

JIANG WU

Leaving for the Rising Sun:
The Historical Background of
Yinyuan Longqi's Migration to Japan in 1654

A neglected area in studies of the Ming-Qing transition, one that informs us about the scope and depth of that transition, concerns the changes in Chinese Buddhism. Not only did a significant number of loyalists join the Buddhist order, but, in addition, Buddhist monks became key political players. One noteworthy event in this context is Yinyuan Longqi's 隱元隆琦 (1592–1673) emigration to Japan in 1654. His departure led to the establishment of the Ōbaku 黃檗 School in Japan, which was considered a mark of Chinese cultural identity for Chinese emigrants there. What happened after the emigration is well known: despite opposition from Japanese Buddhists, Yinyuan won the favor of the shōgunate and the Japanese emperor. Under an interdiction that no new temples be built, the *bakufu* government made an exception to grant land in Uji 宇治, Kyoto, to Yinyuan Longqi. In 1661, Manpukuji 萬福寺, named after Yinyuan Longqi's home monastery at Mount Huangbo (Ōbaku) in China, was erected. In the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, based in this new monastery at Uji, the Ōbaku School spread its influence throughout Japan. For a long time, this *de facto* new sect used the name “Rinzai shōshū 臨濟正宗” or “Orthodox Lineage of Rinzai.” The name “Ōbakushū” was not used until 1876, when the Japanese government employed the term to distinguish Ōbaku from other Zen sects. In 1970, the Ōbaku sect still had 478 temples and 244,584 adherents in Japan.¹

The history of the establishment of the Ōbaku School in Japan belongs to the area of Japanese religion, and such scholars as Helen Baroni have clarified much of Ōbaku's history after Yinyuan landed in Japan.²

¹ *Japanese Religion: A Survey by the Agency for Cultural Affairs* (Tokyo, New York, and San Francisco: Kodansha International Ltd., 1972), p. 245.

² See Helen Baroni, *Obaku Zen* (Honolulu: U. of Hawai'i P., 2000), and Dieter Schwaller, *Der japanische Obaku-Monch Tetsugen Doko: Leben, Denken, Schriften* (Bern; New York: P. Lang, 1988).

This article focuses on the historical background, with special reference to the transformation of Chan Buddhism and the social circumstances of his emigration. In addition to various conventional sources, such as the Jiaxing 嘉興 Buddhist canon (which collected, among other texts, recorded sayings of seventeenth-century Chan Buddhists), Yinyuan's complete collections, and *Ka'i hentai* 華夷變態, my reconstruction is largely based on newly discovered sources such as 117 letters from China addressed to Yinyuan after 1652 and a Japanese collection titled *Tōzuihen* 桃蕊編 (*Peach Bud Collection*), which highlights the Taoist connection to Yinyuan's migration.³

As I demonstrate, Yinyuan Longqi's mission to Japan was, in the first place, a result of the revival of Chan Buddhism initiated in the late-sixteenth century. Furthermore, it was deeply rooted in social and political changes occurring in seventeenth-century China. Two historical developments created the social conditions for Yinyuan's emigration: the Ming-Qing transition and the consequent Chinese diaspora. In particular, Yinyuan Longqi's mission to Japan was first initiated by the Chinese community in Nagasaki, and he was escorted to Japan by Zheng Chenggong's 鄭成功 (1624–1662) fleet. Because of this connection with Zheng Chenggong, it is arguable that the purpose of Yinyuan Longqi's initial mission might have been to request Japanese military intervention for the anti-Manchu resistance. Although this hypothesis is debatable, it is certain that Yinyuan Longqi's emigration was enmeshed in the turbulent political events of seventeenth-century China.

YINYUAN LONGQI IN CHINA

Yinyuan Longqi's emigration was first of all a religious event that can be seen against the background of changes in Buddhism. Late in the sixteenth century, Chan Buddhism was spreading quickly, and Chan monks controlled a significant number of monasteries, including Mount Huangbo in Fujian, where Yinyuan was abbot. Second, Chan monks applied conscious effort to restoring what was perceived to be Chan's

³ In what follows, I primarily use the following main collections: *Ming Jiaxing dazangjing* 明嘉興大藏經 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng, 1987; hereafter, abbreviated *JXDZ*); Chen Zhichao 陳智超, Wei Zuhui 韋祖輝, and He Lingxiu 何齡修, eds., *Riben Huangboshan Wanfusi cang lu Ri gaoseng Yinyuan Zhongtu laiwang shuxin ji* 日本黃檗山萬福寺藏旅日高僧隱元中土來往書信集 (Beijing: China Microfilm Center, 1995; hereafter abbreviated as *Correspondence*); Hirakubo Akira 平久保章, ed., *Shinsan kōtei Ingen zenshū* 新纂校訂隱元全集 (Kyoto: Kaimei shoin, 1979; hereafter, *IGZS*); Hayashi Harukatsu 林春勝 and Hayashi Nobuatsu 林信篤, comps., Ura Renichi 浦廉一, annot., *Ka'i hentai* (Tokyo: Tōyō bunko, 1958–59). The rare source *Tōzuihen* that I cite is a photocopy of a work held in the Komazawa University Library, a gift from Livia Kohn to the Harvard-Yenching Library.

golden past in the Tang and Song eras. One characteristic of this revival was the use of beating and shouting during the so-called encounter dialogues. This style of Chan teaching had been used extensively by Chan masters, and in fact was part of the technique of Yinyuan Longqi's dharma masters Miyun Yuanwu 密雲圓悟 (1566–1642) and Feiyin Tongrong 費隱通容 (1593–1662).⁴ Claiming themselves as authentic descendants of the Linji School, they systematically reinvented Chan institutions. Yinyuan Longqi, as a legitimate dharma heir of this tradition, was situated at the center of the movement. The following section discusses Yinyuan's career in China, especially in Mount Huangbo, where he was abbot for seventeen years.

Yinyuan's Search for Chan Enlightenment

Yinyuan was born in Fuqing 福清 county, Fuzhou prefecture, in Fujian. According to accounts of his life, he received an elementary Confucian education but then had to give up schooling due to poverty. When he was six years old, his father disappeared during a business trip. Therefore, in 1612, when Yinyuan was twenty-one years old, he was determined to search for his father. Not interested in marriage, Yinyuan persuaded his mother to grant him his dowry money for travel expenses. Despite opposition from his relatives, he embarked on the journey nonetheless. He first arrived in Jiangxi and from there went to Nanjing, the southern capital. His search did not result in bringing his father back, but instead led him to the Buddhist faith. In 1614, he took a pilgrimage boat to Mount Putuo, the famous pilgrimage site associated with Avalokiteśvara, and prayed for his father's safe return.⁵ His

⁴ In what follows, I characterize the 17th-c. transformation of Buddhism as a "revival" or "reinvention," suggesting an unprecedented resurgence of Buddhist activities such as temple-building, publishing, public debates, sect formation, and the reintroduction of ancient practices from the Tang and Song. Despite the existence of a large number of sources, scholars have not yet fully explored the breadth and depth of the transformation of Buddhism in this era. For studies in English, see Timothy Brook, *Praying for Power: Buddhism and the Formation of Gentry Society in Late-Ming China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1993); Chün-fang Yü, *The Renewal of Buddhism in China: Chu-hung and the Late Ming Synthesis* (New York: Columbia U.P. 1981), and Jiang Wu, "Orthodoxy, Controversy, and the Transformation of Chan Buddhism in the Seventeenth Century," Ph.D. diss. (Harvard University, 2002). For studies in Chinese and Japanese, see Araki Kengo 荒木見悟, *Minmatsu shūkyō shisō kenkyū* 明末宗教思想研究 (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1979); Chen Yuan 陳垣, *Qingchu sengzheng ji* 清初僧諍記 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962), and *Mingji Dian Qian Fojiao kao* 明季滇黔佛教攷 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962); Hasebe Yūkei 長谷部幽蹊, *Minshin Bukkyōshi kenkyū josetsu* 明清佛教史研究序說 (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1979); and *Minshin Bukkyō kyōdanshi kenkyū* 明清佛教團史研究 (Tokyo: Dōhōsha, 1993).

⁵ For an account of this famous site, see Chün-fang Yü, "P'u-t'o shan: Pilgrimage and the Creation of the Chinese Potalaka," in Susan Naquin and Chün-fang Yü, eds., *Pilgrims and Sacred Sites in China* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1992), pp. 190–245.

pilgrimage turned him into a devout Buddhist believer and subsequently he became a vegetarian, a certain type of Buddhist hallmark at that time in China. But to become a monk was difficult, especially because his mother had to rely on him for her livelihood. When Yinyuan returned home, asking for permission to be ordained, his mother refused. The only possibility was to wait until his mother's death and to fulfill his filial duties. His mother died in 1619, when Yinyuan was twenty-eight. Because local monks from Mount Huangbo were invited to his mother's funeral service, he was introduced to the master Jianyuan Xingshou 鑑源興壽 (?–1625), who persuaded him to be ordained locally and adopt the dharma name “Longqi.”

For Yinyuan, initiation as a monk meant the beginning of a life-time spiritual quest for enlightenment. At first, he was not exposed to the teaching of the Linji School, the type of Chan teaching to which he was later committed. Rather, like many new monks in the seventeenth century, he frequented lectures on Buddhist scriptures. These lectures were popular in the monastic world because Buddhist scholasticism was promoted by monasteries and drew considerable audiences from both the laity and clergy. For example, Caodong masters such as Zhanran 湛然圓澄 (1561–1626) were extremely popular teachers. In 1621, on his way to Beijing to solicit a donation on behalf of Mount Huangbo, Yinyuan stopped at Yunmen 雲門 Monastery and listened to Zhanran's lecture on the *Nirvāna Sūtra*. In 1622, he went to Jiaying 嘉興 county to study the *Lotus Sūtra* and later the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*. After several years of study, however, Yinyuan became increasingly impatient with the “tedious” scholastic tradition. He felt that scriptural studies only pointed out the way, rather than lead people onto it – that study in general was not the way to break the rebirth cycle. At this time, he heard of Miyun Yuanwu, who was regarded as a true master of the Linji School.⁶

Miyun Yuanwu was a leader within an important part of the Chan revival after the death of the three eminent monks Yunqi Zhuhong 雲棲株宏 (1535–1615), Hanshan Deqing 憨山德清 (1546–1623), and Zibo Zhenke 紫柏真可 (1543–1603),⁷ who had greatly shaped the course of the Buddhist revival in the late Ming. During this time period, various

⁶ Nōnin Kōdō 能仁見道, *Ingen zenji nenpu* 隱元禪師年譜 (Kyoto: Zenbunka kenkyūjo, 1999), pp. 94–113.

⁷ Previous scholarship regards “the late-Ming Buddhist revival” as taking place during the Wanli reign (1573–1620) and the later development of early-Qing as simply the aftermath of this revival. See Chün-fang Yü, “Ming Buddhism,” in F. W. Mote and D. Twitchett, eds., *Cambridge History of China*, (Cambridge: Cambridge U.P., 1990) 8.2, p. 927. Many scholars men-

kinds of Chan communities were formed based on the relationship between master and disciple concerning dharma transmission. Because the position of the monastery was controlled by members of a specific lineage, the legitimacy of dharma transmission was emphasized in its strictest sense. Moreover, Chan literature such as “lamp transmission” histories and recorded sayings grew in popularity, and in the Chan communities various archaic forms of practice, like beating and shouting, which can only be found in Chan literature (such as *kōan* collections), were literally enacted: “violent” expressions of enlightenment were performed live, in front of the assembly.⁸

Miyun Yuanwu represented this new trend, and his antinomian style of Chan performance attracted thousands of inspired young monks like Yinyuan. He attended Miyun's assembly in Jinsu 金粟 Monastery in 1624. Among the 500 students there he was relatively unknown. But during a limited number of encounters with Miyun, Yinyuan was deeply impressed by his teaching style and was gradually converted to the new Chan. According to modern biographical studies, it was under Miyun Yuanwu that Yinyuan reached enlightenment.⁹

In 1630, Miyun Yuanwu was invited to Mount Huangbo to assume the position of abbot, and during his tenure there Feiyin Tongrong, later Yinyuan Longqi's master, was bestowed the dharma transmission. After Miyun left Huangbo, Feiyin Tongrong succeeded him. After Feiyin Tongrong finished his three-year tenure at Huangbo, gentry patrons decided to invite Yinyuan Longqi to succeed Feiyin as abbot. In the fifth month of the tenth year of the Chongzhen reign (1637), Yinyuan received the invitation to assume the position of abbot of Huangbo.¹⁰

Mount Huangbo

Mount Huangbo is located in Yinyuan's hometown of Fuqing. It was an important monastery in Chan history not only because it was the place where the famous Chan master Huangbo Xiyun 黃檗希運

tion the “Four Eminent Monks” of late-Ming. However, the usual reference to the “Four Eminent Monks” is a myth created after about 1700. Earlier, Zhuhong, Deqing, and Zhenke were referred to as the three eminent monks, and the fourth, Ouyi Zhixu, was less prominent.

⁸ A new study of this is found in Wu, “Orthodoxy, Controversy.”

⁹ Nōnin, *Ingen Zenji nenpu*, p. 115.

¹⁰ Several versions of his biography indicate that this event coincided with Yinyuan's reception of the dharma transmission from Feiyin Tongrong. The timing of the conferral was interesting and significant: initially, Yinyuan Longqi refused the first invitation. His biographer suggested that the refusal was based on the excuse that Yinyuan had not received the certificate of dharma transmission. Eventually his certificate arrived from Feiyin and Yinyuan thus accepted the invitation officially. See *IGZS*, vol. 11, pp. 5142–46.

(?-850) was ordained, but also because a revived Huangbo Monastery in the seventeenth century also served as the model for the Japanese Manpukuji.

The history of the monastery at Mount Huangbo can be traced back to the eighth century. According to its monastic gazetteer composed in the seventeenth century, in the fifth year of the Zhenyuan 貞元 reign of the Tang (789), the Sixth Patriarch Huineng's disciple Zhenggan 正幹 arrived at the mountain and erected a cloister called "the Terrace of Prajñā" (Boretai 般若臺). Although we have no information about this figure called Zhenggan, in the early history of the monastery, Huangbo Xiyun 黃檗希運 (?-850) was much more well-known. Having being ordained at Mount Huangbo, he left for the Jiangxi area to study with Mazu and became a distinguished Chan master. Xiyun had taught the extraordinary student Linji Yixuan 臨濟義玄 (?-867), who was able to spread Huangbo Xiyun's teaching and established the Linji School.

After Tang times, the history of Mount Huangbo in Fujian is obscure. During the Song dynasty, Mount Huangbo must have been a prominent local monastery because a Song local gazetteer recorded its name.¹¹ The monastery fell into complete oblivion until the end of the sixteenth century, when Fujian society was restabilized after the eventual quelling of the Sino-Japanese pirate invasions. Zhongtian Zhengyuan 中天正圓 (1537-1610), a native monk born in Fuqing, lamented the destruction of Mount Huangbo during the pirate invasions in the middle of the sixteenth century and was determined to restore the monastery. In 1601, he decided to go to Beijing to request a complete set of the Chinese Tripiṭaka from the imperial house in order to glorify his monastery. After eight years of waiting in vain, he died in Beijing without a response. However, in 1607, a native Fuqing official, Ye Xianggao 葉向高 (1559-1627),¹² became the prime minister of the court. Probably in response to his petition, in 1614 the Shenzong emperor, wishing to accumulate merit for his deceased mother, bestowed a complete set of the Tripiṭaka upon Mount Huangbo and changed the name of the monastery from Jiandesi 建德寺 to Wanfusi 萬福寺. Later, when the monastery was restored through imperial patronage, local literati followers decided to open the monastery and turn it into a pub-

¹¹ See *Chunxi sanshan zhi* 淳熙三山志, j. 36, in *Yingyin Wenyuange Siku quanshu* 影印文淵閣四庫全書 (Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1983-96), vol. 484, p. 532.

¹² Ye Xianggao had been the grand secretary from 1607-1614 and 1621-1625; see Leng Dong 冷东, *Ye Xianggao yu Mingmo zhengtian* 叶向高与明末政坛 (Shantou: Shantou daxue chubanshe, 1996).

lic institution.¹³ The first abbot they invited was Miyun Yuanwu. With him, Mount Huangbo became controlled by members of his lineage: his dharma-heir Feiyin Tongrong took the position, and Feiyin's heir Yinyuan succeeded him.¹⁴

Invitations from Japan

In 1654, in response to four letters from the Chinese monk Yiran Xingrong 逸然性融 (1601–1668), the head of Kōfukuji 興福寺 in Nagasaki, Yinyuan Longqi decided to leave Huangbo. The first invitation to take a position in Nagasaki was made in the spring of 1652, but Yinyuan gently declined the offer.¹⁵ Soon after, Yiran sent a second invitation letter, which was lost in route, and Yinyuan never received it. Early in 1653, Yiran's third letter arrived. In it Yiran, on behalf of local officials in Nagasaki, extended the strongest invitation yet. However, Yinyuan was still wavering, even when one of his disciples returned from Nagasaki and reported favorably about Buddhism in Japan.¹⁶ Late in the winter of 1653, Yiran's envoy brought the fourth invitation. This time, Yinyuan accepted.¹⁷

Yinyuan's decision met with opposition from his master Feiyin Tongrong and from the Huangbo community in Fuqing. In 1652, Feiyin resided in Fuyan 福嚴 Monastery. Evidence tells us that when he heard about Yinyuan's intention to leave, he immediately wrote a letter to stop him.¹⁸ Because of Yinyuan's reputation in local Buddhist communities, monks and laity also strongly opposed Yinyuan's decision.¹⁹ As a result, Yinyuan had to promise that after a three-year tenure in Japan, he would find capable Japanese disciples to transmit the dharma and then return to China. This promise probably eased the opposition. For example, his master Feiyin wrote Yinyuan, urging

¹³ Yinyuan Longqi, *Huangbo shanzhi* 黃檗山志, j. 2, in *Xuxiu siku quanshu* 續修四庫全書 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1995-), vol. 719, p. 319a. For a study of Mount Huangbo in the late Ming, see Hayashida Yoshio 林田芳雄, "Minmatsu ni okeru Fukushū no Bukkyō, Ōbakan o chūshin ni" 明末における福州の佛教黃檗山を中心に, *Bukkyō shigaku kenkyū* 佛教史學研究 30. 2 (1987), pp. 1–27; also in *Ōbaku bunka* 黃檗文華 114 (March, 1994), pp. 4–22.

¹⁴ For the reconstruction of Mt. Huangbo, see my article, "Building a Dharma Transmission Monastery: Mount Huangbo in Seventeenth-Century China," *Journal of East Asian History*, forthcoming.

¹⁵ See Yinyuan's reply on August 9, 1652, in *IGZS*, vol. 2, p. 1026.

¹⁶ The report was brought back by Lingsou 靈叟, a disciple of Mu'an Xingtao; Hirakubo Akira, *Shinsan kōtei Mokuan zenshū* 新纂校訂木庵全集 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1992), p. 3528.

¹⁷ For Yiran's letter and Yinyuan's reply, see *IGZS*, vol. 4, pp. 1592, 1595.

¹⁸ See *Feiyin chanshi yulu* 費隱禪師語錄 (*JXDZJ* no. 178), vol. 26, p. 189c. For Feiyin's letter, see *Correspondence*, no. 001, p. 43–46.

¹⁹ See Yinyuan's chronological biography, *IGZS*, vol. 11, p. 5202.

him to keep his promise and return to China as soon as he found new dharma heirs.²⁰

Yinyuan left Mount Huangbo on June 13, 1654. Ten days later, after staying at Pucheng 浦城, he arrived in Quanzhou 泉州 and was welcomed to Kaiyuan 開元 Monastery by his disciple Mu'an Xingtao 木庵性瑫 (1611–1681), who later also joined Yinyuan in Japan. On July 16, 1654, he arrived at Zheng Chenggong's stronghold, Zhongzuosuo 中左所 (after 1655 it was known as Simingzhou 思明州, but now Xiamen 廈門, or Amoy in the West).²¹ Zheng Chenggong's clan-brother 族兄 Zheng Cai 鄭彩 (?–1659) and his generals welcomed him warmly.²² On August 3, 1654, Zheng Chenggong's generals provided the money and boat necessary for Yinyuan's voyage to Japan. On, after a fourteen-day voyage, Yinyuan and his disciples safely arrived in Nagasaki.²³

WHY DID YINYUAN GO TO JAPAN?

Yinyuan's move to Japan becomes intriguing when placed against the backdrop of a series of political upheavals along China's southeast coast. During the 1650s, Fujian became the major battlefield between Manchu armies and resistance troops. Because of this, speculation arose soon after Yinyuan's arrival, promoting a theory that Yinyuan must have been a refugee among the many displaced Chinese who found in Japan a safe haven. The Ōbaku monks themselves, however, contended in the hyperbolic work *Tōzuihen* (mentioned above) that their decision to move to Japan was based on an auspicious prophecy made by a Taoist shaman. This scenario was much more complicated by the fact that it was Zheng Chenggong, the military leader of the Ming loyalists, who sent boats to escort Yinyuan to Nagasaki. Thus, various

²⁰ For this letter, see *Correspondence*, p. 47.

²¹ For a brief account of the history of this place, see Ng Chin-Keong, *Trade and Society: The Amoy Network on the China Coast 1638–1735* (Singapore: Singapore U.P., 1983), pp. 45–52.

²² Zheng Cai was Zheng Chenggong's clan brother but he chose to serve Regent Lu (Zhu Yihai 朱以海, 1618–1662) and thus had certain conflicts with Zheng Chenggong. Yinyuan kept an even closer relationship with Zheng Cai. After Zheng Cai was attacked by Zheng Chenggong and later came to terms with him, he became a Buddhist in 1654 and maintained an unusual relationship with Yinyuan as evidenced by their extant correspondence. See Yinyuan, “Zeng Zhengguogong” 贈鄭國公, *IGZS*, vol. 2, p. 1510. (Zheng Cai's letter is included in this correspondence.) For a study with Zheng Cai, see Kawahara Eishun 河源英俊, “Ryōō Zhu Yihai to Kenkokukō Zheng Cai” 魯王朱以海と建國公鄭彩, *Ōbaku bunka* 117 (1995–1997), pp. 64–67; “Ryōō Kenkokukō Kenkokukō Zheng Cai to Ryūkyū Ōkoku Tanmonshi Hirakawa” 魯王監國建國公鄭彩と琉球王國探問使平川, *Ōbaku bunka* 119 (1998–1999 [sic]), pp. 106–12. See also Kawahara Eishun, “Ingen Zenji to kō Shin seiryoku to no kankei” 隱元禪師と抗清勢力との關係, *Ōbaku bunka* 118 (1998–1999), pp. 107–10.

²³ See “Yinyuan nianpu” 隱元年譜 (*IGZS*), vol. 11, pp. 5200–2.

hypotheses about Yinyuan's political mission emerge. In this section, I shall examine these theories in details.

Speculation about Yinyuan's Mission to Japan

Because the arrival of Chinese monks in Japan usually created a significant stir in the Japanese Buddhist world, the reason for Yinyuan Longqi's emigration has been hotly debated. The Japanese scholar Hirakubo Akira 平久保章 summarizes four possible reasons. The first points to the social and political turmoil of the Ming-Qing transition. During the 1650s, because Fujian was at the forefront of anti-Manchu resistance led by Zheng Chenggong, and the Fujian population suffered miserably from violence, then Yinyuan simply left on one of the several emigration waves. This theory was often taken up by Ōbaku's opponents in Japan because it undermined the sincerity of Yinyuan's purported mission to spread Chan teachings in Japan. The second explanation was often adopted by the Ōbaku monks themselves. It is that Yinyuan's motivation was purely spiritual according to his faith, that is, in order to spread the Buddhist dharma in Japan, where Japanese Buddhism was "corrupt" and "degenerate," at least according to the commonly held opinion of the Ōbaku monks. A third explanation was widely known among Yinyuan's fellow monks in China: Yinyuan moved to Japan in response to several Japanese invitations extended by the Japanese ruler. One extreme version of this, held by Yinyuan's master Feiyin Tongrong, was that he was invited by the Japanese emperor himself.²⁴ In fact, as I have mentioned earlier, Yinyuan was invited four times by the Chinese abbot Yiran Xingrong at Nagasaki's Kōfukuji, a temple that primarily served the Chinese community there. (There was no indication that the Japanese government was involved initially. Thus, Feiyin Tongrong's claim that he was invited by the emperor was certainly an exaggeration. See below, on the reason for this misunderstanding.) The last theory was articulated by Yinyuan Longqi himself. Because at the beginning his decision was bitterly opposed by his master Feiyin Tongrong, Yinyuan Longqi had to persuade him that the trip would be temporary and was only being carried out to repay the "debt" that his disciple Yelan Xinggui 也懶性圭 (?-1651) was unable

²⁴ See Shuijian Huihai 水鑑會海, "Jinsu Feiyin heshang xingzhuang" 金粟費隱和尚行狀, in *Tianwang Shuijian heshang zhu Jinsu yulu* 天王水鑑和尚住金粟語錄 (*JXZJ*, vol. 29) 2, pp. 277A-79A.

to pay.²⁵ In fact, Yelan was invited prior to Yinyuan, but he drowned in a shipwreck in 1651.²⁶

The Chinese scholar Lin Guanchao 林觀潮 tends to emphasize the second explanation, above, that is, that Yinyuan's motivation was to proselytize and to continue his lineage in Japan. Lin argues that because of a misinterpretation of the invitation letters, Yinyuan had assumed that he was invited by the Japanese ruler and thus was determined to answer the call. Lin carefully examines the correspondences between Yinyuan and Yiran and finds a major discrepancy between the expectations of the two sides. Yiran's letter often used the Chinese character "guo 國" to refer to Nagasaki and "Lord of the Town 鎮主" to refer to local administrators (*bugyō* 奉行). He stated misleadingly that it was "the Lord of the Island 島主" who extended the invitation. Actually, although the local *bugyō* was aware of the invitation, the *bakufu* government in Edo was only briefed after Yinyuan landed in Nagasaki. Without knowing the feudal system in Japan, Yinyuan believed that it was the Japanese emperor 日本國王 who invited him to start a new lineage of Chan Buddhism in Japan. This assumption had been widely known in Chinese Buddhist communities, and his master Feiyin Tongrong mentioned it frequently and even boasted about the honor that the Japanese emperor had bestowed on his disciple.²⁷ Thus, as Lin reasons, from the beginning Yinyuan had great expectations concerning Japan, hoping to extend the influence of his lineage there.²⁸

Because of the many circumstances involved, there were other speculations that cast doubt on the sincerity of the emigration. An explanation given by Ōbaku's opponents, for example, Keirin Sūshin 桂林崇琛 (1625–1728), indicates that Yinyuan's departure was a result of the disgraceful defeat of his master Feiyin Tongrong in a notorious lawsuit against him. Keirin Sūshin explained the reason as follows:

²⁵ Xinggui was Yinyuan's dharma heir. Because his friend Wuxin Xingjue 無心性覺 (1613–1671) recommended him to the Sōfukuji, he was invited in 1651. Xinggui left Zhongzuosuo (Xiamen) in the summer of 1651; see Yinyuan Longqi, "Shang jingshan benshi heshang" 上徑山本師和尚, in *IGZS*, vol. 4, pp. 2198–200.

²⁶ See Baroni, *Ōbaku Zen*, p. 36. For an examination of Yinyuan's migration, see Hirakubo Akira, "Tōto kantsuru shosetsu" 東渡に關する諸説, in idem, ed., *Ingen* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1962), pp. 67–77. See also Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, "Ingen no tōto to nihon Ōbaku Zen" 隱元の東渡と日本黃檗禪, in Minamoto Ryōen 源了圓 and Yang Zengwen 楊曾文, eds., *Shūkyō* 宗教, Nitchū bunka koryōshi shōsho 日中文化交流史叢書 4 (Tokyo: Taishukan shoten, 1996), pp. 276–95.

²⁷ See *Correspondence*, p. 43.

²⁸ I want to thank Prof. Lin Guanchao at Xiamen University for kindly sharing his paper with me and checking facts in a later version of this paper. See his "Ingen tōto no shinsō ni suite" 隱元東渡の真相について, *Ōtani daigaku daigakuin kenkyū kiyō* 大谷大學大学院研究紀要 20 (Dec. 2003), pp. 283–313, esp. 291–301.

I heard that monks such as Yinyuan, Mu'an, Jifei, and Gaoquan are indeed supreme within the Ming empire. Although they only have one stick [as property], the reason they came to this country is not actually to sacrifice themselves for the dharma. Feiyin (Tong)rong at Jingshan and Yongjue (Yuanxian) 永覺元賢 (1578–1657) at Gushan 鼓山 brought [the dispute about] the principle of Chan to the government court. And [Feiyin Tongrong] was disgraced by the government officials. Therefore, all his disciples simply lost their aspirations and prestige. Accordingly they accepted the invitation of merchants and ship owners and entered our country from afar. From the present to the future, if we wish such monks to be invited, it would be impossible to bring about because monks like Daozhe (Chao)yuan 道者超元 (1599–1662) and Xinyue (Xing)chou 心越興儔 (1639–1695), who actually came with patriarchal seals (dharma transmission) but are not disciples within Yinyuan's lineage, are not allowed to succeed to the abbacy in the three Chinese temples in Nagasaki.²⁹

The lawsuit that Keirin mentioned, using the phrase “principle of Chan,” was a significant event in the Buddhist world of seventeenth-century China. As I have investigated elsewhere, it was centered on Feiyin Tongrong's new work on Chan genealogy, in which he deliberately changed the commonly accepted lines of dharma transmission and relegated a number of Caodong masters to the derogatory category “lineage unknown 法嗣未詳.” The disciples of these Caodong masters sued Feiyin in the local court, where Feiyin's book was deemed inappropriate and ordered burnt.³⁰ Keirin suggested that because of this defeat, Feiyin Tongrong and his disciples, including his first dharma heir Yinyuan Longqi, lost influence in mainland China. Keirin also complained about how arrogant Yinyuan and his disciples became in Japan, because Chan masters who did not belong to Yinyuan Longqi's dharma transmission line were disgraced and expelled from their monasteries. In this paragraph, he mentioned two important Chan masters. Daozhe Chaoyuan, who had come before Yinyuan and taught a number of famous Japanese monks such as Bankei Yōtaku 盤珪永琢 (1622–1693), was forced to go back to China. Donggao Xinyue 東皋心越 (or

²⁹ Keirin Sūshin, “Nagasaki shō Minsō ben” 長崎招明僧辨, *Zoku zenrin shūhei shū* 續禪林執弊集, p. 15. I thank the Harvard-Yenching Library for making a photocopy of this rare book from the Komazawa University Library.

³⁰ In 1654, Feiyin was sued by Caodong masters. The dispute was about his Chan genealogy *Wudeng yantong* 五燈嚴統. He was charged with altering official Chan transmission lines based on a spurious inscription of Tianwang Daowu 天王道悟 in the Tang; see Wu, “Orthodoxy, Controversy,” pp. 106–78.

Xinyue Xingchou, mentioned earlier), the only Caodong master who was invited to Japan and established the Jyūshō 壽昌 School at Mitō 水戸, was harassed by hostile Ōbaku monks because of his different lineage affiliations when he first landed in Nagasaki.³¹

All these explanations focus on individual psychology and are intended to uncover the subjective world of Yinyuan Longqi so as to reveal intentions. Although it is possible to pursue this line of inquiry, a psycho-historical approach might only lead to speculation, and even to the mythologization of a historical event.

The Taoist Prophecy of Yinyuan's Arrival in Japan

Yinyuan's arrival in Japan was shrouded in myths and legends. To some extent, the Ōbaku monks themselves deliberately concocted stories to glorify the birth of the new Manpukuji with a providential tone. Many methods were used to create such a mysterious aura. For example, Yinyuan's safe journey was said to be aided by dragon kings. According to some biographers, during the night prior to Yinyuan's landing, red beams lit the sky over Nagasaki.³² Yinyuan's supernatural power must have been heavily advertised, because the German traveler Engelbert Kaempfer (1651–1716), who visited Japan from 1690 to 1692, noted that Yinyuan was known in Japan as an effective rainmaker.³³

To enhance the dramatic effect, the Ōbaku monks did not limit themselves to Buddhist discourse. Other religious beliefs, too, especially Taoist divination techniques, were employed.

In 1990, Terence C. Russell brought to light a little-known manuscript from the Japanese National Diet Library that was titled *Tōzuihen* 桃蕊編 (*Peach Bud Collection*), compiled at the request of the Reigen 靈元 emperor (r. 1663–1687) in 1705.³⁴ Its author was the Chinese monk

³¹ The majority of emigré monks were Linji monks in Miyun Yuanwu's and Feiyin Tongrong's lines. There was no influential Caodong master who attempted to spread the dharma in Japan until 1677, when the Ōbaku monks had firmly established themselves. The first Caodong master Xinyue Xingchou, who was usually called Donggao Xinyue, landed in Nagasaki and found himself in an unfriendly world dominated by Ōbaku monks (the poor treatment is attributable to Feiyin Tongrong's defeat in 1654). See his biography in Hayashi Yukimitsu 林雪光, *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten* 黄檗文化人名字典 (Kyoto: Shibunkaku, 1988), pp. 162–63. See also Nagai Masashi 永井正之, "Tōkō Shin'etsu kenkyū josetsu" 東嶽心越研究序説, in Imaeda Aishin 今枝愛真, ed., *Zenshū no shomondai* 禪宗の諸問題 (Tokyo: Yōzankaku, 1979), pp. 365–85.

³² See Nōnin, *Ingen Zenji nenpō*, p. 250.

³³ See B. M. Bodart-Bailey, trans., *Kaempfer's Japan: Tokugawa Culture Observed* (Honolulu: U. of Hawaii P., 1999), p. 177.

³⁴ See Terence C. Russell, "Chen Tuan at Mount Huangbo: A Spirit-writing Cult in Late Ming China," *Asiatische Studien* 44. 1 (1990), pp. 107–40; and idem, "Chen Tuan's Veneration of the Dharma: A Study in Hagiographic Modification," *Taoist Resources* 2.1 (1990), pp. 54–72.

Gaoquan Xingdun 高泉性澈 (1633–1695), the fifth Ōbaku abbot appointed by the shogunate government. (According to Helen Baroni's study of his role in constructing the Ōbaku School in Japan, Gaoquan exerted an enduring influence on Ōbaku's later development.)³⁵ The compilation included thirty-five essays by Ōbaku monks and other Japanese scholar-officials and it details Chen Tuan's prognostication of Yinyuan's success in Japan and even of the Reigen emperor's birth.

It is this book in particular that shows the Ōbaku monks promoting Taoist divination techniques such as spirit-writing and the role of Taoist prophecy in the process of Buddhist myth-making. In it we learn that because the avatar of the Taoist transcendent Chen Tuan 陳搏 (?–989) in the Fuqing area, where Huangbo was located, aroused significant interest in Taoism among the Huangbo monks, thus Taoist divination played a part in Yinyuan's decision to leave China. Yet, although it is known that Yinyuan had contacts with the medium of this Taoist transcendent, the prophesy was obviously a deliberate act of myth-making, with certain political implications. In fact, the legend was not mentioned by Yinyuan or other Chinese monks when they first arrived in Japan. Rather, it was not known until 1705–1706, when *Tōzuihen* was composed. This indicates that Gaoquan might be responsible for making up Yinyuan's Taoist connections.

Judging from the texts recorded in *Tōzuihen*, Gaoquan Xingdun must have participated in Yinyuan's effort to consult the deity. According to his biography, he was very interested in this Taoist technique of contacting the other world. His epitaph publicly stated that he befriended a Taoist spirit-medium,³⁶ and that he had a Taoist name, "Tanhua daoren 曇華道人." When he was in China, one day an official named Wang requested a sample of spirit-writing from the transcendent He Jiuxian 何九仙, who composed a poem to claim Gaoquan and he were old friends. Chen Tuan, to whom Yinyuan prayed, exchanged literary compositions with Gaoquan Xingdun. Later, Gaoquan came to join Yinyuan Longqi in 1661 and was appointed abbot of Manpukuji in 1692 after winning a debate about dharma transmission with the fourth Manpukuji abbot Duzhan Xingying 獨湛性瑩 (1628–1706).³⁷

³⁵ Baroni, *Obaku Zen*, p. 64.

³⁶ See Gaoquan's epitaph in *Daian koe kokushi goroku* 大圓廣慧國師語錄 (Kyoto: Baiyoshoin, 1900), j. 15, pp. 3, 12. According to *Tōzuihen*, Chen Tuan even revised and appreciated Gaoquan's poems composed in China; Gaoquan Xingdun, "Chen xian dian xiao" 陳仙點校, in *Tōzuihen*, appendix.

³⁷ See Baroni's account, *Obaku Zen*, pp. 176–80.

Tōzuihen records the miraculous Taoist spirit-writing that foresaw Yinyuan Longqi's success in Japan. In this episode, Chen Tuan and a Taoist medium connected with him played an important role. Chen Tuan was a famous Taoist figure in the ninth and tenth centuries. He had successfully predicted the establishment of the Song dynasty and was remembered as the person who transmitted a new type of cosmology to the Song neo-Confucian Shao Yong 邵雍 (1011–1077). Although he was a real historical figure, Chen Tuan was gradually deified as a Taoist transcendent who was skillful at physiognomic prognostication and the use of the “River Chart and Luo River Writing” (Hetu luoshu 河圖洛書) – both an ancient cosmogram and a divination manual.³⁸ It is not known when he was associated with the technique of spirit-writing, or planchette. But in the seventeenth century, Chen Tuan became known as a Taoist transcendent who was able to communicate with the human world through spirit-writing.³⁹

According to Russell's study, Chen Tuan's “arrival” in Fuqing county was a local creation in the late-Ming Fuzhou area. Mountains around Fuqing had been renowned as the residences of the Nine Transcendents. However, Chen Tuan, as a Taoist immortal, was not among them. Chen Tuan's “presence” in the Fuqing area, according to the Ōbaku monks, was about fifty years before Yinyuan's journey to Japan. His incarnation might have been related by a spirit-medium called Master Zheng 鄭, who was often mentioned in *Tōzuihen*. The Ōbaku monks explained that Master Zheng had studied the method of spirit-writing in Nanjing and was capable of communicating with Chen Tuan.

Yinyuan's consultation with Chen Tuan is said to have taken place some time during 1652. One day, Yinyuan visited the neighboring Mount Shizhu 石竹, where Chen Tuan often appeared and communicated with his medium through spirit-writing. According to Russell's reconstruction, when the medium entered the trance, Yinyuan asked this question first: “This old monk has recently received an invitation from Japan. I do not know if the Buddhist Dharma can be put into

³⁸ On Chen Tuan, see Livia Knaul (Livia Kohn), *Leben und Legende des Ch'en Tuan* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1981).

³⁹ In the process of spirit-writing, divine revelation was made by written messages through a medium. During the Song, the one most directly connected to it was the Goddess of the Latrine, Zigu 紫姑 (Purple Aunt). Spirit-writing was developed in late-imperial China and largely connected with the Shanshu 善書 (morality books) tradition because the revelations were usually moral injunctions from deities. It is commonly held that the tradition was derived from the beliefs of literati and scholar-officials concerned with their careers in the civil service exams; a brief account the spirit-writing tradition is in David K. Jordan and Daniel L. Overmyer, eds., *The Flying Phoenix: Aspects of Chinese Sectarianism in Taiwan* (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1986), chap. 3, “Background of the *Chi*,” pp. 36–88.

practice there or not.” Chen Tuan replied: “It can! However, when you first get there, do not use the stick (that is, the stick carried by Chan masters for the purpose of rebuking students) for I fear that there may be those among the common people who do not know what it means. If the Master leaves now, his arrival will coincide with the appearance of a new emperor in the world. In later times the Way will be much more prosperous.”⁴⁰

This was the prognostication that Chen Tuan had made. It assures the success of Yinyuan's voyage and indeed mentions the birth of an emperor, who was considered the Reigen emperor by Yinyuan's disciples in Japan. Chen Tuan even promised that his disciple Guiyazi 鬼牙子, who was a golden turtle-dragon in charge of the Northern Sea where Yinyuan was to cross, would guarantee Yinyuan's safety during his trip.

According to *Tōzuihen*, this consultation, taking place two years before the actual voyage, had influenced Yinyuan's decision. This unusually close association of Chan masters with a Taoist immortal is intriguing. In *Tōzuihen*, the Ōbaku monks talked about their encounter with Chen Tuan frankly and admiringly, although it would have seemed heterodox, considering the Ōbaku monks' claim to Chan orthodoxy. Even Yinyuan was very comfortable about his involvement with the immortals. It was recorded in *Tōzuihen* that during a session of spirit-writing, when a Huangbo monk openly criticized the indulgence in such a vulgar practice, Yinyuan asked the monk to apologize to the transcendent immediately.⁴¹

ZHENG CHENGGONG AND YINYUAN LONGQI'S PURPORTED POLITICAL MISSION

Because Yinyuan left China from Zhongzuosuo, the stronghold of Zheng Chenggong's military base, Yinyuan's life must have been intertwined with the history of the Southern Ming.⁴² As various sources reveal, Yinyuan maintained a close relationship with the Ming loyalist movement. Not only did he have close ties with Zheng's generals, he also allowed the Ming loyalist Qian Sule 錢肅樂 (1606–1648) to be buried in Mount Huangbo. Some scholars even speculate that Yinyuan

⁴⁰ Trans. Russell, “Chen Tuan at Mount Huangbo,” p. 113.

⁴¹ Ibid, pp. 127–28.

⁴² See Lynn Struve, *The Southern Ming 1644–1662* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1984); Xie Guozhen 謝國楨, *Nan Ming shilue* 南明史略 (Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe, 1957); Nan Bingwen 南炳文, *Nanming shi* 南明史 (Tianjin: Nankai daxue chubanshe, 1992); and Gu Cheng 顧成, *Nan Ming shi* 南明史 (Beijing: Zhongguo qingnian chubanshe, 1997).

might have carried a special message from Zheng Chenggong to Japan to request military aid. This hypothesis hinges upon the identification of the author of a letter sent to Yinyuan. As I show, although some scholars thought that it was written by Zheng Chenggong, a close reading suggests that such identification is far from conclusive.

“Begging” for Japanese Military Intervention

The hypothesis about Yinyuan’s political mission was grounded in the fact that Ming loyalists were desperate to solicit any possible outside intervention to stop the Manchu invasion. Therefore, it is necessary to review a series of events that aimed to recruit new forces from overseas, especially from Japan.

Huang Zongxi 黃宗羲 (1610–1695), in his retrospective accounts, faithfully recorded the following attempts to request military intervention from Japan.⁴³

1. In 1645, Zhou Hezhi 周鶴芝 was dispatched by the Longwu 隆武 emperor of the Southern Ming. (We must note here that Zhou was also a Fuqing native, as was Yinyuan Longqi). As a former pirate leader who had joined the Wakō raids along the Chinese coast, he was recruited into the loyalist government. Because of his previous connection with Japan, he was chosen to undertake such a mission.⁴⁴
2. In 1648, the Southern Ming official Feng Jingdi 馮京弟 landed in Japan on a mission to solicit Japanese support. But unfortunately this mission occurred at a time when the Japanese shōgunate was fiercely suppressing Christianity and a sense of xenophobia prevailed. Feng’s request was at first rejected though he was given some old coins from the Hongwu 洪武 reign (1368–1398), which the Japanese had probably earned from earlier trade with Chinese.⁴⁵
3. In 1649, there was another delegation headed by the “Barbarian-quelling Earl” Ruan Jin 阮進, who brought a copy of the imperial Tripitaka from Mount Putuo on the advice of a monk named Zhanwei 湛微. The mission failed because this monk had actually been expelled by Japan previously and the mission was a part of his at-

⁴³ The following accounts are based on Huang Zongxi, “Ribei qishi ji” 日本乞師記, in *Taiwan yinhang jingji yanjiu shi* 臺灣銀行經濟研究室, comp., *Taiwan wenxian congkan* 台灣文獻叢刊 (Taipei: Taiwan yinhang, 1962), no. 135, pp. 86–89.

⁴⁴ Huang Zongxi recorded his name as Zhou Cui zhi 周崔芝. In other sources, e.g., *Ka’i hentai*, pp. 12–13, his name is Cui Zhi 崔芝.

⁴⁵ In Huang Zongxi’s epitaph, his disciple Quan Zuwang 全祖望 (1705–1755) stated mistakenly that Huang had accompanied Feng to Japan for the same mission. This mistake has been clarified by Liang Qichao 梁啓超, “Huang Lizhou Zhu Shunshui qishi riben bian” 黃黎洲朱舜水乞師日本辯, originally published in 1923, rpt. *Liang Qichao quanji* 梁啓超全集 (Beijing: Beijing chubanshe, 1999), vol. 7, pp. 4174–75.

tempt to return to Japan covertly. Huang Zongxi's account of this mission might have been taken from another more complete description of the mission entitled *Fengshi Riben jilue* 奉使日本紀略 (*Brief Account of an Ambassadorial Mission to Japan*), which has been translated into English by Lynn Struve.⁴⁶

The delegations sent by the loyalists were far more than the three that Huang Zongxi listed. Ishihara Michihiro 石原道博 has studied this subject thoroughly, using both Chinese and Japanese sources, especially *Ka'i hentai*. According to him, the Ming loyalists at least made the following additional attempts to request military interventions from Japan and other countries.⁴⁷

4. In 1646, Zheng Chenggong's father Zheng Zhilong 鄭芝龍 (1604–1661) sent Huang Zhengming 黃徵明 to Japan.
5. In 1650, the empress-dowager Madam Wang (Christian name: Helena) of the Yongli 永曆 emperor (Zhu Youlang 朱由榔, 1623–1662) wrote a letter to Pope Innocent X. In the same year, the eunuch Pang Tianshou 龐天壽 (d. 1657; Christian name: P'ang Achilleus Christianus) also wrote a letter to the pope to request help. These letters were entrusted to the Jesuit Michael Boym (1612–1659; Chinese name: Bu Mige 卜彌格), who brought them to Rome in 1653. In 1655, Alexander VII (r. 1655–1667) wrote a reply, which never reached the beleaguered Southern Ming court in its final days. But these three letters have survived.⁴⁸
6. In 1645, Kang Yongnian 康永年 was sent by the Longwu emperor of the Southern Ming from Fuzhou to request aid from Vietnam.
7. In 1646, the monk Guangji 廣濟 was sent to Southeast Asia to recruit new soldiers.
8. From 1645 to 1659, the Ming loyalist Zhu Shunshui 朱舜水 (1600–1682) traveled between China, Japan, and Vietnam in order to organize international support.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Lynn A. Struve, trans., "Better to Die at Sea': Requesting Aid From Japan," in idem, *Voices from the Ming-Qing Cataclysm: China in Tiger's Jaws* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1993), pp. 116–21.

⁴⁷ For a detailed study of the following event, see Ishihara, *Minmatsu Shinsho Nihon kisshi no kenkyū* 明末清初日本乞師の研究 (Tokyo: Fuzambo, 1945). See also Kimiya Yasuhiko 木宮泰彦, "Minmatsu no kisshi Oyobi kishi" 明末の乞師及び乞資, in idem, *Nikka kōryū bunka shi* 日華交流文化史 (Tokyo: Fuzanbō, 1955), pp. 641–46.

⁴⁸ The letters were reprinted in Zhang Xinglang 張星娘, *Zhongxi jiaotong ziliao huibian* 中西交通資料彙編 (Hong Kong, 1930), vol. 2, pp. 167–69. For studies in Western languages, see Girad de Rialle, "Une mission chinoise à Venise au XVIIe siècle," *TP*, first series 1 (1890), pp. 99–117. See also Lynn A. Struve, trans., "My Complete Devotion': An Empress Appeals to the Pope," in *Voices from the Ming-Qing Cataclysm*, pp. 235–38.

⁴⁹ For a study of Zhu, see Julia Ching, "Chu Shun-shui, 1600–82: A Chinese Confucian Scholar in Tokugawa Japan," *MN* 30.2 (1975), pp. 177–91.

9. During the year 1650–51, the Yongli emperor asked the Le 黎 ruler in Vietnam to provide aid.
10. In 1661, general Li Dingguo 李定國 (d. 1662) of the Yongli court, at the last moment of the Southern Ming, attempted to secure aid from Burma and Thailand.

All these attempts failed. In comments at the very end of his essay, Huang's tone reveals bitterness and helplessness. He mocks the Japanese for turning away from their famous spirit of *bushidō*, merely to indulge in Chinese culture. He implied that even though Japan had enjoyed peaceful governance since the beginning of the Kan'ei reign (1624–1643) and might have been able to supply aid, they busied themselves with persecuting Christians:

Most people there love poetry, calligraphy, rubbings of calligraphy, famous paintings, ancient outlandish utensils, the twenty-one [dynastic] histories, and thirteen [Confucian] classics. In the past [these items] were worth a thousand taels of silver [in Japan]. But now, they are worth no more than one or two hundred taels of silver because many more have been packed and brought [from China to Japan]. (That is, because they are cheap, most Japanese can buy them.) Therefore [the Japanese] have not seen warfare for a lifetime. Because their own country has neglected defense, how could [the Japanese] cross the sea to fight for revenge for other people? Even if the incident [of Christianity] from the West did not occur, it would not be possible [for the Japanese] to intervene."⁵⁰

Huang Zongxi's conclusion was bitterly contested by Japanese scholars during World War II because obviously Huang had underestimated Japanese military power and courage. As Ishihara Michihiro points out, the failure to elicit a Japanese response could be attributed to the lack of unity among the loyalists themselves. Their internal strife and the military power of the new Manchu regime precipitated the fall of the Ming and the Southern Ming.⁵¹ In sum, considering the frequent missions to solicit aid, it is natural that people assumed that Yinyuan, a Ming loyalist, was involved in political activities.

Zheng Chenggong and Yinyuan Longqi

Within the resistance movement in southeast China, Zheng Chenggong emerged as a powerful, young military leader. In China today,

⁵⁰ Huang, "Ribei qishi ji," pp. 88–89.

⁵¹ Ishihara, *Minmatsu Shinsho*, pp. 113–30.

he is remembered as a national hero who reclaimed Taiwan from the Dutch colonists in 1660. Zheng was born in Nagasaki, a son of a Chinese father and a Japanese mother. When his father Zheng Zhilong, a former pirate leader, surrendered to the Ming, Zheng moved back to China. Winning the favor of the Hongguang 弘光 emperor of the first Southern Ming regime in Nanjing, Zheng Chenggong was granted the surname “Zhu,” the emperor’s royal name, and was thus often called “Guoxingye 國姓爺” (known as “Koxinga” in Japan).⁵²

His military talent and determination made him an undisputable leader in the resistance movement. After the fall of Beijing to Li Zicheng 李自成 (1606–1645) and later to the Manchus, the so-called Southern Ming regime lasted almost forty years until the Qing government cracked down on all military resistance. The rapidly changing battle line put Fujian, especially the Fuzhou area, to the forefront of anti-Manchu resistance led by Zheng Chenggong. In 1645, when the first Southern Ming ruler, the Hongguang emperor, was captured by the Manchus, another Ming prince, Zhu Yujian 朱聿鍵, claimed the throne in Fuzhou, but his regime lasted only a year. Another Southern Ming regime established by the Longwu emperor’s brother in Guangzhou also fell quickly.

It must have been during these turbulent years that Yinyuan Longqi built strong ties with Zheng Chenggong’s generals, who eventually escorted him to Japan. When the political center of the lingering Ming government settled in Fujian, Mount Huangbo emerged as a spiritual retreat for Ming loyalists. Yinyuan did not evade the resistance movement, and in fact openly supported it. In 1654, Yinyuan allowed Qian Sule to be buried in Mount Huangbo.⁵³ This act was a symbol of his

⁵² For a study of Zheng Chenggong, see Ralph C. Croizier, *Koxinga and Chinese Nationalism: History, Myth, and the Hero* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1977).

⁵³ Qian Sule 錢肅樂, a native of Yin county in Ningbo, was a member of the famous literati association Fushe 復社. He served regent Lu of the Southern Ming as grand secretary. His funeral has been recorded in “Zanglu” 葬錄, compiled by Ye Jincheng 葉進晟, a grandson of Ye Xianggao. The text is collected in *Qian Zhongjie gong ji* 錢忠介公集, j. 21, in CSJC *xubian*, vol. 121, and in Feng Zhenqun 馮貞群, ed., *Siming congshu* 四明叢書 (ser. 2, 1934), j. 16–25. According to these records, the event became a significant gathering of Ming loyalists such as Ye Jincheng, Yao Yiming 姚翼明 (later ordained as Duyao Xingri), Zhou Hezhi 周鶴芝, Zhang Mingzhen 張名振, Ji Xuguo 紀許國, Liu Xinchun 劉沂春, Xu Fuyuan 徐孚遠, etc. For details, see Ono Kazuko 小野和子, “Qian Sule no Ōbakusan bosō ni tsuite” 錢素樂の黃檗山墓葬について, *Ōbaku bunka* 118 (1998–99), pp. 1–14. During wartime, Qian had once been tonsured by a Huangbo monk called Biju shangren 碧居上人; see Quan Zuwang, “Ming gu Bingbu shangshu jian Dongge daxueshi zeng Taibao libu shangshu shi Zhongjie Qian gong shendao di'er beiming” 明故兵部尚書兼東閣大學士贈太保吏部尚書諡忠介錢公神道第二碑銘, *Jiji ting ji* 鮎埼亭集 (GXJBCS edn.) 7, pp. 85–95; also Huang Zongxi, “Qian Zhongjie gong zhuan” 錢忠介公傳, in *Nanlei wending houji* 南雷文定後集 (GXJBCS edn.) 4, pp. 58–62. Yinyuan also wrote a memorial essay from Japan to express his deep mourning; *IGZS*, vol. 3, p. 1475.

declared loyalism. Not only did a large number of Ming loyalists, among whom the majority were Zheng Chenggong's generals, turn to Yinyuan for spiritual guidance, there were also signs that some loyalists took refuge in Huangbo and continued to assist the resistance army as monks. In a letter written by Duyao Xingri 獨耀性日 in 1654,⁵⁴ he indicated that another disciple of Yinyuan, Duwang Xingyou 獨往性幽,⁵⁵ joined general Zhang Mingzhen's 張名振 (1601–1656) siege of Nanjing in 1654, an operation that shook Manchu rule in South China even without actually occupying the city.⁵⁶ The spread of Huangbo Buddhism in Taiwan also indicates that some of Yinyuan's disciples actively participated in Zheng Chenggong's military campaign in Taiwan.⁵⁷

The relation between Yinyuan Longqi's voyage to Japan and Zheng Chenggong's attempt to request aid is less known among scholars, although one Chinese source suggests a close connection. This is *Haishang jianwen lu* 海上見聞錄 (*A Record of Personal Experiences on the Sea*), which gives the following about Zheng Chenggong's 1660 mission to Japan and mentions Yinyuan's name:

In the seventh [lunar] month, [Zheng Chenggong] ordered general Zhang Guangqi 張光啓 to borrow armies from Japan and to take the monk Yinyuan and his disciples from Huangbo monastery, fifty in total, with their boats. Because at that time, the Japanese invited Yinyuan sincerely, he was carried [to Japan] together with them. Since Zheng Chenggong only wrote a letter to the Japanese king without reaching the shōguns who actually controlled the state affairs, [Japanese soldiers] were not dispatched.⁵⁸

This source suggests that Yinyuan's emigration coincided with Zheng's attempt to request aid. But the record incorrectly places Zhang Guangqi and Yinyuan together, because as early as 1654, Yinyuan had

⁵⁴ His secular name was Yao Yiming. He was a former Southern Ming official in Regent Lu's court. He was ordained by Yinyuan in 1652.

⁵⁵ He was a celebrated literatus in Fuzhou, whose secular name was Ou Quanfu 歐全甫. A short biog. is in *Correspondence*, p. 101.

⁵⁶ See *Correspondence*, no. 012, pp. 95–101.

⁵⁷ Huangbo monastery in Tainan 台南 was founded in 1688. It was famous for its involvement in insurrections against Manchu rule, but its relation with Zheng Chenggong is not clear, even though its monks in Taiwan were involved in failed attempts to recover the Ming; see Shi Huiyan 釋慧嚴, "Mingmo Qingchu Min Tai Fojiao de hudong" 明末清初閩台佛教的互動, *Zhonghua Foxue bao* 中華佛學報 9 (1996), pp. 209–42; and Lu Xiuhua 盧秀華, "Huangbosi jiqi senglü de zhengzhi huodong" 黃檗寺及其僧侶的政治活動, *Shihui* 史匯 1 (1996), pp. 133–43. See also Nogawa Hiroyuki 野川博之, "Tainan Ōbakuji kō, ko Ōbaku matsuji no seitsui" 台南黃檗寺考古黃檗末寺の盛衰, *Ōbaku bunka* 122 (2001–02), pp. 53–75.

⁵⁸ Ruan Wenxi 阮旻錫, *Haishang jianwen lu* 海上見聞錄 (rpt. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1982), p. 43.

already been escorted to Japan by Zheng Chenggong. It is evident, however, that Zheng Chenggong had attempted to solicit assistance from the Japanese empire, as a letter (dated 1658) preserved in *Ka'i hentai* suggests.⁵⁹ According to other sources, Zhang Guangqi indeed landed in Nagasaki but was not allowed go on to Kyoto. However, he wrote a letter to Yinyuan to express his admiration and hinted at the political connection between him and Zheng Chenggong.⁶⁰

Yinyuan Longqi's political mission became clear when 117 pieces of correspondence preserved at Manpukuji were made public in 1993 by Chen Zhichao 陳智超. These letters, mostly from persons in China to Yinyuan in Japan, were written in the period between 1652 and 1671. They were authored by Yinyuan's disciples and lay devotees, including Zheng Chenggong's generals, local elite in Fuqing, and Chinese merchants in Japan. They show that Yinyuan Longqi maintained his deep connections with Ming loyalists after he arrived in Japan. Among the letters, there is correspondence from former Southern Ming officials such as Tang Xianyue 唐顯悅 and his brothers and Liu Xinchun 劉沂春, and more prominently, Zheng Chenggong's followers such as Zheng Cai and Zhang Guangqi.⁶¹ Because most of the letters were sent from China to Japan, they contain valuable information about the religious, social, and cultural transformations in the Fujian area under early-Qing rule.

Chen identifies one letter without a signature as being written by Zheng Chenggong himself shortly after Yinyuan arrived in Japan.⁶² According to him, it was written late in the summer of 1654. The original letter, containing 241 characters, is 16 cm high and 41 cm long. Addressing himself as "*benfan* 本藩," the author mentions that he met Yinyuan previously and later dispatched ships to escort Yinyuan to Japan. He noted especially that when he learned of Yinyuan's departure, he was at that time unable to see him off. Thus, he sent the letter to show his respect, expressing a wish that Yinyuan return as soon as possible. There is no signature, but the author indicates at the end that

⁵⁹ See "Dai Min Shū Seikō raishū" 大明朱成功來書, *Ka'i hentai*, p. 45.

⁶⁰ This letter is reprinted in *Correspondence*, no. 094, pp. 433-40, and it has been analyzed by Ono Kazuko in "Ingen zenji ni ateta ittō shokan" 隱元禪師にあてた一通書簡, in Nagata Hidemasa 永田英正, ed., *Chūgoku shutsudo moji shiryō no kisoteki kenkyū* 中國出土文字資料の基礎的研究 (Kyoto: Genbunsha, 1993), pp. 65-69.

⁶¹ On the relationship between Yinyuan and Ming loyalists, see Lin Guanchao 林觀潮, "Yinyuan chanshi he Nan Ming kang Qing renshi de guanxi" 隱元禪師和南明抗清人士的關係, *Shaoguan shiyuan xuebao* 韶關師院學報 24.1 (2003), pp. 66-74.

⁶² *Correspondence*, no. 006, pp. 67-71.

his name appears separately 名單具 in the main envelop 正帖. However, because the envelop is lost, his name cannot be found.

Chen Zhichao points to two crucial pieces of evidence. First, the author mentioned that he was responsible for dispatching boats to escort Yinyuan to Japan, and biographical studies show that Zheng was responsible for this arrangement. Second, the author used the term *benfan* to refer to himself, and during that time, Chen claims, only Zheng Chenggong had the right to use it. Otherwise, he would be referred to as “*fanzhu* 藩主” or “*guoxing gong* 國姓公.” Thus, Chen suggests that Yinyuan might have carried Zheng’s special order to request aid and at least acted as an “envoy of friendship 親善大使” for Zheng Chenggong.⁶³

Professor Chen’s discovery was widely broadcast in the Chinese media. But some scholars, after examining the evidence, challenged Chen’s conclusion. Hu Cangze 胡滄澤, for example, though acknowledging that the letter was written by Zheng Chenggong, argued that the content of the letter and Yinyuan’s activities in Japan did not reveal a covert political mission at all.⁶⁴ Lin Guanchao, who inspected the letter carefully, completely rejects the attribution of authorship to Zheng Chenggong. According to him, Yinyuan never met Zheng Chenggong personally, yet the letter mentioned that the author actually had listened to Yinyuan’s teaching in person. Moreover, Lin argues, the customary use of “*benfan*” cannot be taken as a term of self-reference, because in the historiography of Zheng Chenggong’s regime, such as *Xianwang shilu* 先王實錄,⁶⁵ *benfan* was used throughout to refer to “our lord” rather than to the author himself. In addition, the term *benfan* was written on the top of the line whenever it occurred. According to the Chinese epistolary convention of hierarchical avoidance, this special format indicates a respectful attitude towards the author’s superior, who must be Zheng Chenggong. After reading Yinyuan’s complete works carefully, Lin speculates that the author must be Zheng’s staff member Xu Qintai 許欽台, who was eventually ordained by Yinyuan as a monk

⁶³ Chen Zhichao, “Zheng Chenggong zhi Yinyuan xinjian de faxian, jieshao yipi Nan Ming kang Qing douzheng xinshiliao” 鄭成功致隱元信簡的發現介紹一批南明抗清鬥爭新史料, *Zhongguoshi yanjiu dongtai* 中國史研究動態 8 (1993), pp. 1–5. Ono Kazuko also argues for the political implication of Yinyuan’s arrival because the initial protective measure taken by the Japanese during Yinyuan’s stay in Fumonji 普門寺 indicates that the *bakufu* was fully aware of Yinyuan’s unusual mission. See Ono, “Dōran no jidai o ukita Ingen zenji” 動亂の時代を生きた隱元禪師, *Zen bunka* 禪文化 124 (1987), p. 91.

⁶⁴ Hu Cangze disagrees with the hypothesis that Yinyuan’s mission was political, but his argument is speculative and unconvincing; “Zheng Chenggong yu Yinyuan chanshi guanxi luelun” 鄭成功與隱元關係略論, *Fujian shifan daxue xuebao* 福建師範大學學報 4 (1997), pp. 96–101.

⁶⁵ See Yang Ying 楊英, *Xianwang shilu* 先王實錄 (1655; rpt. Fuzhou: Fujian renmin chubanshe, 1981).

in 1662. Based on this new theory about the letter and Yinyuan's attitudes towards Zheng Chenggong and his resistance movement, Lin concludes that although Yinyuan cherished deep nostalgic feeling towards his home country he was primarily a Buddhist leader without direct involvement in the resistance movement.⁶⁶

Although the authorship of the letter will remain debatable, Yinyuan's involvement in politics in China and Japan cannot be completely denied. Even after Yinyuan arrived in Japan, he was closely watched by the *bakufu* and was suspected of being a Chinese spy, and ultimately summoned to Edo in the fall of 1658, which time coincides with the arrival of another letter from Zheng Chenggong soliciting military assistance. Considering the frequent diplomatic exchange between Japan and China, Yinyuan must have had a role of some kind in Sino-Japanese political dealings.⁶⁷

CHAN BUDDHISM AND THE CHINESE DIASPORA COMMUNITY IN NAGASAKI

In addition to the resistance movement in Southeast China, an important part of the historical background to Yinyuan's trip was the new wave of Chinese emigration to Japan. Because of the increasing need of overseas Chinese for religious institutions, Yinyuan Longqi was invited to Japan by the Chinese community in Nagasaki. As I have mentioned, from 1652 to 1653, Yinyuan had received four invitations from the Chinese monk Yiran Xingrong, who was at that time the abbot of Kōfukuji Monastery in Nagasaki and represented the interests of the Chinese community. In addition to these invitations, there were four social conditions that facilitated the emigration of the Ōbaku monks:

1. the growing Chinese overseas communities created a demand for religious service;

⁶⁶ For details, see Lin Guanchao, "Ingen to Tei Seikō tonō kankei ni tsuite" 隱元と鄭成功との関係について, *Ōbaku bunka* 122 (2001–2002), pp. 110–19.

⁶⁷ Kawahara Eishun, "Tei Seikō no Nihon seigan to Ingen zenji no Edo gyōke, Ka'i hentai shosai Tei Seikō enhei yōseisho no nendai kaishaku ni tsuite" 鄭成功の日本請援と隱元禪師の江戸行化華夷變態所載鄭成功援兵要請書の年代解釋について, *Ōbaku bunka* 120 (1999–2000), pp. 61–74, argues that Yinyuan must have had secret political connections with Zheng Chenggong because when Zheng's letter arrived in Japan, the *bakufu* summoned Yinyuan. He points out that a letter appended in *Ka'i hentai* and attributed to Zheng Chenggong by scholars such as Ishihara Michihiro was actually not written by him. Although it was originally dated to 1648, Kawahara reasons from the political situation that it was sent from China and arrived in Japan in the eighth lunar month of 1658. In the ninth month, Yinyuan was summoned to Edo, the close timing of which implying a relationship. See also Kawahara Eishun, "Ingen Zenji no tōtō to tairiku jōsei" 隱元禪師の東渡と大陸情勢, *Ōbaku bunka* 116 (1996), pp. 53–58.

2. as part of the anti-Christian agenda, in 1640 the Tokugawa government required all Japanese subjects to be affiliated with a local Buddhist temple as a measure to prevent the further spread of Christianity in Japan;
3. Chan Buddhists had successfully incorporated the popular Mazu 媽祖 into their pantheon and acted as caretakers of this local cult;
4. the invitation extended to Yinyuan Longqi was related to the rise of a particular diaspora in Nagasaki, whose members originally came from Fuqing county, where Mount Huangbo is located.

The Need for Buddhism in the Nagasaki Chinese Community

First of all, the presence of Chinese monks in Japan was largely related to the religious demands of a local Chinese emigré community in Nagasaki, which took shape in the sixteenth century as a result of the thriving private maritime commerce. This kind of private international trade was illegal during the Ming because the Ming founder Zhu Yuanzhang intended to confine international maritime trade to officially controlled tribute-commerce. Meanwhile, he had largely given up the idea of expanding the Chinese empire through military conquests of its maritime neighbors, especially after considering the two ill-fated expeditions during the previous Mongol rule: the invasions of Japan during 1274–1281, and the 1293 expedition in Java. (Both ended disastrously: the invasions of Japan were blocked by heavy storms and not even a single Chinese soldier landed in Japan. The Chinese army indeed landed in Java but was defeated by the local defense, and most Chinese soldiers were captured.) Thus, Zhu Yuanzhang ruled out any military conquest of the five East and Southeast Asian countries.⁶⁸ Through a series of diplomatic negotiations with neighboring countries, early-Ming rulers successfully established a system of tribute-commerce that was strongly controlled by the government. The trade between China and Japan, for example, was undertaken under a Kangō 勘合, or tally system, that only allowed ships with previously issued government certificates to do business. Ships without official tallies would be denied entrance to Chinese seaports.

The monopoly of trade by the Ming government was loosened in later times and overseas Chinese communities thrived accordingly. Wang Gungwu suggests that the turning point occurred around 1500

⁶⁸ These five countries were An'nan (Vietnam), Champa, Korea, Siam, and Liuqiu (Ryūkyū Islands). Later, fifteen more were added to the “not to be invaded” list. See Wang Gungwu, “Ming Foreign Relations: Southeast Asia,” in Mote and Twitchett, eds., *Cambridge History of China* 8.2, pp. 311–12.

with the coming of the Portuguese at Malacca.⁶⁹ At this point, the tribute system established by the Ming founder was on the verge of collapsing and private trade was undertaken among Chinese, Japanese, and Westerners. The overseas Chinese communities also underwent visible changes. Before 1500, owing to the strict prohibition of private trade, the overseas Chinese communities were dwindling. According to Wang Gungwu, there were only two merchant communities: one on the northeast coast of Java and another at Palembang (Sumatra).⁷⁰ After 1500, however, the vibrant unofficial maritime trade created two large overseas Chinese communities in Asia, one in Manila, which was under Spanish control, and the other in Nagasaki, which is our current focus.

Nagasaki became a major center for overseas Chinese during the sixteenth century. The official trade with Japan ended in 1549 when the so-called *Wakō* invasion began. This devastating maritime invasion of Chinese coasts lasted twenty-five years and was believed to be a reaction to the official suppression of private trade. Chinese coastal merchants and Japanese warriors formed alliances and had their bases in Japan.⁷¹ The early Chinese communities in Japan may have taken shape during this time because the early-seventeenth century had seen a small Chinese community in Nagasaki, which was the stronghold of Jesuit missionaries in East Asia at that time.

The history of Nagasaki was intertwined with the spread of Christianity in Japan from the very beginning. The city of Nagasaki was by and large shaped by foreign residents from Europe and China and by the Tokugawa policies concerning religion. Along with the arrival of the first Portuguese vessel in Japan in 1567, the Jesuits began to disseminate Christian teaching. In 1570, Father Melchior Figueiredo, S.J., discovered the port of Nagasaki, which was soon opened to foreign traders at the request of the captain of a Portuguese vessel. Under the petition of the Jesuits to the local daimyo, Nagasaki even became a Jesuit province and was actually administered by the Jesuits since 1580. However, the Japanese shōgunate began to be aware of the increasing threat of Christianity. In 1587, Toyotomi Hideyoshi 丰臣秀

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 323.

⁷⁰ Wang Gungwu, "Merchants without Empires: The Hokkien Sojourning Communities," in James D. Tracy, ed., *The Rise of Merchant Empires* (New York: Cambridge U.P., 1990), p. 405.

⁷¹ John E. Wills, Jr., "Maritime China from Wang Chih to Shih Lang: Themes in Peripheral History," in Jonathan Spence and John E. Wills, eds., *From Ming to Ch'ing: Conquest, Region, and Continuities in 17th Century China* (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1979), pp. 201-38.

吉 (1536–1598), the powerful prime minister who reunited Japan, issued a decree to prohibit Christianity. In 1592, Hideyoshi appointed a new magistrate to Nagasaki and initiated a license system to regulate all Japanese vessels engaged in international trade. The persecution of Christianity reached its height in 1597 when the twenty-six martyrs were arrested in Kyoto and Osaka and finally were crucified on the hill of Nishizaka 西坂 in Nagasaki. In 1614, Tokugawa Ieyasu 德川家康 (1542–1616), the first shōgun of the Tokugawa *bakufu*, formerly issued the Edict of Prohibition of Christianity. After this, an anti-Christian policy was forcefully carried out. Japanese Christians responded with a series of revolts, especially the Shimabara 島原 revolt that shook Tokugawa rule. In 1639, the Sakoku jidai 鎖國時代 (Isolation Period) began. As a result, only residents of Nagasaki were allowed to engage in international trade, and the Dutch and the Chinese, the only two foreign merchant groups permitted to trade, were confined in certain areas of Nagasaki. At this juncture, Chinese Buddhism was introduced and played a significant role in building the solidarity of the Chinese community in Nagasaki.

The Coming of Chinese Chan monks

The prohibition against Christianity propelled Chinese residents in Nagasaki to consolidate themselves closely around Buddhism. As a policy to prevent further propagation of Christianity, all Japanese residents were required to be registered with a local Buddhist temple. Perhaps in order to distinguish themselves from Christians, the Chinese in Nagasaki displayed a special enthusiasm for Chinese Buddhism. Along with the coming of Chinese immigrants, several Chinese masters arrived in Japan before Yinyuan Longqi. In 1615, an obscure monk, Zhiguang 智廣, was said to be residing in Nagasaki. In 1620, the monk Zhenyuan 真圓 from Jiangxi province started Kōfukuji 興福寺, also called Nankinji 南京寺, a temple sponsored by merchants from the lower Yangzi river area, primarily from Zhejiang and Jiangxi. The abacy of this monastery was inherited by the monk Mozi Ruding 默子如定 (1597–1657) in 1632,⁷² and then by Yiran Xingrong in 1645. Yiran Xingrong arrived in Japan in 1634 as a merchant trading in herbs and ten years later joined the sangha. As I have mentioned, he had been instrumental in Yinyuan's emigration by having issued persistent invitations. (Yiran was also revered as a painter-monk who brought the literati painting style to Japan.) In 1628, eight years after the founding

⁷² See Hayashi, *Ōbaku bunka jinmei jiten*, p. 357.

of Kōfukuji, Fukusaiji 福濟寺 was founded by the Chinese monk Juehai 覺海 (?–1637) and lay patrons from Zhangzhou 漳州 in Fujian. Thus, it was also known as Shōshuji 漳州寺. The substantial development of this temple was attributed to Yunqian Jiewan 蘊謙戒琬 (1610–1673), who crossed the sea from Fujian in 1649. Later, Sōfukuji monastery 崇福寺, also called Fukushūji 福州寺, was founded by the monk Chaoran 超然 in 1629. After the second abbot Baizhuo 百拙 died in 1649, Yinyuan's dharma heir Yelan Xinggui was invited to succeed him. Unfortunately, as I mentioned earlier, Yelan died in a shipwreck in 1651. At the same time, Daozhe Chaoyuan was invited from Fujian in 1650 and returned to China eight years later.

In the lives of these monks we can discern changes of religious identity. The founders of the three Chinese temples in Nagasaki had identities as ordained monks that were obscure. The Kōfukuji founder Zhenyuan first came to Japan as a merchant and then recovered his identity as a Buddhist monk.⁷³ The transmission of the Sōfukuji founder Chaoran was also unclear and his transmission had no influence on later generations.⁷⁴ After migrating to Japan as a merchant, Yiran Xingrong was converted by Mozi Ruding.⁷⁵ Yunqian Jiewan's transmission was also not clear.⁷⁶ But almost all later emigré masters had clear dharma transmissions. When Yelan Xinggui and Daozhe Chaoyuan were invited, their sectarian identity was definite. Yelan was Yinyuan's dharma heir, and Chaoyuan was Yinyuan's dharma brother Gengxin Xingmi's 互信行彌 (1603–1659) dharma heir. This change corresponded exactly to the rise of Chan Buddhism throughout mainland China. As I have described briefly in the previous sections, early in the seventeenth century, the Buddhist world was increasingly organized by the network of dharma transmissions. In the 1654 lawsuit against Yinyuan Longqi's master Feiyin Tongrong, the importance of dharma transmission was brought to a new level by Feiyin Tongrong's emphasis upon the strict practice of dharma transmission, which means that all Chan teachers should be acknowledged by a qualified Chan master. The changing composition of emigré Chan masters in Japan certainly reflected this mainland change, which culminated in the arrival of Yinyuan Longqi in 1654, whose identity as an eminent Linji Chan master was well-established.

The Buddhist Incorporation of the Mazu Cult

Here, it is necessary for us to note that a primary spiritual need for the majority of maritime merchants and sailors in Nagasaki was

⁷³ Ibid., p. 163.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 238.

⁷⁵ Ibid., pp. 17–18.

⁷⁶ Ibid., p. 28.

a popular form of Buddhist faith that protected personal welfare and safety in travel. It would be hard to imagine that Chinese immigrants had a particular spiritual need for Chan studies, which largely appealed to the Chinese elite. However, it seems that during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there was no Buddhist deity who specialized in protecting the safety at sea. The dominant cult for seamen along the southeast Chinese coast was no doubt that of Mazu, which still thrives in southeast China and in overseas Chinese communities.⁷⁷

It is unclear how Buddhism began to assimilate this cult. But the study of the Mazu cult shows that both Taoism and Buddhism were incorporating Mazu into their pantheons. According to Aloysius Chang's study, Buddhist temples in Nagasaki became the caretakers of the Mazu cult.⁷⁸ There were also signs showing that Buddhist monks were well prepared for sea voyage and consciously acted as wonder-workers when danger arose. It was recorded that when Yinyuan made the trip to Japan the ships faced a severe storm. At this juncture, Yinyuan, remaining calm, ordered a plaque erected with an edict "No audience will be allowed! 免參." The high tide soon subsided and the ships safely landed in Nagasaki.⁷⁹ From Shilian Dashan's 石濂大汕 (1633–1702) record of his voyage to Vietnam in 1695, it is clear that Buddhist monks responded to emergencies on the trip and invoked divine protection. According to his travelogue, when the monks were on board, they usually prepared four flags for different emergency situations. The upper part of the four flags displayed the phrase: "I am carrying a clear mandate from the supreme dharma king Śākyamuni;" the lower parts of the four flags were different, reading as follows:

大雨暫止	Heavy rain desist!
順風相送	Send off with a tail wind!
諸神擁護	All Gods protect!
龍王免朝	No audience from the Dragon King. ⁸⁰

According to Jiang Boqin's study, the use of such flags was derived from the Mazu cult. For example, the message of the very last flag, which both Yinyuan Longqi and Shilian Dashan used, refers to an element in the popular legends of Mazu, who is said to have stopped

⁷⁷ Modern studies on this cult in Chinese, Japanese, and Western languages are many. For a point of entry in English, see Joseph Bosco and Puay-peng Ho, *Temples of the Empress of Heaven* (Hong Kong and New York: Oxford U.P., 1999).

⁷⁸ Aloysius Chang, "The Chinese Community of Nagasaki in the First Century of the Tokugawa Period (1603–1688)," Ph.D. diss. (New York: St. John's University, 1970), p. 111, 119–20.

⁷⁹ See "Yinyuan nianpu," in *IGZS*, vol. 11, p. 5206.

⁸⁰ Shilian Dashan, *Haiwai jishi* 海外紀事 (rpt. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1987), j. 1, p. 3.

unusual tides.⁸¹ However, according to Dashan's own explanation, the flag was used because it was commonly believed that when a monk who knows the principle of the *Śūraṅgama Sūtra* and the *Lotus Sūtra* sailed on lakes or went to sea, the Dragon King, who ruled the sea and commanded waves and storms, must come out to greet him. Therefore his mere arrival might cause danger to the boat, making it necessary to reject his audience for the purpose of safety.⁸²

No matter how subtly Buddhist leaders could justify the use of the Mazu tradition, the Buddhist caretaking of the Mazu cult in overseas Chinese communities was evident. At Fukusaiji, in Nagasaki, Mazu was jointly worshiped with Avalokiteśvara and the Lord General Guan (Guandi 關帝); at Kōfukuji, Mazu was also worshiped as Bodhisattva Mazu; at Sōfukuji, an independent Mazu Hall was erected and dedicated to the cult.⁸³ Not only did this happen in Nagasaki, the temples of the Heavenly Consort (Tianfei 天妃) in Taiwan and Macao were also managed by Chan monks.⁸⁴

Local Connections with Fuqing

The emigré monks before Yinyuan had no doubt paved the way for Yinyuan's arrival. But the local connection between the Ōbaku monks and the Fuqing diaspora played an important role in the Ōbaku monks' initial development in Nagasaki. The evidence lay in the fact that most Ōbaku monks, including Yinyuan Longqi, originated from there, and Mount Huangbo was located in the area.

It is notable that Chinese overseas communities often further distinguished themselves according to the regions in China from which they hailed. The three Chinese monasteries in Nagasaki, for example, are often described as expressions of local connections between people from the lower Yangzi region, Zhangzhou, and Fuzhou, respectively. Within the Chinese community there emerged a powerful faction con-

⁸¹ See Jiang Boqin 姜伯勤, *Shilian Dashan yu Ao'men Chanshi, Qingchu Lingnan Chanxue yanjiu chubian* 石濂大汕與澳門禪史清初嶺南禪學研究初編 (Shanghai: Xuelin chubanshe, 1999), p. 449.

⁸² Shilian Dashan, *Haiwai jishi*, j. 1, p. 6.

⁸³ Miyata Yasushi 宮田安, "Maso dōmon oyobi Masodō" 媽祖堂門および媽祖堂, in *Nagasaki Sōfukuji ronkō* 長崎崇福寺論考 (Nagasaki: Nagasaki bunkensha, 1975), pp. 341-58. Lin Guanchao mentions that the annexation of the Mazu cult in Buddhist temples resulted from the persecution of Christianity. To avoid the association between Mazu and Mother Maria, the Chinese community had to build the shrine in Buddhist monasteries to prove its non-Christian origin. But Lin provides no evidence. See Lin, "Ingen tōto no shinsō ni suite," p. 309.

⁸⁴ See Li Xianzhang 李獻璋, *Maso shinkō no kenkyū* 媽祖信仰の研究 (Tokyo, 1979). The Mazu temple in Macao was controlled by Shilian Dashan's lineage for a long time. This is evidenced by the recent discovery of Dashan's lineage in Macau; Jiang, *Shilian Dashan*, esp. pp. 449-53.

nected with Fuqing county. Although generally referred to as people from Fuzhou, Fuqing men distinguished themselves from among other Fujianese by their dialect.⁸⁵ During several centuries of contact with the outside world, Fuqing people, generally called Hokchia, have settled all over the world and become a unique emigrant group.⁸⁶

The Fuqing diaspora can be traced back to the sixteenth century, even before Yinyuan Longqi's emigration. Fuqing people were renowned as good sailors, and were offered special perquisites by captains: "[T]he master mariners and mates were largely Hokkien or of Sanjiang origin, while the crews tended to be Hokchia (natives of Fuqing county), who were remunerated by being allowed to bring small cargoes of their own for trading at their destination."⁸⁷ This tradition produced a network of Hokchia (Fuqing) vendors in Japan, and "Hokchia members make up a tenth of the total number of Chinese permanent residents [in Japan] today."⁸⁸ Two surveys of Fuqing immigrants in Japan conducted in 1987 and 1988 confirm that a large network of the Fuqing diaspora exists in contemporary Japan.⁸⁹

The Fuqing diaspora in Japan must have facilitated Yinyuan Longqi's emigration. In 1654, there were more than twenty disciples accompanying Yinyuan and most of them were natives of Fuqing. During the process of migration, some Fuqing immigrants in Nagasaki played a significant role. For example, Lin Taiqing 林太卿 (z. Chuyu 楚玉, 1561–1645), He Gaocai 何高材 (z. Yuchu 毓楚, 1598–1671), Wang Yin 王引 (z. Xinqu 心渠, 1594–1678), and Wei Zhiyan 魏之琰 (z. Shuang 雙, 1617–1689) became leaders of the Chinese community in Naga-

⁸⁵ For a study of the Fuqing dialect, see Feng Aizhen 馮愛珍, *Fuqing fangyan yanjiu* 福清方言研究 (Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 1993).

⁸⁶ The self-consciousness of this diaspora is still very strong today. E.g., the election of "Miss Fuqing" was held in Singapore on November 23, 2000, symbolizing the international emigrant network of Fuqing people. See Lin Ming 林銘, "Huaren wending shijie Fuqing xiaojie" 華人問鼎世界福清小姐, in *Dongfang shibao* 東方時報 289, August 30, 2000. The process of diaspora also continues. On the morning of June 19, 2000, 58 Chinese illegal immigrants were found dead in a sealed container when the truck transporting them passed the checkpoint at Dover, Britain. Most of the dead were from Fuqing. This locality soon became a focus of inquiry and investigation in China; "Fuqingren weishenmo yao toudu?" 福清人爲什麼要偷渡, *Renmin ribao* 人民日報 (Beijing), June 26, 2000.

⁸⁷ See Lynn Pan, ed., *The Encyclopedia of the Chinese Overseas* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U.P., 1999), p. 332.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 337.

⁸⁹ Jiang Chuidong 蔣垂東, Li Shaoxiong 李少雄, Tung Jiazhou 童家洲, and Ye Qi 葉齊, "Dui lü Ri Fuqing huaqiao wangluo de shizhengxing yanjiu" 對旅日福清華僑網絡的實證性研究, in Ichikawa Nobuchika 市川信愛 and Dai Yifeng 戴一峰, eds., *Jindai lü Ri huaqiao yu Dongya yanhai diqu jiaoyi quan*, *Changqi huashang taiyihao wenshu yanjiu* 近代旅日華僑與東亞沿海地區交易圈長崎華商泰益號文書研究 (Xiamen: Xiamen daxue chubanshe, 1994), chap. 4, sect. 3, pp. 379–415.

saki.⁹⁰ In particular, Lin Gongyan 林公琰 (Japanese: Hayashi Koen, 1598–1683), who was also a native of Fuqing, might have been instrumental in inviting Yinyuan. In 1623, Lin sailed to Japan and in 1628 was appointed the Administrator of the Chinese Community (*tōnen gyōji* 唐年行司) in Nagasaki. His son Lin Daorong 林道榮 (Japanese: Hayashi Dōei, 1640–1708), who was promoted to the position of the Chief Interpreter (*daitsūji* 大通事) in 1674, continued to support the Ōbaku monks, especially master Jifei Ruyi, who might have been a relative of the Lin family.⁹¹ Because of Ōbaku monks' strong local connection with Fuqing, Yinyuan's voyage to Japan was by no means accidental.

CONCLUSION

Being in exile is a universal experience in the Buddhist world. Working in a missionary tradition, Buddhists constantly put themselves, voluntarily or involuntarily, in a situation of dislocation and relocation. Exiled Buddhism very often conflates with the diaspora of a particular ethnic group because religion not only provides the hope of salvation and a spiritual return to the homeland but also solidarity and identity to a diaspora community in a foreign land. It is notable that in our own times, Buddhism's missionary tradition thrives and has extended into the western world.⁹² It is less known, however, that in the seventeenth century, when the process of the Chinese diaspora accelerated, Chan Buddhism, being a popular form in China, was brought with the emigrants as an ethnic religion.

The research in this paper has been motivated by my curiosity concerning the historical circumstances that made Yinyuan's voyage to Japan possible. On the one hand, Yinyuan's historic move to Nagasaki, which was often lauded by his followers as an inevitable course selected by a single man's determination, was a multi-vector combination of historical events that disallow any conjecture of historical determin-

⁹⁰ For details about these Fuqing people and their descendants, see Miyata Yasushi, *Tōtsūji kakei ronkō* 唐通事家係論攷 (Nagasaki, 1979), pp. 388–411; 451–76; 798–819; 961–96.

⁹¹ Hayashi Rokurō 林隆朗, *Nagasaki Tōtsūji, daitsūji Hayashi Dōei to sono shūhen* 長崎唐通事大通事林道榮とその周邊 (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2000); on the relation between Huangbo and the Hayashi family, see esp. pp. 22–26, 42–47, and 66–68. See also Liang Rongruo 梁容若, “Yinyuan Longqi yu Riben wenhua” 隱元隆琦與日本文化, *Zhong Ri wenhua jiaoliu shilun* 中日文化交流史論 (Beijing: Shangwu yinshu guan, 1985), pp. 275–91.

⁹² For studies of various current Buddhist missions, see Linda Learman, ed., *Buddhist Missionaries in the Era of Globalization* (Honolulu: U. of Hawai'i P., 2005); and Charles S. Prebish and Martin Baumann, ed., *Westward Dharma: Buddhism beyond Asia* (Berkeley: U. of California P., 2002).

ism. On the other hand, Yinyuan's emigration was indeed inevitable for the following two reasons.

First, Chan Buddhism is by nature a missionary tradition because dharma transmission is an internal mechanism for Chan monks to carry out missionary work. For every Chan master who has received transmission of the Buddhist dharma, there is an inherited impulse from within to pass the transmission to others in order to multiply his dharma heirs. The necessity of perpetuating his lineage urges a Chan monk to become a missionary. Therefore, under the historical circumstances of the seventeenth century, the rise of Chan Buddhism in China created a large-scale missionary work to reclaim the territory of Buddhism not only within China but also in East Asia. Second, Chan masters' overseas missionary work was complicated by the political changes in China that resulted in a new wave of Chinese emigration to East and Southeast Asia. Yinyuan Longqi, associated with Zheng Chenggong's anti-Manchu resistance movement and the Chinese diaspora community in Nagasaki, thus became a missionary of Buddhist teachings in Japan.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| <i>Correspondence</i> | <i>Riben Huangboshan Wanfusi cang lü Ri gaoseng Yinyuan Zhongtu laiwang shuxin ji</i> 日本黃檗山萬福寺藏旅日高僧隱元中土來往書信集 |
| <i>IGZS</i> | <i>Shinsan kōtei Ingen zenshū</i> 新纂校訂隱元全集 |
| <i>JXDZJ</i> | <i>Ming Jiaxing dazangjing</i> 明嘉興大藏經 |