

audience, is still not quite tuned correctly for broader non-Japanese international audiences in English.

In short, this book, despite its great contribution, still lies on some kind of borderline between immersion in Japanese tradition and a broader global accessibility. It offers the ambiguous phenomenon of an excellent academic work—of relatively restricted accessibility—which happens to be about Japanese religious history’s greatest popularizer. To make Rennyō and his ideas as accessible to a global English-reading audience as they are to contemporary Japanese audiences interested in Buddhism, a number of further stages of contextualization and translation are going to be necessary. Unquestionably, however, this volume will serve as another invaluable stepping stone in that process.

*Zen Classics: Formative Texts in the History of Zen Buddhism.* Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. 296 pages. \$25 paper, ISBN 0-19-517526-3

BEN BROSE

*Zen Classics* is the latest offering from the editorial team of Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. Continuing in the same vein as *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism* (Oxford, 2000) and *The Zen Canon: Understanding the Classic Texts* (Oxford, 2004), *Zen Classics* collects essays from Buddhist scholars focusing on various aspects of Zen (Ch. Chan; Kor. Sōn) Buddhism. Readers of the previous volumes will recognize many of the same contributors here, although this collection moves deeper into Japanese Zen than either of the previous two. Of the eight essays, one deals with China, one with Korea, and the remaining six address issues pertinent to Japan. Each essay offers a detailed study of a text, or series of texts, providing rich insight into the historical development of the Zen tradition, but some readers may be misled by the title. This collection is not an attempt to systematically review the fundamental literature of the Zen tradition, but rather a contribution to our fundamental understanding of the nature of Zen literature itself.

Zen is often portrayed as a maverick school, fond of denigrating the sacred images and texts so central to the tradition. The radical, antinomian side of Zen that has so captured the imagination of the secular West is often said to be typified by the Hongzhou school. Indeed, iconoclastic dialogues and unconventional mental and physical pedagogy first appear in the discourse record (*yulu*) of Mazu and he has therefore been singled out as the originator of what has come to be seen as the “clas-

sic" Zen style. This new, irreverent Buddhist movement distinguished itself from mainstream Buddhism through its rejection of textual study, ritual, and ethical regulations in favor of a purely spontaneous, unmediated, mind-to-mind transmission of the awakened state. This, at least, has been the prevailing image of Tang dynasty (618–907) Zen since the Song dynasty (960–1279) when the tradition was brought to Japan and the words and actions of masters such as Mazu and Baizhang became immutable models of enlightened behavior. That this vivid and colorful myth prevails over a more mundane and subdued reality is perhaps nothing new in either religious or secular history, but it is particularly engrained in the Zen school which has consciously crafted its identity out of such myths. Mario Poceski is one of several scholars who is trying to look beyond the kicks and shouts to the living men behind them.

Several of Poceski's publications have focused on the Hongzhou school. His essay in *The Zen Canon* took up the topic of Mazu's discourse record against the backdrop of that genre's development. In this volume, Poceski turns his attention to Baizhang's foremost disciple, Guishan Lingyou, and his short text entitled, "Guishan's Admonitions." Guishan's place in the mythic structure of Zen history was secured as early as the Five Dynasties period (907–60) when, along with his student Yangshan Huiji, he was recognized as the founder of the "Guiyang" school of Zen, one of the so-called five Zen schools. "Guishan's Admonitions" is the only known text to have issued from his own hand and what it reveals is not the anti-establishment radicalism that is reflected in later literary portraits, but rather a quite conventional Buddhist master exhorting his students to study the sutras and, above all, follow the monastic regulations (*Vinaya*). Guishan's instruction here, eloquent and insightful as it is, is not easily distinguished from teachings that would have been given at monasteries throughout China, Zen or otherwise.

Poceski notes that Guishan was writing near the time of the anti-Buddhist Huichang persecutions (841–6), which were reacting, in part, to the large numbers of ordinary Chinese citizens who were falsely obtaining ordination certificates, thereby removing their names from the government tax registries. Given the growing suspicion that some monasteries were providing refuge for tax evaders, a set of guidelines that exhorted monks to act like monks (as opposed to lay people) would have been wholly appropriate. Yet that is not to imply that Guishan or other masters of his generation stopped at sutra study and precepts. Poceski's conclusion is that Tang Zen took conventional monastic models as the foundation of religious training and that only at advanced levels was a radical detachment from normative forms advocated. Rather than standing in opposition to conventional, ethical norms, direct and "formless" realization implied an internalization of those forms. Radical behavior presupposed a solid grounding in conventional morality.

Translations of a large portion of "Guishan's Admonitions" are interspersed throughout Poceski's essay, but the reader may be disappointed that this short text is

neither reproduced in full or in sequential order, making it difficult to get a complete view of the work. Poceski does refer the reader to two full translations: one in his own Ph.D dissertation and the other in an MA thesis. To this list might be added English translations by Thomas Kirchner (*Kokusai Zengaku Kenkyūsho ronso* 1, 1988, pp. 1–18) and Thich Nhat Hanh (*Stepping into Freedom*, Parallax, 1997).

The normative bent of the Zen tradition, brought to the fore in Poceski's essay, is one of the unifying themes in *Zen Classics*. It surfaces again in the next essay by Charles Muller: "A Korean Contribution to the Zen Canon: The *Oga Hae Seorui* (Commentaries on Five Masters on the Diamond Sutra)." The text under consideration was compiled in the fifteenth century by the Korean Sōn Master Gihwa (1376–1433) and is comprised of five commentaries by Chinese authors in addition to Gihwa's own subcommentary. The prominent place of the *Diamond Sutra* in the Zen tradition is well known; after all, it was the hearing of this text that triggered the awakening of the Sixth Patriarch, Hui-neng. This concise text has also been a classic throughout the Mahāyāna world for the way in which it uses words to reveal their own insubstantiability. In this way, it clarifies the position of the Zen tradition which dismisses reliance on texts yet has produced more literature than any other Buddhist school. The *Oga Hae Seorui* makes the case for a thorough study of the sutras in conjunction with contemplative practices. Thus, according to Gihwa, commentaries should be based on meditative insight just as insight should be compared against textual precedents.

As Muller makes clear, this is a movement away from the earlier "nine mountain" schools of Sōn which tended to advocate the more familiar form of anti-textual Zen rhetoric. Yet as early as the tenth century, a similar trend is found in Korea with the imperially-sponsored transmission of the Fayan tradition of Chinese Zen (Kor. Pōban Sōn), which was characterized by a dual emphasis on meditation and scriptural study. The Pōban tradition became one of the most influential Buddhist movements in Korea during the tenth and eleventh centuries and was followed by the official establishment of the Korean Tiantai tradition (Kor. Ch'ōnt'ae) late in the eleventh century which, of course, also emphasized both doctrinal study and meditation. It appears that the *Oga Hae Seorui* is situated within a long tradition of normative Sōn in Korea extending up to the present day.

In addition to discussing the history of the *Diamond Sutra* in Korea, the biographical background of Gihwa, and analyzing the structure and content of the *Oga Hae Seorui*, Muller has also provided a complete translation of one of its thirty-two sections, giving the reader a satisfying taste of the varying styles of the six individual commentators. Interested readers will find more of Gihwa's commentary in Muller's translation *The Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment: Korean Buddhism's Guide to Meditation (With Commentary by the Son Monk Kihwa)* (State University of New York Press, 1999).

Far too little is known about the Sōn tradition and Korean Buddhism in general.

At present, the bulk of academic energy is given over to studies of China and Japan, while the historically important and currently vibrant Buddhist cultures of Korea and, to an even greater extent, Vietnam remain the exclusive domain of a handful of Western scholars. The reader should not be misled by the back-cover copy which claims that *Zen Classics* concentrates “primarily on texts from Korea and Japan.” Of the eight essays, only Muller’s addresses Korea.

Most of the Korean monks who came to study Fayan Zen in tenth-century China sought out Yongming Yanshou, the most well-known master of that eclectic tradition. Yanshou’s voluminous writings also stressed the importance of conventional Buddhist teachings in conjunction with meditative training and was influential in both Korea and Japan. Much of what we know about him we have learned from Albert Welter (although Huang Yi-shun and Shih Heng-ching have also written book-length studies on this monk). In this essay for *Zen Classics*, Welter casts his gaze further afield to Kamakura Japan and Eisai’s *Kōzen gokokuron* (Promotion of Zen for the Protection of the Country).

Eisai’s text can hardly be considered a classic; Yanagida Seizan notes that it has “hardly ever been read in earnest.” However, as Welter engagingly demonstrates, when taken seriously, the *Kōzen gokokuron* yields a wealth of information about early conceptions of Zen in Japan. The reasons behind the text’s low status in Japanese Zen are twofold: Eisai is accused of sullyng the “pure” Zen tradition through the incorporation of Tendai and Shingon practices and seeking to link the practice of Zen with the preservation of the state. Read from the perspective of later Rinzai orthodoxy, such propositions were hardly in line with the distinctly independent and fiercely sectarian Zen of the Tokugawa era (1603–1868). Like other essays in this collection, Welter’s piece draws a clear distinction between historical reality and retrospective reinterpretation. Setting the *Kōzen gokokuron* within its historical context, the contours of early Kamakura Buddhism begin to come into sharper focus.

Welter traces the relationship of Buddhism and the state from the initial elevation of the *Sutra on the Benevolent Kings* (*Ninnō kyō*), through the rise and domination of the Tendai and Shingon traditions, and on to Eisai and the writing of the *Kōzen gokokuron*. By the twelfth century, Eisai felt that his own Tendai tradition had grown so corrupt that it was no longer able to fulfill its primary function of state security through spiritual cultivation and ritual. The Zen tradition that he was attempting to import from China’s Mount Tiantai was not a new movement but rather a new approach to the already established Tendai tradition. The close relation between Zen and Tiantai was taken for granted in early Song Buddhism as can be seen in the works of Tiantai Deshao, the Zen monk who revitalized the monastic establishment on Mount Tiantai, and his aforementioned student Yongming Yanshou, whose work is frequently cited by Eisai. According to Welter, it is the inclusive tendency of the Fayan tradition of Zen, rather than Linji orthodoxy, which is most apparent in Eisai’s work. This tradition was not characterized by freedom from convention or a

rejection of sutras; it was in fact precisely the opposite. Eisai's Zen stressed a strict adherence to the traditional Buddhist ethical code, thereby establishing a morally pure monastic community better able to serve the interests of the Japanese state. This movement would include both Tendai and Shingon and therefore supercede them both to become the most effective form of Buddhism in the country. By examining the Chinese precedents behind Eisai's work, Welter has clarified some of the preoccupations of Chinese Zen during the Song as well as the Buddhist culture of Kamakura Japan.

Stephen Heine's essay on Dōgen's (1200–1253) abbreviated record (*Goroku*) also illuminates aspects of Chinese Buddhism by shining the light on developments in Japan. Dōgen and Eisai had much in common, of course. Dōgen initially trained at Eisai's monastery in Kyoto, Kennin-ji, before setting off to southern China where he consciously followed in the footsteps of his forebearer. Dōgen found the master he was seeking in the Chinese Caodong (Jp. Sōtō) Master Rujing. After four years of study in China, Dōgen returned to Japan to establish what would through time become the dominant school of Japanese Zen. Heine's essay provides a detailed analysis of Dōgen's abbreviated record through a close comparison with his earlier extensive record (*Kōroku*), the latter being the topic of his essay in *The Zen Canon*.

In the present essay, Heine relates that ten years after Dōgen's death, one of his disciples returned to China with a copy of his extensive record. The extensive record was presented to Wuwai Yiyuan, who had studied with Dōgen under Rujing and gone on to inherit their master's temple. Yiyuan edited the ten-volume original down to a single volume and this abbreviated version was then presented to another two masters from the Linji (Jp. Rinzai) tradition. All three Chinese masters wrote postscripts to the text, effectively authorizing its content legitimating its author. In many ways, what was retained by Yiyuan and what was discarded tells us as much about the concerns of Song Zen as it does about the preoccupations of Dōgen himself.

According to Heine and Ishii Shūdō, a comparison of the extensive and abbreviated records reveals that Yiyuan selected those passages of Dōgen's writings that were most in accord with the style of Buddhism taught by their master Rujing and their eminent ancestor Hongzhi. The abbreviated record portrays Dōgen as a preceptor of monastic rituals and transmitter of the Caodong lineage, emphasizing his continuity with Chinese masters. Dōgen's famously virulent attacks on certain Chinese Zen masters and their syncretic inclinations, characteristic of his later writings, are predictably de-emphasized in the edited version.

The abbreviated record does, of course, reflect many aspects of Dōgen's thought. He *was* concerned with monastic ritual. He *did* advocate the unity of scripture and meditation. But those areas of Dōgen's work which were more innovative and less in-line with Chinese models are noticeably absent. Due to its brevity, the abbreviated record has enjoyed a wider circulation and come to represent the core of Dōgen's

thought. But, as Heine and Japanese scholars have pointed out, there is much more to Dōgen than can be gleaned from his abbreviated record.

For all of Dōgen's philosophical and literary innovations, the monastic institution he established in Japan was solidly based on Chinese models. In this, he was again following the precedent set by Eisai and other Chinese émigré monks who labored to bring Chinese Zen to Japan. Griffith Foulk's study of the use of Rules of Purity (the code of conduct within Buddhist monasteries) in Japanese Zen is the sequel to his essay in *The Zen Canon* on the history of Rules of Purity in the Chinese context. Both pieces build on his earlier work on the Song monastic institution which clearly demonstrated the homogeneous nature of Chinese Buddhism during the Southern Song (1127–1279). But Foulk's essay is more than a review of various versions of monastic rules in Japan; it is also a succinct overview of the history of Japanese Zen from the Kamakura period up until the present day. Beginning with the initial Japanese pioneers we see how each designed and managed their Zen monasteries in accord with Chinese models. This naturally included so-called "syncretic" concessions to the Tendai and Vinaya traditions that were characteristic of Chinese Buddhism during the Song. It was no coincidence, Foulk points out, that early Zen masters in Japan were associated with the promotion of the *Vinaya* and the revival of Hinayāna precepts. Zen and the precepts had always been closely linked.

The use of traditional monastic rules had declined by the late sixteenth century along with the changes that were sweeping through Japanese Buddhism. The institution of the *danka* (parish) system and the hierarchical re-organization of Buddhist temples effectively turned Buddhist monasteries into instruments of the state. According to Foulk, it was during this period that Zen temples began to function more as mortuary temples than as training centers. In such institutions, liturgical manuals came to replace Rules of Purity, which gradually fell out of use. Japanese Zen was re-invigorated in the seventeenth century with the arrival of Ōbaku Zen from China. With its emphasis on communal *zazen* (seated meditation) and precepts, Ōbaku was far more rigorous than anything found in Japan at that time. The new editions of monastic rules that were produced during this period became the standard for Rinzai monasteries and are still in use today. But the coming of Ōbaku Zen and the challenges it presented Tokugawa Zen also created a backlash against the newly imported forms labeled "degenerate" and "syncretic." Through their advocacy of a return to the "pure" Zen of the Kamakura period, reformers were also able to claim that Japan was the sole guardian of "authentic" Zen, the tradition having theoretically died out in China.

Various versions of the Rules of Purity are still upheld today in Japanese temples, providing a rare glimpse into forms that have been in use for nearly a millennium. But such places are uncommon: among the 20,000 Zen temples in Japan today, fewer than seventy training monasteries still adhere to the traditional monastic code.

Of those monasteries, roughly forty train in the Rinzai tradition where many engage in a lengthy curriculum of kōan study, utilizing the large body of literature produced to support and facilitate that work. Victor Hori's essay on Zen kōan-capping phrase books (an abbreviated version of the introductory chapters to his *Zen Sand* [University of Hawai'i Press, 2003]) focuses on one genre within that voluminous literature, but also sets forth new theories regarding the origin and development of the kōan system itself.

Hori begins with a brief history of the development of capping phrases (*jakugo*), a verse presented by a student expressing his understanding of the main case or verse in a kōan text. Fenyang Shanzhao (896–973) was perhaps the earliest figure to systematically append his own verse onto the verses of previous masters but the case-commentary style of presentation is perhaps better known through kōan collections such as the *Blue Cliff Record* (*Biyān lù*) or the *Gateless Barrier* (*Wumen guan*). Although it is not entirely clear how texts like these functioned in Song dynasty China, what is certain is that they took on a life of their own once they were introduced to Japan in the thirteenth century. The density of Chinese literary allusion packed into a few spare lines of poetry lent itself to a Japanese fascination with China's high culture and its penchant for imitation. Hori speculates that originally monks would have been required to compose their own capping phrase for individual cases in order to both confirm their insight and spur them towards a deeper understanding. Over time, notes and handbooks were compiled and edited, creating collections of capping phrases that could be consulted by students until, eventually, it was simply (or not so simply) a matter of selecting the proper phrase from a phrase anthology. The first capping phrase collections date to the late fifteenth century and Hori reviews each in turn up through those compiled as recently as the 1970s.

The final section of this essay sets forth a new theory of the origins of the kōan. Dismissing the legal paradigm and folk-tale models previously set forth by other scholars, Hori asserts that kōans can in fact be traced back to Chinese literary games. To support his conclusion, he offers the following set of characteristics shared by both kōans and the literary game: the use of allusive language; competition between equal partners; improvisation; the use of language to move beyond language; and the ultimate victory of one of the participants. While the practice of linking verses may have been an informal form of amusement among the educated elite in China, it was elevated to the status of ceremony in Japan. The training of Rinzai monks came to revolve around their ability to engage with and respond to these short phrases.

Hori's analysis might initially lead some readers to the conclusion that Japanese Rinzai training is dependent on or equivalent to a mastery of the Chinese classics. In this view, students must not only be able to detect the symbolic and historical allusions in ancient Chinese verse, but must also be polished poets in their own right (or at least skillful selectors of poems). This is not the "direct pointing to the human mind" that Zen authors have so long advocated. While some scholars have suggest-

ed that kōans are little more than metaphysical debates taken out of context, Hori sees the literary context and content as only one side of the matter. In a brief concluding section, he reminds readers that kōan training involves more than decoding allusions and analogies. In his words, “The basic problem of the kōan is to ‘realize’ the kōan not as a third-person description but as a first-person performance of the Fundamental” (p. 206). In other words, the literary background is only a foundation upon which the student is able to attain and then express a direct insight.

Hakuin Ekaku (1685–1768) is largely responsible for the Rinzai kōan curriculum as it is practiced in Japan today. Buddhism in eighteenth-century Japan, under pressure from the newly arrived Ōbaku school, was undergoing a period of reform. The chief architects of those changes were Hakuin and his contemporary Menzan Zuihō (1683–1769). Hakuin’s reforms were carried forward by his disciple, Torei Enji (1721–92). It is one of Torei’s numerous works, a commentary to the *Damo duo luo chan jing*, which occupies Michel Mohr in his essay for this collection. The *Damo* text first appeared in China early in the fifth century but did not garner much attention until the Song dynasty when it was used in a successful attempt to legitimate the Zen lineage that was still undergoing construction. In a move to best their competitors in the Tiantai tradition, Zen Buddhists were at pains to demonstrate an unbroken lineage reaching back to Śākyamuni himself. The *Damo* text, among others, was offered as proof of Zen’s Indian roots, whereas Tiantai masters had long before conceded a “break” in their lineage. That Bodhidharma was the author of this text was a key issue for some Song Zen monks (although this conclusion now seems highly questionable). If this text were the work of the famed transmitter of Zen from India to China, it would carry the ultimate authority. Through a close study of this text, Torei hoped to trace Zen back to its Indian origins. Mohr shows that in so doing, Torei read the text through the lens of Tokugawa Rinzai and, as a result, interpreted passages as addressing “post-awakening practice,” “passing the barriers,” and “kenshō,” all issues pertinent to Japanese Rinzai at the time but anachronistic for fifth-century China.

In addition to drawing the reader’s attention to several other of Torei’s innovations, Mohr reaches the ultimate conclusion that the *Damo* text was used as a means to enhance and reform Japanese Zen through a return to the essentials of Buddhist practice. This is clearly supported by the reforms of the monastic institution outlined by Foulk and Riggs in their essays, but there may be yet another layer to this story. Mohr notes that in the introduction to his commentary Torei reproduces a legend which held that Bodhidharma had been reborn in sixth-century Japan. This legend forms a parallel with that of the founder of the Tiantai school Zhiyi’s reincarnation as Prince Shōtoku, and the two are said to have spent time together after “arriving” in Japan. In both instances the message is the same: the fundamental Buddhist traditions of Japan were introduced directly by their founders. In the case of the Bodhidharma legend, the entire history of Chinese Zen is essentially edited out of



the story. Similarly, Torei's move to reform Japanese Zen through a return to Bodhidharma and the Indian origins of Zen raises the possibility that the Zen school in Japan wanted to distance itself from its Chinese roots. The source of authority, which had previously been Zen masters from the Tang and early Song, appears to have shifted back to India.

Hakuin and Torei's reforms of the Rinzai school paralleled developments in the Sōtō tradition during the same period. Hakuin's contemporary, Menzan Zuihō was largely responsible for reshaping Sōtō Zen into the tradition most people are familiar with today. Menzan is remembered for his pointed critique of contemporary Chinese (Ōbaku) practices and Japanese *kanna* practice (Ch. *huatou*), a distilled form of kōan study. In his essay, David Riggs points out that Menzan's critique was not necessarily directed at the Rinzai school in general (Sōtō also made use of kōans) or Hakuin in particular (the two may not have even known of each other's work), but was rather a general warning against using harsh and crude physical and psychological techniques to force a realization. According to Menzan, the problem with many Zen students was their tendency to seek something outside of themselves rather than stopping the process of making dualistic distinctions. In order to reinvigorate Sōtō Zen during the Tokugawa period, Menzan wrote the *Buddha Samādhi* (*Jijuyū zanmai*) which drew on his substantial research into Dōgen's writings.

Riggs' essay takes up the *Buddha Samādhi* in order to discuss the broader issue of the rise of Dōgen as the central figure in the Sōtō school. Riggs points out that the *Buddha Samādhi* is essentially an extended sermon on the teachings of Dōgen and an attempt to define the uniqueness of Zen as distinct from other Buddhist schools. For Menzan, Zen was not a meditation school per se since all schools of Buddhism engage in meditation. Rather, Zen was a school with a unique understanding of the unity of practice and awakening. Emphasizing one of the central features of Dōgen's thought was part of Menzan's broader program of Sōtō reform through a return to Dōgen's work.

It may surprise readers familiar with modern Sōtō that the centrality of Dōgen is a relatively recent phenomenon. In Riggs' overview of the history of Dōgen's writings, he points out that for centuries after his death, it was simply the possession of one of Dōgen's texts, rather than an understanding of it, that conferred authority within Sōtō circles. In fact, Dōgen's writings were first printed only in the seventeenth century. Although Menzan was not the first to propose that Dōgen's writings should constitute orthodoxy within the Sōtō school, it was through his efforts that those reforms were finally set in motion. The result, according to Riggs, was the establishment of a new tradition which based itself on commentary and scholarship and emphasized original texts rather than ritual and custom.

Like the first essay in this volume on "Guishan's Admonitions," Menzan's work brings us back to the central role of texts within the Zen tradition. The close relationship between Zen and literature, Buddhist and secular, underlies many of the

## BOOK REVIEWS

essays in this collection. In distinct ways, each author opens up the narrow view of Zen to reveal a tradition inextricably linked to the broader Buddhist tradition. In this way, *Zen Classics* goes a long way in revising our understanding of Zen history, literature, and practice.