the basis of the biblical separation of finite and infinite, the other ignores this distinction and bases its economy of meaning on the perception of reality as such'' (257).

Finally, then, there can be no fusion of horizons between the two traditions. Either one becomes translated into the other, as Keenan translates Christianity into Buddhism, or one accepts their ultimate incommensurability, as O'Leary does. ''The event of salvation, historical and fleshly, in which we are caught up, according to the Gospel, cannot be reabsorbed into any general philosophical vision, even that of Buddhism'' (258). That Zen, for example, makes a very similar point does not overcome the difference between two such different ways of understanding the world and living in it.

This summary—much of it appropriating O'Leary own words, which I cannot improve upon—has been able to touch only very briefly on some of the many issues addressed. Despite the reservations expressed above, and the additional reservation that I am not familiar enough with the other literature in this field, *Religious Pluralism and Christian Truth* seems to me an impressive accomplishment. It is too much to expect that all future work in Christian theology and Buddhist-Christian dialogue will take account of what this book does toward keeping the Christian ''good news'' alive. But it should.

TRANSMISSION OF LIGHT: Zen in the Art of Enlightenment by Zen Master Keizan. Translated with an Introduction by Thomas Cleary. San Francisco: North Point Press, 1990. xx + 232 pp.

THE RECORD OF TRANSMITTING THE LIGHT: Zen Master Keizan's Denkōroku. Translated by Francis H. Cook, with forewords by Dr. Azuma Ryushin and Ven. Umeda Shunryu. Los Angeles: Center Publications, 1991. xxiii. + 281 pp.

TAIGEN DAN LEIGHTON
Institute of Buddhist Studies

WE ARE VERY FORTUNATE to have these two translations of this major work of Zen literature. Within the Japanese Sōtō Zen tradition, Keizan's *Denkōroku* is considered second as a text only to Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*, and it serves as a valuable and highly illuminating record of Zen lore and teaching. Sometimes two competent translations of Zen literature are better than one, as com-

parisons can yield nuances of meaning often inexpressible in any one rendering. This complementarity of translations is especially evident in a consideration of these two English renditions of the *Denkōroku*. The Cleary and Cook presentations, and even more so their introductions, contrast strikingly, highlighting key issues in contemporary Zen studies.

Keizan Jōkin (1264–1325) is venerated as the co-founder of the Japanese Sōtō Zen school along with Eihei Dōgen (1200–1253), who brought the Sōtō (Chinese: Ts'ao-tung) lineage back from China to Japan. Keizan founded the Sōjiji monastery, the headquarters temple of the Sōtō sect along with the Eiheiji founded by Dōgen. Keizan is generally credited with greatly popularizing the Sōtō school. He was ordained by Dōgen's successor Kōun Ejō (1198–1280), and eventually became the Dharma successor of Ejō's successor Tettsu Gikai (1219–1309), who also had studied with Dōgen. Keizan studied with a number of other teachers as well, and was strongly influenced by Shingon Vajrayana teachings and by the Japanese native mountain asceticism of Shugendō. Although these influences were definitely part of the Japanese Buddhist sensibility shared by Dōgen, Keizan and his successors incorporated them into Sōtō ceremonial forms and used this syncretic blend to spread Sōtō teaching widely among the peasant laity in the Japanese countryside.

The *Transmission of Light* traces the Dharma transmission of the Sōtō lineage generation to generation from Shakyamuni, through Bodhidharma and the Ts'ao-tung founder Tung-shan in China, to Dōgen and Kōun Ejō in Japan. Separate chapters are given for the Ancestor in each generation, highlighting their awakening experience and transmission from their Dharma teacher, the previous Ancestor. Each chapter reads and functions as a powerful kōan unlocking key aspects of Zen teaching. Each begins with the case, which briefly narrates the dialogues or interactions between student and previous master that occasioned transmission or awakening. This is followed by background information on the Ancestor and their story, and then Keizan's prose commentary. Keizan closes each chapter with a short "capping verse," expressing poetically the core teaching of the original case.

As an example, the seventeenth Indian Ancestor Sanghanandi was awakened hearing a verse by his teacher Rahulata. The Cleary version is: "Because I no longer have self,/ You should see my self;/ Since you take me as your teacher,/ Know that I am not my self." Keizan's final capping phrase is, "Mental workings turn freely in accord with mental characteristics;/ How many times has the self of selves changed faces now?" Cook's versions of the same verses are: "Since I am without a self,/ You should see the Self./ Because if you make me your master,/ You will understand that the self is not the Self." For Keizan's capping phrase Cook has, "Mind's activity smoothly rolling on is the form the mind takes;/ How many times has the Self appeared

with a different face!" Despite the variety of English pronouns (understood and unstated in Keizan's original), we can see how both versions express and amplify the original teaching.

The presentations of Cleary and Cook, as clarified in their introductions, intentionally highlight different aspects of Keizan's material. Cleary concentrates his presentation on the *Denkōroku* as "the most thorough guide to satori in the entire Japanese Zen canon." He describes its "extremely penetrating analysis of the process of satori," as "the classic statement of satori practice." Countering the stereotyped misconception that satori exists only in the Rinzai tradition, Cleary discusses in detail the central importance of satori in the Sōtō tradition as the "true beginning" rather than the end of Zen. The Sōtō style, however, has been to cloak the role of satori teaching with appropriate warnings against its numerous traditional misuses and against other degenerate tendencies in Zen practice.

Cleary elucidates the meaning of transmission as "mutual recognition of awakened minds," expressed in the guideline, "Awaken on your own, then see someone else." During the Tokugawa Period the issue of teaching authorization in a Japan "even more status-conscious than Chinese society," led to a system of authorization which has continued in modern Sōtō with its need to certify temple priests. Cleary claims that, "the *ordinary licensing process* [my italics] known as 'transmission of the teaching' in modern Sōtō Zen sects does not mean the same thing as the transmissions recorded in *Transmission of Light*." Certainly in many cases, at least, the modern Sōtō transmission is a certification of full priesthood, rather than a verification of satori experience. However, I believe that Cleary overstates his point in strongly proclaiming the absence of satori in most of modern Sōtō Zen, as it still lurks even amidst the institutionalism that he decries.

Thomas Cleary has made accessible in generally reliable and evocative English an awesome quantity and quality of major Buddhist works, as well as riches from the *I Ching*, Taoist, and more recently Confucian and Islam traditions. I must personally acknowledge my immeasurable indebtedness to Cleary's work, especially for his monumental translation of the Flower Ornament [Avatamsaka] Sutra; his milestone translations of the major kōan collections *Book of Serenity* [*Shoyoroku* in Japanese], *Blue Cliff Records* [*Hekiganroku*], and *No Barrier* [*Mumonkan*]; as well as his highly reliable translations of Dōgen and many other Zen teachers. So it is with all due respect that I mention shortcomings in Cleary's version of *Denkōroku*.

In pursuing the worthy dictum of relying on the teaching, rather than the person, Cleary at times foregoes mentions of historical or personal context in Keizan's text. He eschews footnotes in this work, and also in some instances does not include the full names of central figures or of places that are given in

the original text. Sometimes he does not include names of mentioned texts, referring to a master having read "Buddhist philosophy" or "a scripture," when the name of a sutra is specified in Keizan's original. These not infrequent omissions may hamper the reader's ability to examine related texts and other traditional examples of the stories given, although they generally do not interfere with the essential teachings at the center of each story. Fortunately, in his works since *Transmission of Light*, Cleary has been more generous in providing helpful ancillary material.

Cleary also sporadically omits phrases from the text, and sometimes omits lengthy sections more focused on historical background than the core teaching featured in the case. For example, in the interesting story of the seventeenth generation in China, when the Ts'ao-tung (Sōtō) transmission was saved from dying out by the intervention of a Lin-chi (Rinzai) master who passed it on to his own student, a lengthy section of Keizan's text dealing with issues of transmission and the stupidity of sectarianism is not translated by Cleary. In the chapter on Dōgen, Cleary's version omits a long story about one of the teachers Dōgen met in China, and also a section on Japanese Buddhism before Dōgen and the importance for Keizan of Dōgen and his teacher Ju-ching in their generations. In the final chapter on Dōgen's successor Kōun Ejō, the Cleary version omits a long section with stories about Ejō's dedication to Dōgen and the monastic standards.

Cook's *Record of Transmitting the Light* fills in the lacunae in Cleary's rendition. Cook provides useful notes with some information on Buddhist and Zen background and related texts, and some historical context, including all personal and place names and text citations given in the original. On the other hand, the Cleary version in turn provides the text for Cook's occasional omissions, for example a notable brief exchange in a Dharma story early in the background section of the chapter on the Chinese Sixth Ancestor, Hui-neng.

Although the translated materials that are included in both versions are generally reliable, Cook occasionally makes mistranslations on key Dharma points. For example, near the end of the chapter on Shakyamuni, Cook reverses the meaning by misreading a quotation from the Chinese master Shih-t'ou's "Song of the Grass Hut." Accurate to Keizan's original, Cleary has, "Ultimately speaking, 'If you want to know the undying person in the hut, how could it be apart from this skin bag?' So you should not understand the beings on earth as distinct from yourself." Cook mistakenly twists the radical Mahayana nondualism of the intended teaching here by saying: "Ultimately, if you wish to know the 'Undying Person in the Hermitage,' is it not something separate from this present skin bag? Thus, do not think of it as the great earth and beings."

Based on these contrary understandings of the Dharma in this instance, the

Cleary and Cook versions of Keizan's capping phrase for the Shakyamuni chapter also diverge in their final meanings. Cleary has, "One branch stands out on the old apricot tree;/ Thorns come forth at the same time." Cook offers a more dualistic reading, "A splendid branch issues from the old plum tree;/ In time, obstructing thorns flourish everywhere."

This may be a matter of personal taste, but for style as well as clarity of meaning, I generally have a slight preference for Cleary's versions of the verses. For example, Keizan's capping verse for the thirty-seventh Ancestor Yun-yen is given by Cleary as: "Without moving, the solitary boat/ sails ahead in the moonlight;/ As you look around, the reeds on the ancient bank/ have never moved." Cook's reading is phrased: "A solitary boat proceeds unaided in the bright moonlight;/ If you turn around and look, the reeds on the ancient shore do not sway."

My point in comparing these translations is not to choose one version over the other. No translation can be exactly the original. We are extremely fortunate to have both the Cleary version of Keizan's *Denkōroku* and that of Cook, who has previously given us very useful translations of some of Dōgen's writings in *How to Raise an Ox* and *Sounds of Valley Streams*. In general, Cook's prose translations are slightly more literal, but occasionally awkward; Cleary's renditions feature somewhat more fluid English, though accurate in meaning. As would be expected of any translations, one or the other version better clarifies the sense of specific passages. The two translations of *Denkōroku* taken together give us much better access to the original of this important, illuminating text than does either one alone.

Turning to the introductions, Cook's focus contrasts sharply with that of Cleary. Cook provides insightful discussion of enlightenment in terms of light itself, and of the critical importance of not clinging to views, but his greatest attention apparently is on issues of historicity that are explicitly secondary for Cleary in his concern for the meaning of awakening. Cook points out that the stories of the Indian masters are full of supernatural and miraculous events, whereas these are fairly rare for the accounts of the Ancestors in China. Cook aptly correlates this with the fact that the historicity of the Indian lineage is weak. Both historical record and authenticity of lineage were of less concern in India, so a mythic line of transmission was patched together later in China from legendary Indian figures. Although there naturally was some (presently unverifiable) interaction between teachers and students in each generation in India, these adepts may not have valued ideals of mind-to-mind transmission or teaching lineage, and the stories recorded later are at the very least partly concocted.

However, Cook questions the historicity of the whole lineage and transmission record through China as well, while still acknowledging its value as

metaphorical truth. This metaphorical truth is the reality of Dharma that is the point of Zen teaching stories. But although we cannot confirm the historicity of interactions and dialogues from T'ang or even Sung China, does it really make sense to deny categorically any possibility of historical factuality to all of oral tradition? The absence of confirmation by official records appropriately leaves us in a state of historical unknowing. In a few cases, for example with the Sixth Ancestor, we have evidence of inconsistencies from contemporary accounts that contradict the handed down stories. But without clear-cut information in contradiction to traditional anecdotes, blanket denial of all orally transmitted lore is a questionable historical methodology.

In the main point in his introduction, Cook seems to be paying obeisance to the contemporary academic orientation of deconstructing Zen history, sometimes with unsubstantiatable imputations of self-serving motivation. Cook avers that a main purpose of Keizan's *Denkōroku* is to legitimize his own lineage. Cook reads into all references to "transmission, succession, and inheritance," a "sectarian" need to demonstrate legitimacy. Cleary, on the other hand, states that the *Denkōroku*, "makes no reference to the lineage of masters in its story line as a symbol or proof of authority. Never does it use the idea of connection to the ancients for the purpose of enhancing the prestige of the author's school; rather, it uses the prestige of the ancients to evoke a sense of shame—one of the most powerful tools of Japanese psychology— in the followers of the school." Thus Cleary offers a lucid view, highly disparate from Cook's, of the purpose of Keizan's presentation of the traditional material as based on its function in practice.

Cook's main argument stems from the fact that Keizan features only one Ancestor in each generation, unlike the important earlier Chinese spiritual genealogy the *Ching-te Chuan teng lu* (in Japanese *Keitoku Dentōroku*), which was a primary source for Keizan's anecdotes and which gives biographies for many figures in each generation, with numbers of students for each teacher. Therefore, Cook claims, "The model for Keizan's record is that of patrilineal descent, in which the family inheritance is passed on from father to eldest son in each generation. It is still a genealogy, but one which ignores all members of the family except the chosen son." I find Cook's logic curious. The fact that only one Ancestor in each generation is featured certainly need not imply that Keizan discredits other figures in collateral lineages.

To assume that veneration of one's own teaching lineage necessarily implies disrespect for all other spiritual lineages is to equate all faith, and any upholding of particular spiritual traditions, with religious bigotry. On the contrary, in the commentaries in the *Denkōroku* Keizan respectfully cites many other important figures in related lineages. He also explicitly attacks sectarianism, for example: "Lin-chi followers are excellent and our own followers are excel-

lent. . . . O monks, do not quarrel about the five houses and seven traditions, just clarify Mind. This is the true Dharma of all the Buddhas. . . . You must not discriminate superior and inferior.'' (Cook translation) In other works, Keizan highly praises figures from other lineages. For example, in his Esoteric *Shōbōgenzō* Keizan gives ten kōans with commentary. (See the translation in Cleary's *Timeless Spring*.) The first five kōans are of personages from Shakyamuni to Tung-shan, founder of Keizan's Ts'ao-tung (Sōtō) lineage. But the second five all feature persons outside the Ts'ao-tung lineage.

The contrasting approaches of Cook and Cleary highlight key issues in contemporary Zen studies that appropriately arise in a quasi-historical work like Keizan's *Transmission of Light*. I acknowledge that I sympathize with Cleary's priority of attention to the fundamental spiritual meaning of Dharma and awakening, and its functioning in the text. But in this work Cleary takes this so far as to omit historical information in the text itself. Cook, on the other hand, while respecting the spiritual content, pursues the conventional approach of contemporary Zen academic historians. We have much to learn from historical scholarship about the dynamics of teaching and awakening and their relationship to societal history. The prevailing social realities and institutional dynamics are certainly factors in the doings of Dharma teachers, who, after all, are also human beings. However, the a priori *assumption* that these teachers' motivations are always primarily determined by power-seeking and aspirations for empire-building, as if they were competing warlords, is not ''objective'' scholarship. I sincerely hope that Zen scholarship will develop such that we can learn from whatever historical data may be gleaned, and imagine the social pressures that have impinged on these spiritual movements, while also giving regard and respect for the spiritual teachings that may still be of benefit in our own world.