenzō*; during Nishiari’s tenure with him Gettan also lectured extensively on, for instance, the Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment (*Engaku kyō* 圓覺經).

Looking back from the context of contemporary Sōtō, it may seem natural that an ambitious Sōtō monk would prioritize the study *Shōbōgenzō*, but, as has been noted in Section Two, the identification of Sōtō with the *Shōbōgenzō* is in fact a Meiji era development. As Kishizawa notes, Gettan’s emphasis on *Shōbōgenzō* in the mid-nineteenth century was unusual for the time (Kishizawa 1938, 594–596). In this period well before the surge in popularity of the *Shōbōgenzō* following Watsuji Tetsurō and others, and before even the text’s institutionalization in Sōtō through the *Shushōgi*, *genzōe* and the like, teachers and students who specialized in the text were not in the mainstream. The lengths to which Nishiari is said to have gone to hear Guzen teaching the *Shōbōgenzō*, for example, is emblematic of this—a Sōtō cleric since the late Meiji would have no need to travel far to hear extensive teachings on *Shōbōgenzō*, but would from the first days of his training understand as a matter of course that the study of Sōtō doctrine is tantamount to the study of *Shōbōgenzō*.

Following a longstanding trope in Zen hagiography, the biographies linger on the severity of Nishiari’s training and the poverty and disrepair of Kaizōji. Kishizawa relates a dialogue said to have taken place while Nishiari and two other monks stood awaiting entry at

the temple, in which Gettan made it clear that there would be no food for them if they trained there. Nishiari and his compatriots replied that they would arrange for their own food (presumably through the daily begging rounds they were subsequently said to have practiced), and only at that were they admitted. Kishizawa also relates another story celebrating the malnutrition at Kaizōji, in which Kishizawa himself speaks to an old monk who had trained there while Nishiari had been the head of the kitchen (*tenzo* 典座). The old monk described to Kishizawa how the rice gruel at that time had been so thin that the ceiling could be seen reflected in it, and that in miso soup for fifty monks, Nishiari would put just a single scoop of miso.¹²⁷

It is unclear how long Nishiari resided with Gettan at Kaizōji. The biographies report that he served Gettan for twelve years (1849-1862), seven of which he served as *tenzo* (1851-1858). During this period, however, Nishiari also had involvements in other temples. Thus while the hagiographies make much of Nishiari's mettle in persisting with the severe Gettan for twelve years, and while it is clear that he did study closely with him and completed a number of Kaizōji retreats, by my calculations it seems that Nishiari lived consecutively at Kaizōji for only the first three of those twelve years, from 1849 to 1852.¹²⁸

In 1855, Nishiari was appointed to the abbacy of Nyoraiji 如来寺 in Mishima 三島, where oversaw fourteen or fifteen monks in training. Late in 1858, he assumed a concurrent post as abbot of the nearby Eichōin 英潮院. Nyoraiji was about fifteen miles away from Kaizōji, and Eichōin was even closer, and through his time in these abbacies Nishiari stayed closely connected with Gettan. When Gettan held three-month retreats at Kaizōji, Nishiari was able to take up residence there with him, and during other times of the year, despite his other duties, Nishiari was able to regularly commute to hear Gettan lecture. The biographies universally celebrate this commute from Nyoraiji to Kaizōji, which would begin in the dark of morning and finish in the dark of night, as a demonstration, like his long walk in 1842 from Edo to Echigo to hear Guzen, of his profound devotion to the *Shōbōgenzō* and to his teachers. During this same period, Nishiari also maintained contact with other teachers, and he is said in 1861 to have studied for an on-and-off year with a teacher named Baimyō 梅苗 of Shuzenji and to have

¹²⁷ See Kishizawa 1938, 596–599.

¹²⁸ These years represent the only span in Nishiari's putative Kaizōji period that he is not shown as having significant responsibilities elsewhere. As detailed below, the biographies indicate that he spent at least the two summers of 1853 and 1854 training at Ryūkaiin, and likely the intervening and following months as well. Subsequently, after 1855 when Nishiari took up the abbacy of Nyoraiji 如来寺, and through his concurrent abbacy of the nearby Eichōin 英潮院 from the winter of 1858 until 1862, he was only an intermittent resident at Kaizōji, living there during formal three-month retreat periods but otherwise commuting to attend lectures.

realized the truth of the cosmos in his teaching on the “fire at the end of the eon that destroys all things” (*gōkatōnen* 劫火洞然).¹²⁹

A culmination of Nishiari’s training with Gettan came in 1862, shortly prior to Nishiari’s return to Edo to assume the abbacy of Sōsanji 宗参寺, the temple where exactly twenty years prior he had served as *shuso* under Taigen Soryū. Before his departure, Gettan visited Nishiari at Nyoraiji and there granted him confirmation of enlightenment (*inka shōmei* 印可証明).¹³⁰ Kishizawa cites the verse by which Gettan conferred this certification:

富嶽巽兮三島乾
 靈龕年古^{リテ}草芊芊
 兔徑一路雖^{ドモ}隨^{ツト}水^ニ
 菜葉不^ト流^ラ德^{ナリ}自^{ナリ}鮮 (Kishizawa 1938, 610)

To the southeast of Mt. Fuji and the northwest of Mishima¹³¹
 A spirit altar grows old in years, and grasses flourish.
 Although the single path of the rabbit runs along the water,
 No vegetable floats [there], and the virtue is self-evident.¹³²

While the period of his regular contact with Gettan came to a close with the *inka* and the move back to Edo, Nishiari continued to have some contact with the teacher, assisting him for example at 1865 events at Fukushōji 福昌寺, in the position of preceptor (*kaishi* 戒師).

Sōsanji Abbacy (1862-1871)

¹²⁹ This likely refers to the famous question in Case #4 of the *kōan* collection *Hekiganroku* 碧巖録, of whether or not anything remains after the world-destroying fire. See ZGD, 306a.

¹³⁰ I have not been able to establish the role of *inka shōmei* in late Tokugawa Sōtō. Unlike *shihō*, it does not appear to have been a scripted ceremony or to constitute a concrete promotion in the institutional ranks. I am tempted to speculate, as the American Zen teacher James Ford has suggested about contemporary Sōtō, that the certification served as a kind of “second Dharma transmission” in the Sōtō sect, a way to seal a master-disciple relationship while sidestepping the central Sōtō doctrine that Dharma transmission can be received only once, and from a single teacher. See ZGD, 55a; Ford 2012.

¹³¹ I take this line as a rough description of the geographical location of Nyoraiji.

¹³² This seems a reference to a trope in Zen literature that a vegetable leaf floating downstream of a hermitage is evidence of a hermit who, infrugal, lacks awakening. I have been unable to determine the original context of this trope.

Nishiari resided as abbot at Sōsanji from 1862 until 1871, when he left the area of Edo again to assume the abbacy of Hōsenji 鳳仙寺 in Kiryū 桐生. At Sōsanji he oversaw a training hall of about twenty monks, including some who would later rise to prominence in the sect, and he began himself to lecture on the *Shōbōgenzō*. At that time, Nishiari felt he was beginning to fully to appreciate the teachings of his teacher Gettan:

小田原の早川に到り海蔵寺の月潭老人に参ずることが前後十二年で、此間に月潭老人より眼蔵の提唱を二回聴聞したので漸く臆気に御開山の御思召を窺ふことが出来たやうな心地がしたから江戸に歸つて宗参寺で初めて眼蔵の提唱をして初志の幾分に酬ひたのである¹³³

I studied for about twelve years with Old Man Gettan of Kaizōji in Hayakawa in Odawara. During that time I twice [daily] heard him lecture on the *Shōbōgenzō*, [yet] I felt I could only barely, faintly glimpse the sublime thoughts of the esteemed Founder [Dōgen]. Upon my return to Edo, [however,] when I began to offer [my own] lectures on the *Shōbōgenzō* at Sōsanji, my original intention was to some degree fulfilled.

Training and Enlightenment with Morotake Ekidō (1852-1855)

An important interlude in Nishiari's training with Gettan was the time he spent with the prominent teacher and eventual abbot of Sōjiji, Morotake Ekidō 諸嶽奕堂 (1805-1879).¹³⁴ As noted above, Gettan was first and foremost a textual scholar, and in his monastery there was little emphasis on the practice of sitting meditation. Therefore, after about three years at Kaizōji, Gettan is said to have sent Nishiari to deepen his training in *zazen* at Morotake's hundred-monk training hall, Ryūkaiin, some eighty miles away in the vicinity of Kyōto. In the eighth month of 1852, after joining with Sōtō monks from across the country in assisting with major services at Eiheiji in celebration of the six hundredth anniversary of Dōgen's death,

¹³³ I have drawn this text directly from Nishiari's *Keirekidan*, but I am indebted for its selection to the edited and modernized version in the *Nenpu in Kyōdo no meisō* (Nishiari 1905, 15; NBZ, 25).

¹³⁴ Morotake is also known by his imperial name, Kōsai Jitoku Zenji 弘濟慈徳禪師. The first independent abbot of Sōjiji, Mross notes his support of the Sōjiji independence movement, and Jaffe notes his participation in the pan-Buddhist organization *Shoshū dōtoku kaimei*. See Mross 2009; Yokoi 1991, 462; Jaffe 2001, 115.

Nishiari met up with Morotake and accompanied him back to Ryūkaiin, where he proceeded to train for about two and half years.¹³⁵

Nishiari is said to have made quite an impression on Morotake and the monks at Ryūkaiin. Upon his arrival, Morotake immediately promoted Nishiari to a high rank within the temple (*fūsu* 副寺).¹³⁶ Further, the teacher is said to have entrusted the thirty-three year old Nishiari with the Dharma seat in the bi-monthly question-and-answer ceremony of *shōsan* 小参:

奕堂門下には百人以上の修行僧が雲集していた。奕堂は毎月一日、一五日の小参（修学僧が問答すること）には扠子（導師をつとめる道具）を瑾英和尚にわたし、「小参は副寺に一任す」と言って自分は方丈の間へ帰った。その直後本堂では火の出るような命をかけた法戦問答が闘わされたのである。瑾英和尚の行解（座禅を学問）両全の人格の力量が、修行僧の質問に対して烈火の如く爆発し、激流の如く流出したのである。既に瑾英和尚は一家の本宗将であった。当時早くもその道誉が大本山永平寺にも聞こえて、瑾英和尚は不老閣（永平寺貫首の室）に上って靈堂禅師に相見して来た。¹³⁷

Over a hundred practicing monks had flocked to follow [Morotake] Ekidō. At the *shōsan* (question and answer [ceremony] with monks in training) held on the first and fifteenth of each month, Ekidō would pass the *hossu* (the tool used by the guiding teacher) to Master Kin'ei [Nishiari], saying "I entrust *shōsan* to the *fūsu* [Nishiari]," and returning to the abbot's room. Immediately afterwards, like an eruption of flames and with their very lives in the balance, Dharma combat would be waged in the main hall. Master Kin'ei would meet the distinct capacity of each individual with his own practice understanding (learned in *zazen*),

¹³⁵ The core of this training was the two summer retreats of 1853 and 1854. Given the winter Ryūkaiin setting for the anecdote recorded below as Nishiari's enlightenment story, and the existence of a verse by Morotake upon Nishiari's 1855 departure to his new post as abbot of Nyōraiji, it seems likely that Nishiari stayed straight through between retreats at Ryūkaiin, ultimately training there for at least two and half years from the eighth month of 1852 through at least to the first month of 1855.

¹³⁶ *Fusu*, technically an assistant to the *kansu* described above, is a temple administrative post that likewise confers status and ceremonial responsibilities but may or may not involve practical duties. See DDB, "監寺," article by Griffith Foulk and Charles Muller.

¹³⁷ The text and parenthetical notes are from Yoshida, *Bakumatsu/Meiji no meisō Nishiari Bokusan Zenji*, excerpted in NBZ (NBZ, 27).

exploding like a raging fire and flowing like a thundering river. Already Master Kin'ei was among the core leaders of the sect. Even as early as that time his reputation in the Way was known even at the great head temple Eiheiji, and he came to enter the room of the Eiheiji abbot and meet Zen Master Ryōdō.

Ryūkaiin is most significant for Nishiari's biographers as the site of the anecdote recorded as Nishiari's "sudden great enlightenment" (*katsuzen daigo* 豁然大悟). Kishizawa tells the story as follows:

あるとき奕堂禪師に専使を命ぜられ、紛紛として鷺毛をとばす雪をおかし、沼田在にゆき、一尺もつもったなかをかえり、門に入ると行者がみつけて典座寮にはしりお湯をたらいにくみきたり、まめまめしく草鞋のひもといてくれた。先師が足をふみ入れると、にえたっている熱湯であったからおもわず、「あ、あつい」と、いうて足をひきあげる途端に行者がすばしこく庭にとび出しかかえてきた雪をお湯にたたっこむと、しゅうという声をたててとけてしまった。先師これを見て豁然として大悟し、

把^テ雪^{ユキ}団^{ダン}団^{ダン}投^{スレバ}熱^ネ湯^{トウ}

乾^{ケン}坤^{コン}撲^{ツク}落^{ラク}妙^{ミョウ}高^{コウ}儂^{ジョウ}

不^フ知^チ今^{イマ}日^{ニチ}何^{ナニ}時^{トキ}節^{セツ}

踢^{キキ}倒^{シテ}銀^{ギン}盤^{パン}笑^{シヤウ}一^{イツ}場^{ジョウ} (Kishizawa 1938, 605)

Once [Nishiari] was sent out on an errand by Master [Morotake] Ekidō. It was snowing like a flurry of goose feathers, and in the rice paddies and countryside the snow came up to a foot high. Entering the gate, [Nishiari] found the Master's attendant [to report his return], and then hurried to the temple kitchen to fetch a tub full of hot water. He carefully untied the laces of his straw sandals, [but] when my former teacher [Nishiari's] foot touched the boiling hot water, he spontaneously cried "Aaah! Hot!" and yanked his foot out. The Master's attendant immediately rushed to the garden, collected some snow, and threw it into the hot water. With a "shuu" sound it melted completely. Seeing this, my former teacher [Nishiari] suddenly greatly understood, and composed this verse:

Grabbing up the snow, and throwing it into the water,
Heaven and earth are cast off, Mt. Meru collapses.

I do not know [even] what season it is!

Laughing at once, I kick over the silver dish.¹³⁸

It should be noted here that while this story is the standard account, another story also circulates as Nishiari's requisite enlightenment moment. This version, set during his time with Gettan, is recorded in the *Zengaku Daijiten* is as follows:

三〇歳の時、鳳林寺を辞し相模(神奈川県)海蔵寺月潭全竜の会下に投じ、刻苦参禅辨道すること一二年に及ぶ。一日、老人の〔楞嚴經〕を提唱するを聞き、「知見不立見」の語にいたって忽然として開悟。

At thirty years old, [Nishiari] left Hōrinji and threw himself into the assembly of Gettan Zenryū of Kaizōji in Sagami ([in what is now] Kanagawa Prefecture), for twelve years wholeheartedly endeavoring in Zen training and the practice of the Way. One day as he heard his teacher lecture on the *Śūraṃgama-sūtra*, at the words “seeing through knowing is not seeing”¹³⁹ he suddenly opened and understood.

It is noteworthy that the enlightenment story is so standard a feature of Zen hagiography that it cannot be dispensed with even in the case of an orthodox Sōtō teacher like Nishiari, who taught the doctrine of “the oneness of practice and enlightenment” (*shushō funi*) and seemed to endeavor to deemphasize the kind of thinking that the enlightenment story genre supports. To pick an example from his translated work, for instance:

Because enlightenment must not remain, you grind it off completely, until there is not even a speck of enlightenment. When you reach the point of “no stink of enlightenment,” where there is no trace, you vow with great determination to let the

¹³⁸ “Silver dish” (*ginban* 銀盤) here, especially in the snowy context of the anecdote, invokes the phrase “filling a silver bowl with snow” (*ginwan ni yuki wo moru* 銀盃盛雪), from Dongshan's *Hōkyō zanmai*, a Sōtō liturgical text. See ZGD, 239d.

¹³⁹ This phrase is ambiguous, and a study of the lines in their sutra context is outside the scope of the present paper. The phrase 知見不立見 does not appear in the Taishō edition of the *Śūraṃgama-sūtra*, nor in any other Taishō text. It may be a reference to the following section from the *sūtra*, in which the Buddha addresses Ānanda as follows:

知見立。知即無明本。知見無。見斯即涅槃。無漏眞淨。

To see through knowing is the root of ignorance. When there is not seeing through knowing, there is *nirvāṇa*, untainted and pure.

(T945: 19.124c9-10. Text from SAT *Daizōkyō*; the CBETA text punctuation differs on the first phrase: 知見立知。This four character phrasing expressed by the CBETA punctuation is more compelling than the phrasing of the SAT edition.)

absence of enlightenment continue long, long, long, like a single rail of iron for myriad miles. (Weitsman and Tanahashi 2011, 59)

Indeed, Kishizawa in his telling of the enlightenment story of his teacher Nishiari seems to acknowledge an assumption, perhaps implied by the above rhetoric, that Nishiari was not enlightened. As noted above, Yasutani Hakuun, for example, said so outright. Kishizawa thus concludes his telling of Nishiari's enlightenment story, which includes the exchange of several additional verses with Morotake, with the following:

世間では、先師に悟りなしというが、かえりて洞山古仏に光明ありやいなやを問わば、何と答えんとするか、阿呵呵。
(Kishizawa 1938, 605)

In the world it is said that [Nishiari] my former teacher was not enlightened, but if you asked the Old Buddha Tōzan [Dongshan] if he had the bright light (*kōmyō*) what would he say? Ha-ha-ha.

Part II: Nishiari and the Meiji Buddhist Persecution and Reinvention

When Nishiari returned to the capital in 1862, as the prominent abbot of Sōsanji he had access to elite society and had at least some contact with members of the ruling Tokugawa family. For example, at a major precept convocation (*jukaie* 授戒会) held in 1865 at which he officiated with Gettan, over one thousand participants were said to have received the precepts, including such high level Tokugawa family members as Tokugawa Tenshōin 天璋院 (1837-1883), the ordained widow of the thirteenth *shōgun* Tokugawa Iesada 徳川家定 (1824-1858). The continuity into the Meiji period of Nishiari's inevitable political involvements, and his considerable political skills, are evident in a story from the Boshin 戊辰 War (1868-1869) in the tumultuous year of the establishment of the Meiji regime. At that time, the abbot Nishiari is said to have risked his life to save a Sōsanji parishioner, Muroga 室賀, who had fought on the side of the Tokugawa shogunate but later joined the government army. Pursued by Tokugawa loyalists angered at his defection, Muroga fled to seek sanctuary at Sōsanji. Nishiari saved Muroga's life by convincing the troops—two hundred strong, in the account of one hagiography (Saiyūji 1938, 29)—to spare him. Just as the religious institutions struggled to stay on the right side of the political turmoil nationally, at the local level, too, priests like Nishiari needed to strike a balance between past loyalties and the present political realities.

Like all leading monks of the period, however, Nishiari's relationships with the government and government policy ran far deeper than any local parish concern. An influential voice in the Sōtō establishment, he was actively involved at the top levels of the sectarian leadership in shaping the institution for the Meiji. In general, while Nishiari resisted some of the reforms to Buddhism proposed and enacted by the Meiji government, he joined the mainstream of Buddhist institutional figures in assigning the bulk of the blame for the persecution on the excesses and degeneration of Buddhists themselves.¹⁴⁰ Rather than to work against anti-Buddhist policies or to reject them as unfounded, Nishiari joined in the effort to reform Buddhism such that its imagined pre-Tokugawa purity would be regained and the new regime could recognize it as a useful and powerful partner in its modernizing, imperialist agenda. A Sōtō abbot, Ueda Shōetsu 上田祥悦, expresses this orientation of Nishiari in his recent apologetic article, "Nishiari Bokusan and the Persecution of Buddhism" (*Nishiari Bokusan to haibutsu kishaku* 西有穆山と廢仏毀釈). Discussing Nishiari's 1873 text, "Guidelines to Protect the Dharma" (*Gohō yōjinshū* 護法用心集), he writes:

¹⁴⁰ As noted in Section One, this has been the overwhelming trend in Buddhist historiography and persists to the present.

穆山禪師は「護法用心集」を著して廢仏毀釈の誤りや弊害を指摘批判し、正法の護持と僧風の革新を唱道したのである。また、禪師は島地黙雷等革新的進歩派のように正面政府の宗教政策を是正せしめんとしたのではなく、時流に樟さしながら、その流れを改正せしめる柔軟な戦術にでたのである。(Ueda 2009, 53)

Zen Master Bokusan wrote “Guidelines to Protect the Dharma” to identify and critique the errors and harmful effects of *haibutsu kishaku*. In it he advocated for the preservation of the true Dharma and the reform of Sangha customs. He did not try to rectify the government’s religious policies at their surface, as did Shimaji Mokurai and his reformist, progressive faction, but rather employed soft tactics: altering the stream of events while flowing along with the current of the times.

These “soft tactics,” though celebrated by Ueda as corrective of the religious administration of the whole country and showing the path forward for genuine Buddhist progress, seem largely to have amounted to Nishiari’s full and congenial participation with the government program. He was recognized and promoted by the government during his service under the Great Teaching Academy (*Daikyōin*; see Section One) in the 1870s, and maintained a high enough profile and a cordial enough relationship with the government, that by the late Meiji he was personally granted a Zen Master’s name by the emperor. This name, Jikishin Jōkoku Zenji 直心浄国禪師 (“Direct Mind, Purifying the Nation”), was conferred on him in the sixth month of 1901, coming perhaps as a matter of course shortly after his election as chief abbot (*kanshu*) of Sōjiji. The name’s distinctly nationalistic valence is no accident, I think, and certainly reflects Nishiari’s career-long pro-State stance. The relationship with the Meiji emperor did not end with the bestowal of the name: biographies also record visits by Nishiari to the imperial court to bless the emperor in the New Year in 1902 and 1904 in his position at the pinnacle of the sect hierarchy as chief abbot (*kanchō*).

Evangelizing for the State (1872-1874)

Nishiari was involved in the Great Teaching Academy from its beginnings in 1872, having in the third month of that year received a summons to report to the newly empowered Ministry of Doctrine (*Kyōbusho*). Though he is said to have firmly refused the first request, he soon complied, and at the end of the fourth month of 1872 he was made a representative of Sōjiji to the Ministry of Doctrine, and early the following month was appointed Ministry representative

of the head of the sect (*kanchō jimutoriatsukai* 管長事務取扱). Whatever reservations may have been behind his initial refusal to report to the Ministry, he went on to serve it wholeheartedly as a mid-level and then, from the tenth month of 1872, as an upper-level doctrinal instructor (*daikōgi* 大講義) and as an examiner for the certification of Sōtō sect lecturers for the Academy.

Missionizing across Japan, and especially in Hokkaidō, Nishiari was by all accounts an eager and able ambassador of the Great Teaching Academy and its pro-State, neo-Shintō ideology. Nishiari is not at all unusual in this, as noted in Section One, at the Academy's peak there were 81,000 doctrinal instructors active in Japan from the Buddhist institutions alone. I have not been able to find the content of any of Nishiari's lectures from the period, but I expect that they would make for an interesting study. I cannot yet establish the extent to which he stuck strictly to the mandated "Three Standards of Instruction" (*sanjō kyōsoku*) and the later "Themes" (*kendai*) of the Great Teaching, or to what extent he was tempted into the "individual or Buddhistic interpretations" warned against in the 1872 government proclamation noted in Section One.

Joining the Academy well before the codification of Sōtō doctrine as expressed in the *Shushōgi*, for example, it is not clear exactly what message Nishiari would have had for the Sōtō laity in the context of Academy-sponsored lectures. Lobreglio notes that the Academy did circulate a text to aid Sōtō lecturers, a short entry in an 1872 text called the *Shoshū sekkyō yōgi* 諸宗説教要義, a manual for Academy lecturers of the various Buddhist sects. Following the trend in Sōtō thought at the time, the text expresses a position that Takiya's revision to the *Shushōgi* would later overturn: an understanding of Sōtō as what Lobreglio calls a "two-tiered" system with "more difficult and rarefied path" for monastics and a "lower-tiered path" for the "lay masses whose intellectual and spiritual capabilities were deemed not adequate for the subtleties of the most profound Buddhist doctrines and the rigors of *zazen*." Nishiari resisted some aspects of the *Shushōgi* consensus (see Scarangelo 2012, 315–316), and on this point too he likely objected; his life-long emphasis on monastic purity would point to an inclination towards the "two-tiered" system. The Sōtō instructions issued by the Academy are vague, but they do give some indication of the kinds of ethics-based, nationalistic teachings Nishiari would have been expected to deliver to lay audiences in the early 1870s as he worked, necessarily, under the auspices of the Great Teaching Academy. Lobreglio describes the content of this Academy-published text of unknown authorship:

The text exhibits a number of elements characteristic to virtually all such documents of this period: support for an emperor-centered system of rule in which the continuity of the imperial lineage with the ancestral *kami*, or deities, of the nation is stressed and ardor for contributing to the edification of a benighted populace.

Despite such clear catering to the wishes of the government, and its lack of in-depth doctrinal explication, the little that it does say about doctrinal matters is of interest. First of all, the central doctrinal tropes found... [in other Sōtō texts of the period] are once again affirmed: “Zen [...] takes as its main principle (*shūshi*) ‘directly pointing to the mind, seeing into one’s nature and becoming Buddha.’” Secondly, though, such elevated spiritual attainment, and the taste of its subtle joy, are clearly not conceived as something open to all. The fact of inequality in human capabilities is duly noted and the Sōtō approach to those less able is spelled out:

“In order to guide those dull-witted people of average or below average ability, we teach such things as *kanzen chōaku* (encouraging good and chastising evil) and *inga ōhō* (retribution based on cause and effect). This leads [them] to respect and worship the *kami* and buddhas, humbly serve the Emperor, think fondly about their debt to the nation, live in harmony with the actual conditions of their lives, and [it] spreads the benefits of civilized governance everywhere throughout [the land].”
(Lobreglio 2009, 83–84)

Nishiari began his missionizing with the government’s Academy in 1872 in the northern mainland, the region of Akita 秋田 Prefecture, work for which in 1874 he was bestowed by the abbot of Eiheiji a monetary commendation. He is most celebrated, though, for his missionary work, beginning in 1873, on the Academy’s circuit in Hokkaidō, the remote northern island under the control of the Meiji government’s new Development Commission (*Kaitakushi* 開拓使). The value of missionaries in colonization has been well-known to imperial governments throughout history, and despite its anti-Buddhist rhetoric the Meiji government did not hesitate to use Buddhist missions to gain a foothold in their colonizing efforts in Hokkaidō. For its part, the Buddhist institutional leadership, striving to regain the good graces of the government, rose enthusiastically to the occasion and threw substantial material and personnel resources into the effort.¹⁴¹ Nishiari was an enthusiastic participant in this collaboration, and by the third month of 1874, at the age of fifty-three, he was promoted to the rank of supervising instructor for the Academy work in Hokkaidō (*Hokkaidō kyōdō torishimari* 北海道教導取締). His efforts in Hokkaidō culminated with his 1881 establishment of the temple Chūōji 中央寺 in Sapporo 札幌. The Eiheiji abbot Kugami Tsunonobu 久我密雲 (1817-1884) consented to serve as the nominal founder (*kaisan* 開山) of the temple, and though he was immediately replaced by a “second

¹⁴¹ See Section One.

generation” abbot of lower stature, the temple was granted the high status of direct branch temple (*jikimatsuji* 直末寺) to Eihei-ji.¹⁴²

Nishiari’s evangelizing prowess was on full display during his time in Hokkaidō, where he is said to have taught seven or eight times a day, and are in evidence from the day of his arrival. Denied entry to the Development Commission’s administrative headquarters at Sapporo by a high-ranking official named Matsumoto Jūrō 松本十郎 with pronounced anti-Buddhist leanings, Nishiari engaged him in a debate said to have raged for several days. When Nishiari at last prevailed, Matsumoto not only became a follower but offered his full administrative cooperation and granted him the large tract of land that would eventually become the site of Chūō-ji.

The extensive missionizing and evangelism of Nishiari must be appreciated for its marked distinction from the Western modernist Zen self-characterization as an anti-evangelist teaching.¹⁴³ Nishiari himself was an unapologetic evangelist, and Japanese sectarian biographers writing throughout the twentieth century have unambivalently celebrated his excellence in this regard. Nor should his evangelism with the Academy be taken simply as a function of the government’s doctrinal instruction mandate; before and after his tenure as a doctrinal instructor of the Great Teaching, Nishiari was devoted to the propagation of the faith among the laity and throughout the land. To cite one example among many, when as abbot of Kasuisai he was dismayed by the people’s lack of faith, Nishiari became an outright street evangelist. Buying cart-load of Buddhist rosaries (*juzu* 数珠), he handed them out indiscriminately to everyone he met, saying, “These beads will give you faith in Buddhism, bring you happiness, and protect you.”¹⁴⁴

As noted in Section One of this paper, the Great Teaching Academy dissolved in 1877 after being deeply undermined by the 1875 withdrawal by the Shin sect from the project. It is unclear when exactly Nishiari left the ranks—biographies show he was active in Academy missionizing from 1872 through at least late in 1874, but I find no references to activity by him under its auspices in 1875 or later.

It should be noted that Nishiari’s cooperation with Meiji government policies likely extended to advocacy of the expansionist exercises of the Japanese military in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905). Though the

¹⁴² Kugami Tsuun was the sixty-first generation abbot of Eihei-ji; also known as Kugami Kankei 久我環溪. See ZGD, 244c.

¹⁴³ As Richard Jaffe has reminded me, it is useful to note that Nishiari’s evangelism in Hokkaidō, like that of Buddhist missionaries in Korea, would have been primarily oriented towards Japanese settlers rather than regional natives. To the extent that this was so, and remained so for the Japanese Buddhist missionaries to the West as well, it is perhaps natural that Western Zen converts in the twentieth century may have been left with the sense that they had themselves not been evangelized, and by extension that the tradition itself was anti-evangelist.

¹⁴⁴ 仏教信心をなされ、幸福を与え、身を守る数珠でござる。Ueda 2009, 53.

hagiographies are muted on the subject, there is no reason to believe that Nishiari's approach to the escalating Japanese militarism of the time should be distinguished from the overwhelming majority of Buddhist establishment voices. In fact, in Nishiari's work can be heard forerunners of the kind of rhetoric that would culminate, for example, in the statement by Nishiari's "grand-disciple" Sawaki Kōdō that "It is the precept forbidding killing that wields the sword" (Victoria 2006, 35). See, for an example among many, Nishiari's emphasis on the principle of "killing the one to save many" in the very first words of his introduction to his 1903 comments on Zen precepts, the *Busso shōden zenkaishō kōwa* 佛祖正傳禪戒鈔講話:

同じ殺生戒でも。小い心。狭い心を以つて殺生戒を持てば小乗の戒法となるのでございます。此の小乗に依つて殺生戒を持てば縦令ひ百萬の敵が来ても。一人も殺すことは出来な
い。大乘では。悪人一人を殪して千萬人の為めになることな
れば。殺生戒を持つことになる。若し悪人一人を殪さずに置
いて。害毒を千萬人に流させるやうな事になると。却つて殺
生戒を破つたことになる。(Nishiari 1903, 1)

Even though [the Small and Great Vehicles have] the same precept against killing, when this non-killing precept is observed with a small and narrow mind, it is the precept taught by the Small Vehicle. Observing the non-killing precept from that standpoint of the Small Vehicle, even if a million enemies come, one cannot kill a single one. In the Great Vehicle, [however,] to kill a single evil person for the sake of ten million people is to observe the non-killing precept. On the other hand, to not kill a single evil person, and [thereby] to allow harm to flow to ten million people, is to break the non-killing precept.

Reforming the Sangha

To argue that Nishiari was in general cooperative with the government's mandates is not, however, to suggest that he accepted as a matter of course the reforms to Buddhism proposed by the government. On the contrary, it is clear for instance that as a defender of monastic discipline, Nishiari was strongly opposed to government policies that sought effectively to laicize the clergy. Ueda's praise for Nishiari's "soft tactics" notwithstanding, on these points of monastic deportment Nishiari was clear in his positions. As Ueda notes in the passage cited above, Nishiari's advocacy for "the reform of Sangha customs" bore no resemblance to the kind of reforms proposed by Shimaji and other progressives attempting to

adapt the Buddhist institutions to the modern world. Nishiari instead was in the mold of traditionalist reformers like Fukuda Gyōkai and Shaku Unshō, who sought a return to an ideal of monastic discipline. What Jaffe says of Fukuda applies equally to Nishiari:

Fukuda did not believe that the revitalization of Buddhism depended on abolishing precepts that were out of step with the time. For Fukuda, the renewal (*isshin*) of Buddhism meant the restoration (*fukko*) of past practices.

Jaffe argues that Nishiari's religious conservatism was part and parcel of a broader social conservatism, and that Nishiari's staunch defense of Buddhist precepts can be understood as part of his basically reactionary stance toward the modernizing social, economic, and political landscape of Japan. Jaffe writes that,

Nishiari attributed a host of problems—ranging from disloyalty to social dislocation—to the overwhelming concentration on material progress and modernization at the expense of spiritual cultivation. The inability of the Buddhist clergy to keep their vows was symptomatic of a more fundamental ill that plagued Japan. It was inner development, not material progress, that marked true 'enlightenment and civilization.'¹⁴⁵ (Jaffe 2001, 139)

He goes on to cite Nishiari's anti-marriage tract, *Dan sōryo saitai ron* 彈僧侶妻帶論 (1879):

I am old-fashioned and there are things I do not understand about 'civilization and enlightenment.' Should what is happening in Japan today be seen as progress or decline? The most striking things about the so-called progress of civilization are such external manifestations as machinery, tiled roofs, Western clothes, Western literature, and Western language. However, when we examine the disposition of those who are adolescents or younger, we find that those with flippant, servile, and resentful voices are numerous, but those with a sense of integrity are extremely few.

Precept violation by the clergy, the business enterprises of the nobles, and ex-samurai pulling rickshaws are not considered contemptuous. A woman is not embarrassed about being a consort or geisha, and things have reached the state where it is

¹⁴⁵ Jaffe 2001, 123. "Civilization and enlightenment" (*Bunmei kaika* 文明開化) is an umbrella slogan with which much of the modernizing moves of Meiji Japan were justified, signifying alignment with the West and the adoption of Western institutions and values.

considered foolish to be a “virtuous woman and a good wife.” Deceit is a natural occurrence. It is difficult to loan and borrow money without collateral, even among fathers and sons or brothers. If this trend continues for a few more years, what will become of the nation, let alone the Buddha Dharma? When compared to the generations in which celibate clerics were valued and virtuous women were admired, is the current state of affairs beautiful or ugly, progress or decline? Ultimately, my grieving over the decline of the Buddha Dharma results in my grieving for the nation. (Jaffe 2001, 139)

Nishiari on Clerical Marriage and Buddhist Cosmology

Nishiari’s opposition to clerical marriage, an issue of great significance in Meiji Buddhism that has been noted in Section One, has been studied in detail by Richard Jaffe, who in his 2001 work presents a summary and analysis of the *Dan sōryo saitai ron* and in his 1999 work publishes a complete translation of it. Jaffe describes the text, written by Nishiari under the penname Uan Dōnin 有安道人, as one of the “major tracts opposing clerical marriage that were published in 1879.” Nishiari’s aims and efforts were thus aligned with the main organization seeking the repeal of the law, the pan-sectarian “Alliance of United Sects for Ethical Standards” (*Shoshū dōtoku kaimei*) mentioned in Section One. I cannot establish whether Nishiari was a formal member of the group, but his teacher Morotake was among its leaders and there is no question that Nishiari shared the values of the organization. The *Shoshū dōtoku kaimei* “linked adherence to the Buddhist precepts to the revivification of Buddhism and viewed the decriminalization of *nikujiki saitai* as a stumbling block to Buddhist reformation.”¹⁴⁶

Jaffe presents three aspects of Nishiari’s argument in defense of clerical celibacy in the *Dan sōryo saitai ron*: appeals to cosmology, to the protection of the nation, and to filial piety. Nishiari’s cosmological argument is not only interesting in terms of its attempt to justify Buddhist celibacy through Shintō cosmology—a move intended to sway the Shintōists who controlled the government policies—but also because it speaks to Nishiari’s staunch defense of a literal understanding of Buddhist cosmology. Donald Lopez has eloquently told the story of the debates between Buddhist cosmologists and their Christian and scientific interlocutors in the early modern era as part of his well-documented attempt to prove that the Buddhist modernist principle of Buddhism’s compatibility with science is neither rooted in tradition nor historically uncontested. Lopez describes in detail the literalist approach to Buddhist

¹⁴⁶ See Jaffe 2001, 115–116.

cosmology propounded by Fumon Entsū 普門円通 (1755–1834), and Jaffe aligns Nishiari’s perspective on Buddhist cosmology squarely with this “most prolific modern defender of Buddhist cosmology,” Entsū. Nishiari, Jaffe writes, along with Fukuda Gyōkai and Shaku Unshō, “continued to argue for a literal understanding three-realm, Sumeru-centered Buddhist cosmos and elements of Buddhist eschatology.” This stands in marked contrast, for instance, with figures like Inoue Enryō who instead advocated the modernizing of Buddhism by harmonizing its teachings with science and modern values and “argued that the Mount Meru cosmography was a Hīnayāna teaching, and thus was ancillary to Buddhism; whether it is true or not is immaterial, although it remains of historical interest.”¹⁴⁷

Jaffe describes Fukuda’s use of cosmology to justify celibacy as rooted in Buddhist cosmology, an argument that to be able to reach beings in all three realms of desire, form, and nonform, Buddhist clergy cannot be entangled in the single desire realm as they are if they eat meat or have sex. Nishiari’s argument, on the other hand, is tailored to Shintō, making an argument that Shintō cosmology itself is fundamentally in accord with the principle of celibacy, and that the purity of celibacy reflects a cosmic principle recognized by Shintō and Buddhism alike. Nishiari reminds readers that the cosmos is created asexually in Shintō, and that indeed the plunge of the cosmos into defilement is precisely the result of the beginning of sex. He claims that this doctrine of creation from purity corresponds to the truths underlying the Buddhist universe, in which sexual desire is absent in the higher realms. Jaffe paraphrases Nishiari’s conclusion: “Therefore, if the *kami* viewed human sexual relations with disgust, how much more so must the Buddhas who have transcended the three realms?”¹⁴⁸

While some conservative Meiji clerics like Fukuda resisted the *ōbō buppō ichinyō* rhetoric of Buddhist-State equality and argued instead for the primacy of Buddhism, Nishiari was more ardent a nationalist and affirmed the role of Buddhism in protecting the nation. In what Jaffe calls “the true spirit of the defense of the Dharma literature,” Nishiari “yoked together the purity of the clergy and the fortunes of the realm.” He cites again Nishiari’s *Dan sōryo saitai ron*:

The *kami* and the Buddhas take pleasure in an abundance of pure clerics. When the *kami* and the Buddhas rejoice then their protection grows stronger. Thus we can say that when pure clerics are numerous, those who protect the nation are numerous.

The fate of the Tokugawa family is a recent example of this. At the beginning of the Tokugawa’s reign, the clergy’s rules were upheld, in the middle the rules gradually slackened, and by the end the rules were in great disorder. This gave rise the “abolish

¹⁴⁷ See Lopez 2008, 47–51; Jaffe 2001, 133.

¹⁴⁸ See Jaffe 2001, 134.

the Buddhas” movement of Lord Mito. Is it not the case that the vigor and weakness of the pure clerics corresponded with the prosperity and decline of the Tokugawa family?

If you love your nation you should support the celibate schools and you should pray that those who uphold the precepts will increase daily. You should not favor those who break the precepts. (Jaffe 2001, 135)

Jaffe describes Nishiari’s third defense of celibacy as a refutation of the renewed Confucian critiques in the late Tokugawa and early Meiji of the fundamental unfiliality of world-abnegating Buddhists. As Jaffe reminds us, this line of attack, and the corresponding Buddhist rebuttals, have a long history in East Asia, and Nishiari draws on this tradition to answer the rehashed critiques. Nishiari argues that since “the Buddha stated, ‘all sentient beings are my children,’” then there is a fraternal connection that binds all people. He argues that someone who rushes to the rescue of a sibling would not be considered unfilial even if he neglected his parents in doing so, and that the Buddhist clergy are precisely those people, rushing to rescue a world full of siblings from the paramount danger of “the three poisons and the four devils.”¹⁴⁹

Nishiari on Clerical Dress

Jaffe notes that the debates on clerical marriage touched on more minor points of discipline like “meat eating, abandoning tonsure, and wearing nonclerical clothing” (Jaffe 2001, xiv). It is clear that on virtually all of these points Nishiari maintained his traditionalist stance. The biographies emphasize, for example, a particular moment in 1873 when Nishiari threw his full energy and influence behind his opposition to a proposed government mandate from the Ministry of Doctrine that would have forced Buddhist clergy to wear non-clerical clothing. The Ministry eventually relented, and the decision was instead transferred to the heads of the individual sects to be decided.¹⁵⁰

As an advocate of orthodox Sōtō monastic dress, Nishiari also has a little-acknowledged but important role in the development of the “robe that accords with the Dharma” (*nyohō-e* 如法衣) tradition of sewing and wearing the definitive Buddhist garment, the *kesa*. Among the texts Nishiari edited and published is an 1896 edition of a work entitled *Proper Dharma Attire* (*Hōbuku kakushō* 法服格正), a seminal text in the *nyohō-e* movement completed in 1821 by Mokushitsu Ryōyō 黙室良要 (1779-1833) with the help of a disciple, Gettan Zenryū (who would

¹⁴⁹ See Jaffe 2001, 137–138.

¹⁵⁰ See Ueda 2009, 53.

later become Nishiari's teacher). Riggs describes this text as drawing from Dōgen's fascicles *Kesa kudoku* 袈裟功德 and *Den'e* 傳衣 to produce "a study that balances *vinaya* and scriptural teachings about the *kesa* with Dōgen's writings and other Zen sources." She notes that the work "is revered by modern Sōtō Zen students of the *kesa*" like Sawaki Kōdō and Hashimoto Ekō, whose lectures on the text "inspired a generation of Sōtō clerics, nuns, and lay people to begin sewing robes in a manner they refer to as *nyohō-e*." Though Ryōyō and Gettan had completed the text in 1821, the text was still unpublished when Gettan passed it to Nishiari for caretaking. Nishiari was finally able to edit and publish the manuscript with the help of his former fellow student under Gettan, and his predecessor as Sōjiji abbot, Azegami Baisen. His 1896 edition of the text marks the first time it was published.¹⁵¹

Nishiari and Alcohol ("Prajñā Water")

Nishiari's well-attested fondness for alcohol is one striking exception to his dedication to monastic discipline. While strictly speaking the Zen precepts as transmitted to Nishiari did not prohibit intoxication but only the sale of alcohol (*fukoshukai* 不酤酒戒), given the strictness of Nishiari on points of monastic deportment it is surprising to note that here Nishiari differs, at least in practice, from his most conservative reformist colleagues as well as his progressive reformist opponents.

It should be noted that a temperance movement was gaining popularity in Buddhist circles in the mid-Meiji, influenced largely by Christianity and Western temperance movements, a movement that identified alcohol as a key element of Buddhist degradation and advocated temperance as a path to Buddhist renewal. As Thelle shows, the Buddhist temperance society *Hanseikai* 反省会, founded in 1886, was enormously influential: by 1895 it boasted more than twenty thousand members, and "most of the so-called New Buddhists were at some time members of the association," including giants like Shimaji Mokurai and Inoue Enryō. The organization grew so influential that its allies boasted that "what was new or progressive in the Buddhist world had either been started by *Hanseikai* or influenced by *Hanseikai*."¹⁵² Not only were the New Buddhists involved in temperance, but, as has been noted, establishment figures like Fukuda and Shaku Unshō were working within the institutions to "restore the precepts," and they also shared the goal of temperance. Shaku Unshō, for example, "strictly adhered to the 250 precepts and is reputed to have refrained for much of his later life from drinking liquor, carrying money, eating after noon, and taking life" (Jaffe 2001, 141).

¹⁵¹ See Diane Elizabeth Riggs 149–150, 204–206, 257. There are also references to this text as the *Tōjō hōbuku kakushō* 洞上法服格正. See ZGD, 708a.

¹⁵² From the New Buddhist journal *Bukkyō*; see Thelle 1987, 200.

Even the most blatantly hagiographic of the sources on Nishiari, however, says plainly that he was a “heavy drinker”.¹⁵³ A late twentieth century write-up on his life in the Sōtō journal *Daihōrin* 大法輪 describes the paradox of Nishiari’s discipline quite succinctly:

酒だけは滅法好きであつたらしいが、肉食、妻帯、蓄髪をしないのことは無論のこと、八〇歳をすぎても、若い雲水たちと、行動をともにして、自律自戒の生活を厳守した。
(Akizuki 1979, 147)

Though it seems that he was extraordinarily fond of *sake*, it goes without saying that Nishiari abstained from meat eating, marriage, and growing out his hair. Even past the age of eighty he trained alongside the young monks, strictly observing a lifestyle that accorded with the *vinaya* and [Zen] precepts.

Across virtually every source on Nishiari are regular and consistent references to his heavy drinking. These begin at his youth: one anecdote, recorded by Kishizawa and dated to the period of the young Nishiari’s service under his first teacher Kinryū, has Nishiari gulping sake at the home of a widowed parishioner; the anecdote turns on the pun that she drinks for the pain of loss (*awanu tsurasa* 逢わぬつらさ) and he for the pain of millet (*awa no tsurasa* 粟のつらさ), that is, of having to eat millet in the temple instead of rice (Kishizawa 1938, 580–581). Another story, this from his training at Kaizōji under Gettan in his thirties, has Nishiari and his later prominent friend Azegami Baisen regularly slipping out of the *takuhatsu* line to drink large amounts of sake while begging in town. The story noted above, too, of his saving the parishioner Muroga from angry soldiers, turns on his ability to share *sake* with the troop’s leader (Saiyūji 1938, 29). A striking anecdote entitled “Zen Master Bokusan’s *Prajñā* Water” (*Bokusan Zenji no hannya tō* 穆山禪師の般若湯), by a Sōtō abbot named Kudō Taigen 工藤泰巖, recalls a drunken conversations with a disciple of Nishiari’s named Tagawa Yūzen 田川雄禪, who praises Nishiari’s habit of mixing sake and hot water in a tea bowl, a beverage of so many merits that it is called “*Prajñā* Water” (NBZ, 40).

It is unfortunately beyond the scope of this study to review Nishiari’s lectures on Buddhist precepts to consider the extent to which his “extraordinary fondness” for alcohol impacted his rhetoric around the traditional monastic prohibitions of alcohol. A cursory review of his comments on the relevant *fukoshukai* precept in his *Busso shōden zenkaishō kōwa*, for example, indicate the strong condemnation of drinking that one would expect from such a text.

¹⁵³ This is the *Saiyūji itsuwashū*, using the term *shugō* 酒豪 in reference to Nishiari and Azegami both during the time of their training with Gettan (Saiyūji 1938, 26). It is not insignificant that Nishiari here is shown drinking with his friend, another prominent monk: there is no question that the consumption of alcohol was pervasive in the Buddhist establishment at the time. A thorough account of the role of alcohol in Nishiari’s life would need to consider the context of consumption habits in the regions and temples of his time.

While I thus suspect that he did not moderate his rhetoric against alcohol in light of his own consumption, a full consideration of this topic will need to await another time.

Nishiari and the Renewal of Sōtō Doctrinal Study

As noted in Section One, the growing emphasis on doctrinal study in Meiji Buddhism is a development that cannot be separated from the exposure of Japanese Buddhists to Western academic fields like religious studies, Buddhology, and Orientalism. While there is a clear distinction between the sectarian project of *shūgaku* and the positivist Western academic approach, Nishiari's efforts to what Mohr calls "raise the level of Sōtō scholarship in the sect," especially through rigorous textual studies, arguably left an impact on both modes of scholarship (Mohr 1998, 178–179). Apart from his masterwork *Shōbōgenzō keiteki*, the high level of Nishiari's scholarship is evident in his publication of textual editions of a number of Tokugawa period texts.¹⁵⁴

While Nishiari himself appears to have done relatively little seminary teaching, from 1877 at his *alma mater* the Sendanrin, his students would become major figures in the Sōtō University, like Oka Sōtan, who would later become president of Komazawa University, and his student Sawaki Kōdō, an influential Komazawa professor. This line of influence extends into postwar scholarship as well, for instance in the work of two subsequent Komazawa presidents, Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆 (1923-1989), a student of Oka's who bridged the gap between *shūgaku* and academic Buddhist studies, and Kurebayashi Kōdō 榑林皓堂 (1893-1987), a "a towering figure in postwar sectarian studies," who though a student primarily of Kishizawa Ian also studied with Nishiari.¹⁵⁵

It was noted in Section Two that Morita Goyū is held to be the founder of the *genzōe*, but Nishiari's role in the development of the institution should not be overlooked. As Kurebayashi notes, not only was his disciple Oka the first lecturer, but the list of *genzōe* lecturers through the early Shōwa reveals that his students dominated, if not monopolized, the lecture seat.¹⁵⁶ As Bodiford writes, Nishiari was only Zen teacher "to have even lectured on how the *Shōbōgenzō* should be read and understood" prior to establishment of the *genzōe* (Bodiford 2012a, 221). Given this, and the enormous role the *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* has played in modern Sōtō studies, it is not an exaggeration to suggest that there is no modern commentator

¹⁵⁴ See Appendix for a list of his textual editions.

¹⁵⁵ See Ishii 2012, 231; Heine 2012b, 44.

¹⁵⁶ See Kurebayashi 1972; ZGD, 291d.

on *Shōbōgenzō* in the sect or in the academy who cannot trace in their intellectual heritage a direct link to Nishiari.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷ As noted, a study of Nishiari's hermeneutical approach to *Shōbōgenzō*, which centers on the *Shōbōgenzō kikigakishō* (abbr. *Goshō*) commentary by Senne and Kyōgō, is well outside the scope of this paper. Some brief attempts to summarize Nishiari's perspective on the *Shōbōgenzō* can be found in Nishijima 1997; Tō 2009; and Itō 1955.

Part III: Nishiari's Later Life

Relics, Deities, Icons: Hōkōji (1874-1877) and Kasuisai (1877-1892)

Nishiari returned from Hokkaidō to the mainland of Japan in the ninth month of 1874 to assume the abbacy of Hōkōji, the temple in which he had trained under Kinryū forty years prior. He served as residing abbot of Hōkōji until 1877, and his elevation of the temple's status during that time, as well as his contributions to its subtemple, Kōryūji, have been noted above in the discussion of his early life.

His longest and more important post of the 1870s and 1880s, however, began in 1877 when at the age of fifty-six he moved to a temple called Kasuisai 可睡齋 in Shizuoka 静岡 to become abbot. Kasuisai in the Tokugawa period had served as a regional headquarters temple (*sōrokuji* 僧録寺) with responsibility for the regulation of all Sōtō temples in the four provinces of the Tōkai 東海 region, and it remained an extremely high status temple into the Meiji, ranking just below the level of the *honzan* and overseeing hundreds of subordinate branch temples.¹⁵⁸ A fully-committed resident abbot despite some concurrent abbacies, Nishiari resided at Kasuisai for fifteen years, until 1892, marking the longest continuous stretch of residency in his career. His was clearly strongly identified with the temple, and it is during that period that he adopted the name *Kaō* “Old Man of Ka” 可翁.

This period of Nishiari's life is uniquely well-documented in Western scholarship thanks to Dominick Scarangelo's work on the syncretic Shintō-Buddhist cult at Mt. Akiha 秋葉 and the role of Kasuisai in redefining the cult in the violently anti-syncretic Meiji era of *shinbutsu bunri*. Scarangelo shows that in large measure as a result of Nishiari's efforts, Kasuisai—despite being a dozen miles off of Mt. Akiha itself—was able to appropriate the Mt. Akiha cult of the fire-protecting deity/Buddha-manifestation (*gongen* 権現) Sanshaku-bō 三尺坊.¹⁵⁹ Through

¹⁵⁸ On the complex *sōrokuji* system and Kasuisai's place in the government administration of Sōtō temples in the Tokugawa period, see Scarangelo 2012, 96–97, 97n26. Kasuisai today—in part due to the efforts of Nishiari, as discussed below—is one of the three prayer temples (*kitōdera* 祈禱寺) of the Sōtō sect, a well-known pilgrimage and prayer site regarded especially for its efficacy in fire-protection. Like the other Sōtō prayer temples, it is also one of the couple of dozen official Sōtō monastic training halls in the country (*senmon sōdō* 専門僧堂). See Reader and Tanabe 1998, 9–10, 264n33.

¹⁵⁹ The mountain is also pronounced Akiba. Scarangelo, who has done extensive work at the site, favors the pronunciation Akiha and notes that Akiba is the way “it is pronounced in Eastern Japan” (Scarangelo 2012, 51).

concerted ritual efforts, the creative use of Sōtō doctrine, and the active evangelization of the laity, Nishiari was able to transform Kasuisai into a *more* sacred and *more* appropriate spot for Mt. Akiha cult worship than Mt. Akiha itself. The glimpse offered of Nishiari in Scarangelo's work reveals aspects of the charismatic monk that are missed in depictions of him as simply a monastic-oriented, traditionalist scholar monk—we see in Scarangelo a Nishiari who is at once a powerful ritualist, an effective evangelist with a keen appreciation of the need to adapt to the concerns of the laity, a bodhisattva cult devotee, a shrewd political operator and organizer, and a creative doctrinal innovator.

The drama of the contested sites of Mt. Akiha cult devotion that lies at the center of Scarangelo's study is outside the scope of this paper, but it is worth presenting in brief by way of situating Nishiari's doctrinal and ritual efforts to legitimate Kasuisai's claims to the cult. In one of countless similar determinations that unfolded in the course of the implementation of the early Meiji policy of *shinbutsu bunri*, officials in the Shizuoka region decided that the Buddhist temple Shūyōji 秋葉寺, long a site for Mt. Akiha 秋葉 cult devotion, should be relocated and replaced with a proper Shintō shrine. The Zen monks of the mountain fervently contested this decision, but only managed to put off the relocation until 1873, at which point the Shintō priests and Shugendō practitioners prevailed, dismantling Shūyōji and establishing the Akiha Shintō Shrine. Around 1874 the temple's precious Sanshaku-bō icons were transferred to Kasuisai, the highest ranking Zen temple in the area. A couple of year later, in 1876, just before Nishiari assumed the abbacy, Kasuisai publicly enshrined the icons, announced that, geography aside, *it* was the legitimate site for Mt. Akiha cult worship, and began construction of a special worship hall for the icons. Soon after this announcement, however, supporters of the original Mt. Akiha Zen temple, Shūyōji, managed to gain government approval to reopen at their original site, at which time they reasserted their logical geographic primacy as the site of Mt. Akiha devotion. As a result, where there had initially been a single site for Mt. Akiha cult devotion, there were now three (Shūyōji, Kasuisai, and the Akiha Shintō Shrine); the ensuing struggle for primacy continues to the present. The force of Kasuisai's lasting claim as the primary site owes in large part to Nishiari's active engagement in the full enshrinement of the deity at Kasuisai and his nurturing of a lay cult to Sanshaku-bō that would recognize the centrality of Kasuisai.¹⁶⁰

Nishiari was crucial in what Scarangelo calls the “enmountaining” of Kasuisai—the project of making it somehow *more* Mt. Akiha than Mt. Akiha itself was. Nishiari went to great lengths to create a “sacred landscape” on the grounds of Kasuisai, one which would be worthy of the Sanshaku-bō icons and which could compete with the inherently sacred landscape of Mt. Akiha. Thus in 1882 Nishiari created a “numinous boundary” or “bounded sacred space (*kekkaï* 結界)” around the monastery by laying twelve pillars, each elaborately consecrated, at intervals

¹⁶⁰ See Scarangelo 2012, 9–10, 144, 246–268.

along the edges of the monastery. Scarangelo translates from Kishizawa's treatment of the process, in his section "Bounded Sacred Space" (*Kekkai* 結界):

Due to the deteriorated state of the monastery [Nishiari Bokusan] made a great vow—that every person who entered the grounds of Kasuisai—even just once—would establish a karmic connection with the Buddha. For this reason he recited the *Mind of Compassion Dhāraṇī* and the *Disaster Extinguishing Dhāraṇī* tens of thousands of times, and afterwards carefully inscribed both incantations. Next, he used boulders to fashion rectangular pillars. Nishiari opened holes in the top of the pillars, inserted the *dhāraṇīs*, tightly plugged the openings and then buried them in the corners on all sides of the monastery. (Scarangelo 2012, 255)

Scarangelo also notes that along with this "enmountaining" of Kasuisai was a process by which the icons of Sanshaku-bō replaced the mountain and the deity as the primary elements of devotion. To achieve this, any sense of the icon as merely symbolic, indeed as anything less than Buddha itself, was stripped away completely. According to Scarangelo, Nishiari did this by using the doctrine of "the equivalence of Buddha bodies" and further by drawing on the sense of "the equanimity and immanence of the Buddhas often suggested in Dōgen's work." As I understand it, that is to say that the icons itself were understood to be Sanshaku-bō, who was understood to be the Buddha; as these Buddha manifestations in deity and icon were no more or less than any other Buddha manifestation, the icons could be regarded as proper and orthodox objects for Sōtō veneration.¹⁶¹

This integration of Akiha cult worship into Sōtō doctrine and the teachings of Dōgen required some theological footwork, and Nishiari, in Scarangelo's telling, worked hard with Sōtō doctrine to "make room for devotional cults." Scarangelo analyzes Nishiari's text of "spiritual assurance" for laypeople, *Anjin ketsu* 安心訣 (1890), and concludes that it departs in key ways from the Sōtō consensus expressed in the *Shushōgi* in order to "mak[e] room for devotional practices through the [doctrine of the] interpenetration of all Buddhas." The *Anjin ketsu* took a remarkably inclusive approach to the content of recitative practices, including the three refuges (as the *Shushōgi* advocated exclusively), or the single refuge (in Buddha), or Bodhisattvas' names, or *dhāraṇī*. Nishiari thus "broke with the *Shushōgi*'s sole and exclusive prioritization of the three refuges for the attainment of spiritual assurance and opened up room for Bodhisattva or deity cults."

[Nishiari] Bokusan did not mention the Akiha deity in particular, but displayed a special concern for the problem of personal devotion in the form of particular cults or popular recitations. Devotional cults are an issue that is entirely absent from the

¹⁶¹ See Scarangelo 2012, 273, 327.

Shushōgi, but was obviously important for propagation at Kasuisai. Bokusan himself is rumored to have been intensely devoted to the Bodhisattva Kannon. In contrast to his lectures on the *Shōbōgenzō*, Bokusan did not thoroughly elaborate the corporeal interpenetration of all the Buddhas in *Anjin ketsu*. Yet, he appears to have deployed his understanding of the relationships of the Buddhas for the purposes of opening up interpretive space to incorporate Bodhisattva or other types of devotional cults into Sōtō spiritual assurance. This would have also encompassed the veneration of the Akiha deity and the inclusion of its fire-preventing, protective mantra into spiritual assurance at Kasuisai.¹⁶²

Nishiari spread the doctrinal underpinnings and the devotional practices of the Kasuisai Sanshaku-bō cult through the establishment of “teaching assemblies,” organs which, as discussed in Sections One and Two, were central to Buddhist lay propagation and institutional development in the Meiji. Scarangelo’s research has uncovered a Kasuisai teaching assembly founded by Nishiari for Mt. Akiha cult devotion as early as 1879, but his most prominent teaching assembly at Kasuisai, founded in 1881, was called the *Kōshōkai* 敲唱會. This association of clergy and laity was dedicated to “morality and religious education,” emphasizing clerical purity (i.e. the rejection of meat eating and clerical marriage) and the reassertion of fundamental Sōtō doctrine “to combat the notion of Buddhism as primarily a body of ancestor veneration and funerary rites.” Though couched in orthodox Sōtō terms, however, Scarangelo argues that Mt. Akiha cult devotion was central to the work of the association, and suggests that it is no coincidence that “the 1881 *Kōshōkai* teaching assembly conference was held at the same time as the public viewing of Kasuisai’s secret Sanshaku-bō icon (*kaichō* 開帳), a jubilee event in theory held only once every sixty years.”¹⁶³

During Nishiari’s tenure at Kasuisai, the temple received from Eiheiji’s abbot an artifact even more powerful and prestigious than the Sanshaku-bō icons: a relic of Dōgen himself. Nishiari was deeply moved to encounter this rare relic, and by some accounts the relic, too, was moved by the meeting. Scarangelo translates Kishizawa on Nishiari and this relic:

When Nishiari Bokusan was still the abbot of Kasuisai, he received a fragment of bone of Sōtō’s founder Dōgen from Eiheiji abbot Kankei.¹⁶⁴ Bokusan was certain that this was the result of a mysterious resonance with Dōgen, and as such, he set up an altar,

¹⁶² See Scarangelo 2012, 314–317.

¹⁶³ See Scarangelo 2012, 141–148.

¹⁶⁴ The above-mentioned Kugami Tsuun 久我密雲 (1817-1884), the sixty-first generation abbot of Eiheiji; also known as Kugami Kankei 久我環溪. See ZGD, 244c.

enshrining the bone fragment next to the main Buddha of the temple. He dedicatedly made offerings, revered and made obeisance to the bone fragment of Dōgen, chanting the “*Sarīra Worship Incantation*” (*Shari raimon* 舍利礼文) before it day and night without fail.

One morning, Bokusan had just finished making full body prostrations and chanting the “*Sarīra Worship Incantation*” to the relic, when, as he lifted up his head something occurred that could only have been a mutual resonance between Bokusan and Dōgen. [At that moment] the relic shattered with a slight dinging sound and [from one bone] five pieces of relics appeared, giving off a powerful radiant light.

Such a thing had never occurred since Dōgen’s death, and for this reason it was truly an unusual, unfathomable numinous resonance. Bokusan was both surprised and elated, and revered Dōgen all the more. He made a vow to propagate *Shōbōgenzō* and faithfully continued making offerings and worshiping the relics. (Scarangelo 2012, 328–329)

The passage goes on to note that of the five relics produced from the single relic in this “mutual resonance” (*kannō dōkō* 感応道交) between Dōgen and Nishiari, three were eventually transferred to the temple of Nishiari’s youth, Hōkōji, and two remained at Kasuisai to be later enshrined in a “nation-protecting stupa” (*gokokutō* 護国塔).¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ On the novel, Indian-style “nation-protecting stupa” completed at Kasuisai in 1911, see Jaffe 2006, 275-278. For the transfer of the relics to Hōkōji, see the section above on Nishiari’s early life. Faure mentions the three relics at Hōkōji in his note on the seven monasteries said to house Dōgen relics, but he makes no mention of relics at Kasuisai; in light of Kishizawa and Scarangelo, I take this as an oversight (see Faure 1991, 143n36-37). I will add with respect to the account of Nishiari’s “mutual resonance” with the relic that, as always with such supernatural occurrences that suffuse Buddhist historiography, I cannot help but to speculate on the protagonists’ own experience of the event. In this case, as a modern who cannot help but to reject the notion that a spiritual “mutual resonance” would spontaneously effect physical matter, I wonder, for example, whether this reproduction of relics had a physical basis (for example, in their falling off of the altar and shattering), or whether it was a deliberate, fraudulent reproduction carried out self-consciously by Nishiari, or whether the division of the relic has no factual basis at all, and is simply a story told by disciples about five empty boxes. Whatever the irretrievable “fact” of the matter, it is clear that Nishiari, despite the age he lived in, was no “modern” monk, and it is striking to sense in this account the depth of his pre-modern formation (as well as that of Kishizawa, who despite living decades deeper into the twentieth century, relates the account entirely

It is interesting here to note the relationship suggested in Kishizawa's account between Nishiari's communion with the relic and his textual study. It is clear here that for Nishiari *Shōbōgenzō* is worlds apart from the philosophical text later modernizers like Watsuji Tetsurō would have it be. For Nishiari here, in fact, it seems that the real power of the *Shōbōgenzō* is not primarily "textual" or doctrinal at all. Instead, the power of the text is part and parcel of Dōgen's personal religious power; imbued with a power more immediate than any of the particular doctrines it might express, the *Shōbōgenzō* is a veritable textual "relic" of Dōgen himself. Here again, Nishiari's devotion, awe, and mystical communion with this relic should dispel any lingering notions of him as a modernist Sōtō monk committed only to the core practices of meditation, textual study, and discipline.

As Kasuisai under Nishiari succeeded in winning this relic of Dōgen and establishing itself as the base for Sanshaku-bō devotion, it grew in resources and in prominence, and with it Nishiari too rose still further through the Sōtō ranks. Nishiari during his time there was named the "leader of propagation activities in Western Shizuoka" (*kyōdō torishimari* 教導取締) and was affirmed by the two Sōtō head temples to have "senior ranking (*jōseki* 上席) when attending events at both institutions"; Kasuisai was "designated the regional office for sectarian affairs," became a "direct branch temple" of Sōjiji, and was granted permission to establish a sectarian school. This school, the Manshō School (*Manshō Gakusha* 万松学舎), became a venue for the *Kōshōkai* to fulfill its mission of doctrinal education, and a platform for Nishiari to lecture on *Shōbōgenzō*.¹⁶⁶

Between Elections: Denshinji (1892-1901)

In 1891, while residing at Kasuisai, Nishiari hit a bump in his otherwise unobstructed ascent through the Sōtō institution, narrowly losing an election to the abbacy of the Sōtō head temple Eiheiji. Though he never trained there himself as a young monk, over the course of his career he had of course had substantial contact with Eiheiji. Five years prior, for instance, in 1886 at the age of sixty-five, he had spent some time there enjoying the prestigious status of *seidō* 西堂, a promotion which had entitled him to wear the abbatial robes of red and yellow and which guaranteed him a lifetime stipend from the sect.¹⁶⁷ As the biographies tell it,

uncritically, leaving open the question of his own genuine sense of the factual basis of this mystical resonance).

¹⁶⁶ See Scarangelo 2012, 156–158.

¹⁶⁷ The guarantee of a lifetime stipend from the sect following his 1886 promotions was a supplement to Nishiari's income, but it should be noted that as Nishiari assumed abbacies and ascended the Sōtō ranks, his financial compensation likely also rose as well. Indeed, in looking at recorded donations made by

however, his fame and prestige in the sect were not enough to overcome a most mundane of obstacles: with many ballots invalidated due to orthographic errors, he is said to have lost by a slim margin only because of the difficulty of his name character *boku* 穆.

While the difficulty of the character *boku* may have figured into his loss, a more compelling explanation comes from Michaela Mross, who in an unpublished paper suggests that Nishiari's loss should be understood in the context of the disputes between Eiheiji and Sōjiji, and among Sōjiji factions (see Section One). Nishiari's contestation of the legitimacy of the election, then, was broadly connected to the fight for Sōjiji independence and the ongoing struggles between the head temples, an understudied and critical part of Sōtō institutional history into which were entangled all of the main players in Meiji Sōtō, including Nishiari and those close to him, like his peer Azegami and his teacher Morotake.

It is tempting to infer that his loss of the election catalyzed, or perhaps forced, his departure from Kasuisai, but whatever the reason, Nishiari retired from Kasuisai at the age of seventy-one in 1892. He then assumed the abbacy of Denshinji 伝心寺 in Shimada 島田, about twenty miles away. He served at Denshinji until 1901 when finally he was able to win election to a head temple abbacy, this time of Sōjiji. Nishiari's time at Denshinji thus marks the period between his loss of the election for Eiheiji abbot and his victory in the election for Sōjiji abbot. Though he began his teaching of *Shōbōgenzō* as early as his post at Sōsanji and was involved in doctrinal education at Kasuisai that included some *genzō-e*-style lectures, most of his teaching on the *Shōbōgenzō* took place after 1892 while based at Denshinji. The lectures he gave during his time at Denshinji were formative in the careers of later prominent *genzōka* mentioned above, like Oka Sōtan, Kishizawa Ian, Tsutsugawa Hōgai, Akino Kōdō, and others. It is in this period too that Yasutani Hakuun trained with Nishiari and served as his attendant.¹⁶⁸

The time at Denshinji, between his retirement from Kasuisai and his move to Sōjiji, was a very active time for Nishiari. He lectured around the country at prominent Sōtō temples on texts like the *Shōbōgenzō* and other works of Dōgen, commentaries like Menzan Zuihō's *Eiheikakun* 永平家訓, and the Heart Sutra (*hannya shingyō* 般若心經). He led pan-sectarian Buddhist services in his hometown of Hachinohe and elsewhere, and was honored with a major

Nishiari in 1876, 1886, and 1896, it can be inferred either that he was becoming more charitable with age or that the size of his disposable income was increasing considerably. Donations, increasing over the years, are reported to various associations for the public good, like public works for levees and reconstruction from fire, orphanages, and schools, as well as a number of temples. That his donations to charitable works are noted at all in the biographies is interesting and must be understood in terms of the Meiji period Buddhist emphasis on charity, inspired by Christianity, that was noted in Section One. A study of Nishiari's own finances, or the economics of Sōtō in the Meiji in general, would make for an interesting study but is well outside the scope of this paper.

¹⁶⁸ Yasutani's public rejection of Nishiari was to come much later, as noted above. See Yasutani 1996, xxii.

banquet in honor of his birthday at the site of his Edo seminary, Kichijōji. He was also very active as a preceptor, holding back-to-back precept convocations in 1900, for example, that drew over five hundred people in Edo in the ninth month and over seven hundred and fifty people in Hanamaki 花巻 the month following. In 1902 alone he is said to have taught at thirty different locations for a total of over a hundred days. During this time of intensive teaching he also founded three temples: Mantokuji 満徳寺 (1893) in Yokohama, which was made a subtemple of Kasuisai; Jōgenji 常現寺 (1899) near Hachinohe; and the eponymous Saiyūji 西有寺 (1900), also in Yokohama, a subtemple of Mantokuji.

In 1899, at the age of seventy-eight, after lecturing at Jōganji 成願寺, about forty miles from his base at Denshinji, he contracted dysentery. The illness lasted about three months. It is said that even while on his sickbed he did not relent in his studies, working at the time with the *Goi kenketsu ganjikyaku* 五位穎訣元字脚, a 1793 commentary by Gettan Tōsui 月湛洞水 (1728-1803) on the *Goi kenketsu* of Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (Tōzan Ryōkai, 807-869). Nishiari would in 1901 publish an edition of a subcommentary on the *Goi kenketsu ganjikyaku* (see Appendix). Nishiari's student Akino Kōdō reported that when he suggested to Nishiari that reading texts while ill was not good for his body, the teacher said "The reading side is the reading side, the shitting side is the shitting side," a phrase which his students would come to call the *ganjikyaku* (元字脚, "basis of the original text") of dysentery.¹⁶⁹

Shortly after his illness, Nishiari was visited by Japan's first female journalist, Hani Motoko 羽仁もと子 (1873-1957), also from Hachinohe. Based on her visits and their conversations, she published a glowing serialized article in the *Hōchi Shimbun* 報知新聞 newspaper about Nishiari's life and teaching, based around the themes of 1) his mother's influence; 2) his lifestyle; and, 3) his teachings on the mind and spirit of Zen. This piece seems to have considerably influenced later biographers.¹⁷⁰

Nishiari at the Pinnacle of the Sect (1901-1905)

A novice thinks of becoming an elder. An elder thinks of becoming head priest. Head priest wants to be head of the council. A council member thinks of becoming head of the sect. Because of the many legs of the self, we are not really settled. We carry ourselves forward and then run after the myriad dharmas. This is delusion.

¹⁶⁹ 見る方は見る方、放る方は放る方だ。See NBZ, 32.

¹⁷⁰ See Itō 2009.

—Nishiari on *Genjōkōan*¹⁷¹

While his disputed loss in the 1891 election to the Eiheiji abbacy proved his only chance at that position, ten years later in 1901 Nishiari did win an election to the abbacy of the other head temple, Sōjiji, this time by a reportedly wide margin. He thus became the third independent abbot of Sōjiji, a post he held until 1905.¹⁷²

It was concurrent with his post as Sōjiji abbot that Nishiari served at the pinnacle of the sect as Sōtō sect chief abbot (*Sōtōshū kanchō*). As part of the tenuous compromise between the battling head temples, it had been determined that the chief abbacy of the sect would alternate annually between Eiheiji and Sōjiji abbots. Thus, beginning on the first of the year of 1902, concurrent with his Sōjiji abbacy, the eighty-one year old Nishiari assumed office as the seventh chief abbot of the Sōtō sect. Following the rotation, Eiheiji abbot Morita Goyū stepped into the post for the duration of 1903, and Nishiari served a second year again in 1904.

The Sōjiji abbot and Sōtō sect chief abbot posts were positions of national stature. As noted above, chief abbots had the status of “semi-government officials,” were empowered with “full authority over the sect” and, by government proclamation, were considered of equal status to other imperially appointed officials.¹⁷³ Thus in this role Nishiari was connected, at least nominally, with the highest levels of the Meiji government. As mentioned above, a few months after his election to Sōjiji he was granted the imperial name Jikishin Jōkoku, and during his years as chief abbot he performed at least two palace visits.

The period before, during, and after Nishiari’s post was one of turmoil at Sōjiji, a period in the history of the temple between its destruction and rebuilding, during which time it is not entirely clear what sort of training or monastic practice was possible. In 1898 a fire is said to have destroyed most of the temple, and in 1903 it was decided that the temple should move from Noto 能登, where it was deemed too close to Eiheiji, to Tsurumi 鶴見 in the vicinity of Yokohama. As abbot of Sōjiji at the time, and given his own connections in Yokohama (where he had founded Mantokuji and Saiyūji), it is likely that Nishiari played an important if not decisive role in this determination. The benefits of a move to Yokohama, a site much closer to the centers of government power and international travel, were tremendous; indeed, Sōjiji stood to gain so much from the move that it is tempting to question the nature and cause of the 1898 fire. Sōjiji did not reopen in Yokohama until 1911; the Noto site of the original temple was eventually rebuilt as Sōjiji-soin 総持寺祖院.

¹⁷¹ Translation by Weitsman and Tanahashi 2011, 41.

¹⁷² On the establishment of the “independent abbacy” of Sōjiji as an attempt by the early Meiji government to settle the discord between Eiheiji and Sōjiji, see Section Two.

¹⁷³ See Ikeda 1998, 13–18.

In mid-1903, Nishiari suffered a stroke from which he took about three months to recover. It is unclear whether this left a lasting impact on Nishiari, but I suspect that it did; a little more than a year later, in the second month of 1905, shortly after completing his second year-long term as chief abbot of the sect, he retired from Sōjiji and moved a few miles away to Saiyūji.

Nishiari's Final Years (1905-1910)

Nishiari stayed at the newly-founded Saiyūji as abbot for the five years between his retirement from Sōjiji and his death in 1910. At least two precept convocations were held during this period, in 1906 and 1910, but his lecturing as well as his publishing seems to have dropped off following his retirement from Sōjiji. I take this precipitous reduction in his teaching schedule as further evidence that he never fully recovered from his 1903 stroke. Whatever the state of his health, there is no question that he remained a monk of great prominence; his “eighty-eighth” birthday party in 1908, for example, boasted over a thousand people in attendance, reportedly including dignitaries like the prominent New Buddhist and missionary to America, Shaku Sōen, Ōkuma Shigenobu 大隈重信 (1838-1922), who would later become the prime minister of Japan, and members of the Tokugawa clan.

At two o'clock in the afternoon on the fourth day of the twelfth month of 1910, at the age of eighty-nine, Nishiari died at Saiyūji. It is said that before passing away he sat upright on his mat and gestured to his disciple Ōden Jinrei 玉田仁齡 to fit his *kesa* onto him. Nishiari thereupon passed away, wearing full robes and with the name of the Bodhisattva Kannon on his lips.

The death poem recorded to his name is:

老僧九十
 言端語端
 末後無句
 月冷風寒 (Saiyūji 1938, 35)

An old monk of ninety years,¹⁷⁴

“The speech is to the point, the words are to the point.”¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁴ By the Japanese reckoning, Nishiari died at the age of ninety.

¹⁷⁵ *Gontan gotan* 言端語端. Literally denoting something like “at the limits of words and speech,” this phrase appears in the verse in the *Hekiganroku* (Case 2) and is generally taken as a positive expression

After the end there is no verse.
The moon is chilly and the wind is cold.¹⁷⁶

of the power of language. I have borrowed Cleary's translation of the line. Yokoi renders it "words are the expression of truth". See Cleary and Cleary 1977, 13; Yokoi 1991, 171; ZGD, 368b.

¹⁷⁶ *Getsurei fūkan* 月冷風寒. This evokes a similar phrase in another verse in the *Hekiganroku* (Case 82), *getsurei fūkō* 月冷風高, which Cleary renders, "The moon is cold, the wind is high." See Cleary and Cleary 1977, 533; ZGD, 274d.

Appendix

The Published Works of Nishiari Bokusan

Listed below are the titles of Nishiari's published work, much of it transcriptions from lectures. The list is drawn from the work of the *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai* 西有穆山禪師顕彰会 research group in the commemorative volume *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji*, and more complete bibliographic information on these titles can be found there. To give a sense of the range of Nishiari's doctrinal interests and teaching, I have dropped the chronological structure of the *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji* bibliography and have arranged the titles loosely by the topic implied. I have added notes when I have been able to determine additional information about the text, and I have included publication dates with the caution that they do not necessarily bear a relationship to the date of the composition or lecture.

Monastic Conduct

Authored Works

- Collection of Admonitions on the Defense of the Dharma. *Gohō yōjin shū* 護法用心集. 1873. (See Section Three.)
- A Treatise Refuting Clerical Marriage. *Dan sōryo saitai ron* 彈僧侶妻帶論. 1879. (Jaffe has translated and analyzed this text; see Section Three.)

Textual Editions

- Proper Dharma Attire. *Hōbuku kakushō* 法服格正.¹⁷⁷ 1896. The first published edition of a seminal text by Mokushitsu Ryōyō 黙室良要 (1779-1833), completed in 1821. (Diane Riggs has discussed this text; see Section Three).

¹⁷⁷ Also known as the *Tōjō hōbuku kakushō* 洞上法服格正, see ZGD 708a.

*Dōgen Commentaries***Authored Works**

- Teachings from the Lecture Seat on [Dōgen's] *Gakudō yōjin shū*. *Gakudō yōjin shū kōen kunjū monge* 学道用心集講筵楮拾聞解. 1884. (I cannot determine the relationship of this text to the *Gakudō yōjin shū monge* 学道用心集聞解 by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 [1683-1769].)
- Lecture Notes on *Shōbōgenzō*. *Shōbōgenzō kaikō bibō* 正法眼藏開講備忘. 1896.
- Personal Commentary on [Menzan's] *Eihei kakun*. *Eihei kakun shiki* 永平家訓私記. 1897.
- Recorded Teachings on [Dōgen's] *Gakudō yōjin shū*. *Gakudō yōjin shū teiji roku* 学道用心集提耳録. 1908.
- Lectures on [Dōgen's] *Shōbōgenzō Bendōwa*. *Shōbōgenzō bendōwa kōgi* 正法眼藏排道話講義. 1908.
- Recorded Teachings on [Dōgen's] *Fukanzazengi*. *Fukanzazengi teiji roku* 普勤坐禪儀提耳録. 1911.
- A Guide to the *Shōbōgenzō* [1930]. *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* 正法眼藏啓迪. 10 volumes. 1930. Transcriptions by Tomiyama Soei 富山祖英 (1876-1929) of lectures on the *Shōbōgenzō*.
- An Analysis of Commentaries on [Dōgen's] *Hōkyōki*. *Hōkyōki benben* 寶慶記辨々. 1942.
- A Guide to the *Shōbōgenzō* [1965]. *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* 正法眼藏啓迪. Lectures on twenty-nine *Shōbōgenzō* fascicles, transcribed by Tomiyama Soei and edited by Kurebayashi Kōdō 樽林皓堂 (1893-1987). Consists of lectures on the following fascicles:
 - *Bendōwa* 辨道話
 - *Maka hannya haramitsu* 摩訶般若波羅蜜
 - *Genjōkōan* 現成公案
 - *Ikka myōju* 一顆明珠
 - *Sokushin zebutsu* 即心是佛
 - *Uji* 有時
 - *Sansui kyō* 山水經
 - *Shin fukatoku* 心不可得
 - *Kokyō* 古鏡
 - *Kankin* 看經
 - *Busshō* 佛性
 - *Gyōbutsu iigi* 行佛威儀
 - *Jinzū* 神通

- *Zazen shin* 坐禪箴
- *Bukkōjōji* 佛向上事
- *Inmo* 恁麼
- *Kaiin zanmai* 海印三昧
- *Juki* 授記
- *Kannon* 觀音
- *Arakan* 阿羅漢
- *Hakujushi* 柏樹子
- *Kōmyō* 光明
- *Shinjin gakudō* 身心學道
- *Muchū setsumu* 夢中說夢
- *Gabyō* 畫餅.
- *Sesshin sesshō* 說心說性
- *Shohō jissō* 諸法實相
- *Mujō seppō* 無情說法
- *Shōji* 生死

Textual Editions

- The Original Text of the *Shōbōgenzō shiki*. *Shōbōgenzō shiki ehon* 正法眼藏私記曾本. 1896. This text is a *Shōbōgenzō* commentary from the 1770s by Zōkai Zakke (1730-1788), described by Bielefeldt as “a good, clear, ‘orthodox’ interpretation” (Bielefeldt 1972, 10; ZGD, 717a). Nishiari based this edition on original manuscripts from the Tenmei era (1781-1789) (See ZGD, 582a).
- Lectures on the Continuing Thread of *Shōbōgenzō*. *Shōbōgenzō zokugen kōgi* 正法眼藏統絃講義. 1896. This text is a series of lectures on *Shōbōgenzō* beginning 1731 by Otsudō Kanchū 乙堂喚丑 (d. 1760) (ZGD, 184d, 582d)
- Compilation of *Shōbōgenzō Wago [shō]* and [*Shōbōgenzō*] *Byakuja ketsu*. *Shōbōgenzō wago tei byakuja ketsu gappon* 正法眼藏和語梯關邪訣合本. 1898. An edition of two texts by Menzan: *Shōbōgenzō byakuja ketsu* written in 1738, translated by Riggs as “Exposing False Interpretations of the *Shōbōgenzō*” and described as “an attack on Tenkei’s views on the compilation of the *Genzō*”; and Menzan’s 1764 *Shōbōgenzō wago shō*, translated by Riggs as “Japanese Language Selections from the *Shōbōgenzō*” and described as “glosses on mostly Japanese words and phrases of *Genzō*” (David E Riggs 2002, 255–256).

Zen Precepts

Authored Works

- Instructions on Sustaining the Zen Precepts. *Zenkai kunmō* 禪戒訓蒙. 1902.
- Lectures on [Banjin Dōtan's] *Busso shōden zenkaishō*. *Busso shōden zenkaishō kōwa* 佛祖正傳禪戒鈔講話. 1903. (See Section Three).
- The Essential Points of the Zen Precepts. *Zenkai no yōketsu* 禪戒の要訣. 1922.
- Gossip Behind the Scenes of a Transmission of Precepts Gathering, and Other [Writings]. *Denkai-e ri kanwa hoka* 傳戒会裏閑話他. 1977.

Spiritual Assurance (Anjin 安心)

Authored Works

- The Meaning of *Anjin*: Also Called the Meaning of Refuge in the Three Treasures. 安心訣: 一名皈依三宝訣. *Anjin ketsu ichimei kiesanbō ketsu*. 1889. (Scarangelo has analyzed this text; see Section Three.)
- The Meaning of *Anjin* for Followers of Tōzan. *Tōjō shintō anjin ketsu* 洞上信徒安心訣. 1890 (revised 1905).
- The Meaning of *Anjin* for Sōtō Sect Adherents. *Sōtōshū shintō anjin ketsu* 曹洞宗信徒安心訣. 1933.

Five Ranks (Goi 五位)

Authored Works

- Lectures on the Sōtō Teaching of the Five Ranks. *Tōjō goisetsu kōgi* 洞上五位説講義. 1897.
- Talks on Tōzan's Teaching of the Five Ranks. *Tōzan goisetsu kōen* 洞山五位説講演. 1901.

Textual Editions

- *Goi kenketsu ganjikyaku jijo kattōshū* 五位顯訣元字脚自叙葛藤集. 1901. The *Goi kenketsu ganjikyaku* is a 1793 commentary by Gettan Tōsui 月湛洞水 (1728-1803, also known as 月湛全苗 Gettan Zenbyō) on the *Goi kenketsu* of Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (Tōzan Ryōkai, 807-869). I have been unable to determine exactly what the *Jijo kattōshū* text is, but the note in the *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji* bibliography implies that it is an edition or sub-commentary, by Gettan Bonchō (?) 月湛梵丁,¹⁷⁸ of Tōsui's commentary on Dongshan's work. (NBZ, 231; ZGD, 273d, 301cd)

Miscellaneous

Authored Works

- Idle Words from the Shadow of the Mountains. *Sanin kanwa* 山陰閑話. (Date unknown.)
- A Brief Explanation of Three Sections (?). *Sanshō ryakkai* 三章略解. 1874.
- Regulations of the Association of Sanshaku-bō Confraternities. *Sanshakubō kōsha kekisoku* 三尺坊講社假規則. (1880s). This text is not mentioned in the *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji* bibliography but is cited in Scarangelo (Scarangelo 2012, 314n28).
- Discourse on the Teaching (?). *Migyō ron* (?) 御教論. 1903. Co-authored with Morita Goyū 森田悟由 (1834-1919).
- A Collection of Teachings. *Suikai issoku* 垂誠一則. 1903.
- Zen Talks of Nishiari. *Nishiari zenwa* 西有禪話. 1905.
- The Recorded Sayings of Zen Master Jikishin Jōkoku (Nishiari Bokusan). *Jikishin Jōkoku Zenji goroku* 直心淨國禪師語錄. 1926.
- Recorded teachings on [Keizan's] *Zazen yōjinki*. *Zazen yōjinki teijiroku* 坐禪用心記提耳錄. 1933.

Textual Editions

- Teachings of the Clock. *Jishingi setsu* 時辰儀說. 1877. This is an edition of a text by Kumagai Tōshū 熊谷東洲 (d. 1890).

¹⁷⁸ I have been unable to find information about this Gettan Bonchō 月湛梵丁, though he also appears as an editor of the *Tōsui Oshō goroku* 洞水和尚語錄 (*Sōtōshū zensho* Volume 5) and is presumably a disciple of the *Goi kenketsu ganjikyaku* author Tōsui.

- *Hōkyō zanmai kun'yūdan* 寶鏡三昧薰齋談. 1886. This is an edition of a commentary by Gesshū Sōko 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696) on the Sōtō liturgical text *Hōkyō zanmai* by Dongshan.
- *Sandōkai kun'yūdan* 參同契薰齋談. 1886. This is an edition of a commentary by Gesshū Sōko 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696) on the Sōtō liturgical text *Sandōkai* by Shitou Xiqian 石頭希遷 (Sekitō Kisen, 710–790).

WORKS CITED

- Akizuki Ryūmin 秋月竜眠 et. al. 1979. "Tokushū: Nihon No Zensō No Kotoba: Sōtōshū: Nishiari Bokusan 特集・日本の禅僧のことば・曹洞宗・西有穆山." *Daihōrin*, 1979 (June): 147.
- Besserman, Perle, and Manfred B Steger. 1991. *Crazy Clouds: Zen Radicals, Rebels, and Reformers*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Bielefeldt, Carl. 1972. "Shōbōgenzō-Sansuikyō." MA, Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley.
- Blum, Mark L. 2011. "Shin Buddhism in the Meiji Period." In *Cultivating Spirituality: A Modern Shin Buddhist Anthology*, edited by Mark L Blum and Robert Rhodes, 1–52. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bodiford, William M. 1991. "Dharma Transmission in Sōtō Zen: Manzan Dohaku's Reform Movement." *MN Monumenta Nipponica* 46 (4): 423–51.
- . 1993. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- . 2012a. "Remembering Dōgen: Eiheiji and Dōgen Hagiography." In *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*, edited by Steven Heine. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012b. "Textual Genealogies of Dōgen." In *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*, edited by Steven Heine. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clarke, Shayne Neil. 2014. *Family matters in Indian Buddhist monasticisms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Cleary, J. C. 2005. *Apocryphal Scriptures*. Berkeley, Calif.: Numata Center for Buddhist Translation and Research.
- Cleary, J. C., and Thomas F. Cleary. 1977. *The Blue Cliff Record*. Boulder, Colo.: Shambhala.
- Collcutt, Martin. 1986. "Buddhism: The Threat of Eradication." In *Japan in Transition, from Tokugawa to Meiji*, edited by Marius B Jansen and Gilbert Rozman. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Davis, Winston. 1992. *Japanese Religion and Society: Paradigms of Structure and Change*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dumoulin, Heinrich. 1992. *Zen Buddhism in the 20th Century*. New York: Weatherhill.
- . 2005. *Zen Buddhism: A History, Japan*. World Wisdom, Inc.
- Fader, Larry. 1982. "Historical and Philosophical Implications of the 1893 Chicago World's Parliament of Religions." *The Eastern Buddhist*. 15: 122–45.

- Fasan, Jacques T. 2012. "Kiyozawa Manshi (1863-1903) and the Search for Autonomy in Modern Japan." Ph.D., Illinois: The University of Chicago.
- Faure, Bernard. 1991. *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2010. "Afterthoughts." In *Buddhist Warfare*, edited by Michael K Jerryson and Mark Juergensmeyer. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ford, James. 2012. "Dharma Transmission in North American Sōtō Zen: A Progress Report." *Monkey Mind*. May 28, 2012.
<http://www.patheos.com/blogs/monkeymind/2012/05/dharma-transmission-in-north-american-sōtō-zen-a-progress-report.html>.
- Foulk, T. Griffith. 1993. "Myth, Ritual, and Monastic Practice in Sung Ch'an Buddhism." In *Religion and Society in T'ang and Sung China*, edited by Patricia Buckley Ebrey and Peter N Gregory, 147–208. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- . 2001. "The Meaning of Practice and Verification (Shushōgi)." In *Sōtō School Scriptures for Daily Services and Practice (Sōtōshū Nikka Gongyō Seiten 曹洞宗日課勤行聖典)*.
- . 2010a. *Standard Observances of the Sōtō Zen School, Vol. I*. Tōkyō: Sōtōshū shūmuchō.
- . 2010b. *Standard Observances of the Sōtō Zen School, Vol. II*. Tōkyō: Sōtōshū shūmuchō.
- Fueoka Jishō 笛岡自照. 1972. "Genzōe to Ishihara Toshiaki-ō 眼藏会と石原俊明翁." In *Shōbōgenzō zenkō 正法眼藏全講*, by Kishizawa Ian 岸澤惟安, Supplement #19, 月報 19:3–8. Tōkyō: Daihōrinkaku.
- Gluck, Carol. 1985. *Japan's Modern Myths: Ideology in the Late Meiji Period*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Grapard, Allan G. 1984. "Japan's Ignored Cultural Revolution: The Separation of Shintō and Buddhist Divinities in Meiji ('Shimbutsu Bunri') and a Case Study: Tonomine." *History of Religions* 23 (3): 240–65.
- Hachinohe shiritsu toshokan 八戸市立図書館. 1972. *Kyōdo No Meisō: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Sono Hito to Nenpu 郷土の名僧「西有穆山禪師その人と年譜」*. Hachinohe: Hachinohe shiritsu toshokan.
- Hardacre, Helen. 1989. *Shintō and the State, 1868-1988*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Heine, Steven. 2003. "Abbreviation or Aberration?: The Role of the Shushōgi in Sōtō Zen." In *Buddhism in the Modern World: Adaptations of an Ancient Tradition*, edited by Steven Heine and Charles S. Prebish. Oxford University Press, USA.
- . 2006. *Did Dōgen Go to China?: What He Wrote and When He Wrote It*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2012a. *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- . 2012b. “What Is on the Other Side? Delusion and Realization in Dōgen’s ‘Genjōkōan.’” In *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*, 42–74. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hirata, Seikō. 1995. “Zen Buddhist Attitudes to War.” In *Rude Awakenings Zen, the Kyōto School, & the Question of Nationalism*, edited by James W Heisig and John C Maraldo, translated by Thomas Kirchner, 3–15. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Hur, Nam-Lin. 1999. “The Sōtō Sect and Japanese Military Imperialism in Korea.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 26 (1/2): 107–34.
- . 2007. *Death and Social Order in Tokugawa Japan: Buddhism, Anti-Christianity, and the Danka System*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Ikeda, Eishun. 1998. “Teaching Assemblies and Lay Societies in the Formation of Modern Sectarian Buddhism.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 11–44.
- Ishii, Seijun. 2012. “New Trends in Dōgen Studies in Japan.” In *Dōgen: Textual and Historical Studies*, edited by Steven Heine, 223–35. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ishikawa Rikizan 石川力山. 2000. “Transmission of Kirigami (secret Initiation Documents): A Sōtō Practice in Medieval Japan.” In *The Kōan Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, edited by Steven Heine and Dale S Wright, translated by Kawahashi Seishū, 233–43. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. “The Social Response of Buddhists to the Modernization of Japan: The Contrasting Lives of Two Sōtō Zen Monks.” Translated by Paul L. Swanson. *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 87–115.
- Itō Shōji 伊藤勝司. 2009. “Bokusan Zenji to Hani Motoko 穆山禪師と羽仁もと子.” In *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo hyakunen o mukaete 西有穆山禪師：没後百年を迎えて*, by Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai 西有穆山禪師顕彰会, 222–25. Hachinohe: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai.
- Itō Yōichi 伊東洋一. 1955. “Nishiari Bokusan No Shōbōgenzō Kan 西有穆山の正法眼蔵観.” *Rinrigaku Nenpō 倫理学年報* 4: 1–11.
- Ives, Christopher. 2009. *Imperial-Way Zen: Ichikawa Hakugen’s Critique and Lingering Questions for Buddhist Ethics*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Jaffe, Richard. 1998. “Meiji Religious Policy, Sōtō Zen, and the Clerical Marriage Problem.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 45–85.
- . 1999. “A Refutation of Clerical Marriage.” In *Religions of Japan in Practice*, edited by George J Tanabe and Ian Reader, 78–86. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . 2001. *Neither Monk nor Layman: Clerical Marriage in Modern Japanese Buddhism*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 2006. “Buddhist Material Culture, ‘Indianism,’ and the Construction of Pan-Asian Buddhism in Prewar Japan.” *Material Religion* 2 (3): 266–293.

- Jaffe, Richard, and Michel Mohr. 1998. "Editors' Introduction: Meiji Zen." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 1–10. doi:10.2307/30233596.
- Jannetta, Ann Bowman. 1987. *Epidemics and Mortality in Early Modern Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Jansen, Marius B. 2000. *The Making of Modern Japan*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Josephson, Jason Ananda. 2006. "When Buddhism Became a 'Religion': Religion and Superstition in the Writings of Inoue Enryō." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33 (1): 143–68.
- . 2012. *The Invention of Religion in Japan*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風. 2002. *Meiji zenki Sōtōshū no kenkyū* 明治前期曹洞宗の研究. Kyōto: Hōzōkan.
- Ketelaar, James Edward. 1990. *Of Heretics and Martyrs in Meiji Japan: Buddhism and Its Persecution*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Kim, Hee-Jin. 2004. *Eihei Dōgen: Mystical Realist*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Kim, Hwansoo Ilmee. 2012. *Empire of the Dharma: Korean and Japanese Buddhism, 1877-1912*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Kirita, Kiyohide. 1995. "D. T. Suzuki on Society and the State." In *Rude Awakenings Zen, the Kyōto School, & the Question of Nationalism*, edited by James W Heisig and John C Maraldo, translated by Richard Szimpl and Thomas Kirchner, 52–74. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Kishimoto, Hideo. 1956. *Japanese Religion in the Meiji Era*. Translated by John F. Howes. Tōkyō: Ōbunsha.
- Kishizawa Ian 岸澤惟安. 1938. *Senshi Nishiari Bokusan Oshō* 先師西有穆山和尚. In *Shōbōgenzō keiteki* 正法眼藏啓迪 by Nishiari Bokusan 西有穆山, 579-653. 2004. Tōkyō: Daihōrinkaku.
- Kitagawa, Joseph Mitsuo. 1993. "The 1893 World's Parliament of Religions and Its Legacy." In *Museum of Faiths*, 171–89. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Kiyozawa Manshi. 1984. *December Fan: The Buddhist Essays of Manshi Kiyozawa*. Translated by Haneda Nobuo. Kyōto: Higashi Honganji.
- Kurebayashi Kōdō 樽林皓堂. 1972. "Genzōe no rekishi 眼藏会の歴史." In *Shōbōgenzō zenkō* 正法眼藏全講, by Kishizawa Ian 岸澤惟安, Supplement #2, 月報 2:1–4. Tōkyō: Daihōrinkaku.
- Leighton, Taigen Daniel, and Shohaku Okumura. 1996. *Dōgen's Pure Standards for the Zen Community: A Translation of the Eihei Shingī*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

- Lobreglio, John. 2009. "Orthodox, Heterodox, Heretical: Defining Doctrinal Boundaries in Meiji Period Sōtō Zen." *Bochumer Jahrbuch Zur Ostasienforschung (Bochum Yearbook for East Asian Studies)* 33: 77–103.
- Lopez, Donald S. 2008. *Buddhism & Science: A Guide for the Perplexed*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Marcure, Kenneth A. 1985. "The Danka System." *Monumenta Nipponica* 40 (1): 39–67.
- Mohr, Michel. 1994. "Zen Buddhism during the Tokugawa Period: The Challenge to Go beyond Sectarian Consciousness." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 21 (4): 341–72.
- . 1998. "Japanese Zen Schools and the Transition to Meiji: A Plurality of Responses in the Nineteenth Century." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 167–213.
- Mross, Michaela. 2009. "The Independence Movement of Sōjiji: A Milestone in the Formation of Modern Sōtō Zen." *Unpublished*.
- Muller, A. Charles, ed. *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. <<http://buddhism-dict.net/ddb>>.
- Nelson, John K. 2013. *Experimental Buddhism: Innovation and Activism in Contemporary Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai 西有穆山禪師顕彰会. 2009. *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo hyakunen o mukaete 西有穆山禪師：没後百年を迎えて*. Hachinohe: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai. Abbreviated "NBZ".
- Nishiari Bokusan 西有穆山. 1903. *Busso shōden Zenkai shō kōwa 仏祖正伝禪戒鈔講話*. Tōkyō: Kōmeisha. <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/823469>.
- . 1905. *Nishiari zenwa 西有禪話*. Tōkyō: Kōmeisha. <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/823426>.
- . 2004. *Shōbōgenzō keiteki 正法眼藏啓迪*. 3 vols. Transcribed by Tomiyama Soei 富山祖英 and edited by Kurebayashi Kōdō 樽林皓堂. Tōkyō: Daihōrinkaku.
- Nishijima, Gudo Wafu. 1997. "Japanese Buddhism and the Meiji Restoration." Presentation to The American Academy of Religion: Annual Meeting 1997. San Francisco.
- Reader, Ian. 1985. "Transformation and Changes in the Teachings of the Sōtō Zen Buddhist Sect." *Japanese Religions* 14 (1).
- . 1986. "Zazenless Zen?: The Position of Zazen in Institutional Zen Buddhism." *Japanese Religions* 14 (3).
- Reader, Ian, and George Joji Tanabe. 1998. *Practically Religious Worldly Benefits and the Common Religion of Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Riggs, David E. 2002. "The Rekindling of a Tradition: Menzan Zuihō and the Reform of Japanese Sōtō Zen in the Tokugawa Era." Ph.D., Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Riggs, Diane Elizabeth. 2010. "The Cultural and Religious Significance of Japanese Buddhist Vestments." Ph.D., Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.

- Saiyūji 西有寺. 1938. "Saiyūji Itsuwashū 西有寺逸話集." In *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo Hyakunen O Mukaete* 西有穆山禪師：没後百年を迎えて, by Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai 西有穆山禪師顕彰会, 14–35. 2009. Hachinohe: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai.
- Satō, Kemmyō Taira, and Thomas Kirchner. 2008. "D. T. Suzuki and the Question of War." *The Eastern Buddhist* 39 (1): 61–120.
- . 2010. "Brian Victoria and the Question of Scholarship." *The Eastern Buddhist* 41 (2): 139–66.
- Sawada, Janine Anderson. 1998. "Political Waves in the Zen Sea: The Engaku-Ji Circle in Early Meiji Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 25 (1/2): 117–50.
- . 2004. *Practical Pursuits: Religion, Politics, and Personal Cultivation in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Scarangelo, Dominick John. 2012. "Embodying the Deities: A Study of the Formation of a Modern Japanese Deity Cult." Ph.D., Virginia: University of Virginia.
- Schlütter, Morten. 2008. *How Zen Became Zen the Dispute over Enlightenment and the Formation of Chan Buddhism in Song-Dynasty China*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Sharf, Robert H. 1995a. "The Zen of Japanese Nationalism." In *Curators of the Buddha : The Study of Buddhism under Colonialism*, edited by Donald S Lopez, 107–60. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1995b. "Whose Zen?: Zen Nationalism Revisited." In *Rude Awakenings Zen, the Kyōto School, & the Question of Nationalism*, edited by James W Heisig and John C Maraldo, 40–51. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 2002a. "On Esoteric Buddhism in China." In *Coming to Terms with Chinese Buddhism: A Reading of the Treasure Store Treatise*, 263–78. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- . 2002b. "On Pure Land Buddhism and Ch'an/Pure Land Syncretism in Medieval China." *T'oung Pao* 88 (4/5): 282–331.
- Snodgrass, Judith. 2003. *Presenting Japanese Buddhism to the West : Orientalism, Occidentalism, and the Columbian Exposition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- . 2009. "Publishing Eastern Buddhism: D. T. Suzuki's Journey to the West." In *Casting Faiths: Imperialism and the Transformation of Religion in East and Southeast Asia*, edited by Thomas David DuBois, 46–72. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sōtōshū shūmuchō 曹洞宗務局. 1889. *Tōjō Gyōji Kihan* 洞上行持軌範. 2 vols. Tōkyō: Sōtōshū shūmuchō. <http://dl.ndl.go.jp/info:ndljp/pid/823402>.
- . 1988. "Sōtōshū Gyōji Kihan" no kaitei nitsuite 『曹洞宗行持軌範』の改訂について. Tōkyō: Sōtōshū shūmuchō.

Staggs, Kathleen Marie. 1979. "In Defense of Japanese Buddhism: Essays from the Meiji Period by Inoue Enryō and Murakami Senshō." Ph.D., New Jersey: Princeton University.

Takakashi Banmei 高橋晩成. 2009. *Zen 禅*. Kadokawa Pictures, Inc.

Thelle, Notto R. 1987. *Buddhism and Christianity in Japan: From Conflict to Dialogue, 1854-1899*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Tokuno, Takayuki 徳野崇行. 2010. "Meiji-Taishō ni okeru Sōtōshū no sōgi-tsuizenkuyōhō-- gyōji kihan-Tōjō gyōji yonbun yōroku-Tōjō gyōji fugin kindō o shiryō toshite 明治-大正期における曹洞宗の葬儀-追善供養法--行持軌範-洞上行持四分要録-洞上行持諷經錦囊を資料として." *Komazawa Daigaku Daigakuin Bukkyōgaku Kenkyūkai nenpō*, no. 43: 19–39.

Tō Ryūshin 東隆眞. 2009. "Nishiari Bokusan to Shōbōgenzō 西有穆山禪師と「正法眼蔵」." In *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo hyakunen o mukaete*. 西有穆山禪師: 没後百年を迎えて, by Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai 西有穆山禪師顕彰会, 42–48. Hachinohe: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai.

Ueda Shōetsu 上田祥悦. 2009. "Nishiari Bokusan to haibutsu kishaku 西有穆山と廃仏毀釈." In *Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Botsugo hyakunen o mukaete* 西有穆山禪師: 没後百年を迎えて, by Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai 西有穆山禪師顕彰会, 50–54. Hachinohe: Nishiari Bokusan Zenji Kenshōkai.

Victoria, Daizen Brian. 2003. *Zen War Stories*. London; New York: RoutledgeCurzon.

———. 2006. *Zen at War*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

———. 2010. "The 'Negative Side' of D. T. Suzuki's Relationship to War." *The Eastern Buddhist* 41 (2): 97–138.

———. 2013a. "Zen as a Cult of Death in the Wartime Writings of D.T. Suzuki." *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 11 (30.5).

———. 2013b. "D.T. Suzuki, Zen and the Nazis." *The Asia-Pacific Journal* 11 (43.4).

Watanabe, Shōei 渡部正英. 1983. "Tōjō gyōji kihan nitsuite no isshiten 「洞上行持軌範」についての一視点." *Shūgaku kenkyū* 25 (March): 132–38.

———. 1984. "Tōjō gyōji kihan nitsuite no isshiten ni 洞上行持軌範」についての一視点-2-." *Shūgaku kenkyū* 26 (March): 149–54.

Weitsman, Mel, and Kazuaki Tanahashi, trans. 2011. "Commentary by Nishiari Bokusan." In *Dōgen's Genjo Koan: Three Commentaries*. Counterpoint Press.

Williams, Duncan Ryuken. 2005. *The Other Side of Zen: A Social History of Sōtō Zen : Buddhism in Tokugawa Japan*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Yasutani, Hakuun. 1996. *Flowers Fall : A Commentary on Dōgen's Genjokoan*. Translated by Paul Jaffe. Boston: Shambhala Publications.

Yifa. 2002. *The Origins of Buddhist Monastic Codes in China: An Annotated Translation and Study of the Chanyuan Qinggui*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

———. 2005. “From the Chinese Vinaya Tradition to Chan Regulations.” In *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya: Essays Presented in Honor of Professor Stanley Weinstein*, edited by William Bodiford, 124–35. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

Yokoi Yūhō 横井雄峯. 1991. *Japanese-English Zen Buddhist Dictionary* 日英禪語辭典. Tōkyō: Sankibō Buddhist Bookstore.

Yoshida Ryūetsu 吉田隆悦. 1976. *Bakumatsu/Meiji No Meisō Nishiari Bokusan Zenji: Sono Shōgai to Shōseki* 幕末・明治の名僧西有穆山禪師：その生涯と勝蹟. Hachinohe: Ikichishoin 伊吉書院.

Zengaku Daijiten Hensanjo 禪學大辭典編纂所編. 1993. *Shinpan zengaku daijiten* 新版禪學大辭典. Tōkyō: Taishukan. Abbreviated “ZGD”.



直心浄国禅師の肖像（安田靱彦謹写）