

REVIEW ARTICLES

— Heinrich Dumoulin's *Zen Buddhism: A History* —

John JORGENSEN

Heinrich DUMOULIN, *Zen Buddhism: A History*, 2 vols. Translated by James W. Heisig and Paul Knitter. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company. Volume 1: India and China, 1988. xxvi+349 pp. Volume 2: Japan, 1990. x+509 pp. Tables, indexes, bibliography, Chinese characters. Hardcover \$35.00; ISBN 0-02-908220-X (set). Paper \$14.95; ISBN 0-02-908220-7(set).

Heinrich Dumoulin, the foremost exponent of the history of Zen Buddhism to the West, wrote his first history of Zen in German in 1959. This was published in English as *A History of Zen Buddhism* in 1963. Comparing that work with his latest two-volume *Zen Buddhism: A History* reveals how much new scholarship on Zen history has occurred in the last two decades and how little has changed in the approaches to Zen history.

Despite the flood of research on Zen Buddhism, it is clear that only the barest outlines have been revealed. YANAGIDA Seizan, a specialist on early Zen history and one of Dumoulin's most frequently cited advisers, wrote in December 1989 that "the Zen literature of Tun-huang has been known now for ninety years. It would appear that research has exhausted [the materials], but in fact still nothing has been resolved. . . . The greater half of the material has not been read as a whole. . . . Existing theories will need to be revised time and again" (1989, p. 247). If that is so for some of the most intensively studied materials from a short span of Zen history, it is evident that the task of writing a comprehensive history of Zen through the ages is herculean.

The field of Zen Buddhist studies has in the past two or three decades gained such momentum that now any work intended to cover the entire history of Zen is virtually outdated by the time it is published. A survey of all the research on Zen history requires the talent of a great linguist and more than a single lifetime. Firstly, competence in Chinese and Jap-

anese is essential to read the voluminous Zen literature. Yanagida Seizan has estimated that Zen *goroku* 語錄, or “conversations of the masters,” occupy one third of the 150-volume *Zoku-zōkyō* 續藏經 [Continued Tripiṭaka]. Yet this is only a portion of the Chinese materials alone (YANAGIDA 1985-86, pp. 220–21) and does not include works in Japanese or the many works in Chinese that had to be excluded by the compilers or were not known to them, works such as those discovered at Tunhuang. Moreover, in premodern times Zen spread from China not only to Japan, but also to Korea, Vietnam, Tibet, Nan-chao (modern Yunnan Province), and even Central Asia, where Zen-related texts have been discovered in Turkish and Tangut, the significance of which is still obscure. Modern studies of Zen have appeared in languages the majority of researchers into Zen do not know. For example, translations of the *Platform Sūtra of the Sixth Patriarch* have appeared in Czech by Oldrich Kral and in Russian by N. V. Abaev.¹

Dumoulin therefore has restricted his history of Zen to that of Japan and pre-Yuan dynasty China, plus some Indian background. He has used primary sources in Classical Chinese and modern studies in Japanese, as well as selected studies in English, German, and French. Some useful works in modern Chinese like those by Hu Shih, Yin-shun, Lu Ch'eng, and T'ang Yung-t'ung, or in Korean by scholars such as Han Ki-du, Yi Chong-ik, Min Young-gyu, and Kim Chi-gyōn, have not been consulted. Studies in Russian by N. V. Abaev, G. C. Pomerantz, A. M. Kabanov, and G. B. Dagdanov, which tend to emphasize psychological and political aspects, may not have been available. Restrictions due to language, availability, or time have doubtlessly meant such studies have been overlooked or excluded.

Indeed, in 1986 Dumoulin admitted that his work is “rooted . . . in a Japanese milieu and composed from a Japanese point of view” (1, p. ix), and he is conscious of “the increasing advances being made in the study of Zen Buddhism, especially in the last two decades, and the nearly un-surveyable spectrum of related literary scholarship . . .” (1, p. ix). By the time the second volume was finished, Dumoulin had to declare the 1983 volume on China already outdated, for “a series of important new disclosures regarding the early history of Zen Buddhism in China emerged one after the other in rapid succession.” He had also become aware that “valuable contributions to the history of Zen in Korea and Tibet have appeared,” but space precluded mention of them (2, p. ix).

In spite of these limitations, these two volumes are useful for specialists and general readers. Specialists, faced with a torrent of new studies,

¹ Oldrich Kral, *Chuej-neng, Tribunova sutra sesteho patriarchy*. Praha, 1988. See notice 503 in *Revue Bibliographique de Sinologie* 1989/VII. N. V. Abaev, *Chan-Buddhizm: kulturno-psikhologicheskie traditcii v srednevekovom Kitae*. Novosibirsk, 1989, pp. 175–227.

need survey histories to maintain an overview of developments in areas beyond their immediate area of expertise. As far as I know, there is as yet no comparable work in a European language supported by such a depth of research, and for that reason alone Dumoulin's history is invaluable. A survey history is also helpful for general readers as it provides an insight into Zen and a context for the many translations and popularizing homilies and apologetics that have flooded the spiritual market.

Dumoulin's history is an excellent summation, the outcome of a lifetime of studying Zen, yet it belongs to the "church history" or "sect history" genre that is influenced by the normative values of establishment Zen, in which the roles of eminent individuals in the tradition dominate through an ineluctable emphasis on their hagiographies, lineages, and teachings (cf. 1, p. xviii). This makes the history episodic and rather traditional, conditioned as it is by the Japanese scholarship that concentrates on bibliographical, Buddhological, and lineage concerns.

Japanese Zen scholarship is very productive, and within its teleological concerns to explain its own origins, can yet be questioning and critical. This scholarship may be accused of serving "sectarian history" and of lacking an adequate modern hermeneutic, yet it has successfully pioneered a new field of research and obtained fresh results. However, it has yet to adequately study many questions and themes (particularly so with China) such as the role of patrons, the sociology of sainthood, the topoi of hagiography, or the place of popular beliefs and miracles in Zen, in anything like the detail that has been done for medieval European Christianity or Southeast Asian Buddhism.²

However, for new or radical paths such as social or psychological history, or structural criticism in literary history, successfully to develop, a basis such as a summation of traditional scholarship akin to that ably presented by Dumoulin is a necessary first step. Some of the criticisms of the scholarship that Dumoulin represents, as being partly "empirical historiography" and of following Japanese Zen's self-understanding and teleology (MARALDO 1985, pp. 146–47, 152), a form of historiographical reductionism or "substantialism" (FAURE 1986a, pp. 188–90), may be justified, but the alternate methodologies have only begun to be applied and are still considered to be on probation by many historians.

There is an assumption underlying Dumoulin's work that there is an "authentic Zen" that is best displayed in a few notable figures like Rinzai,

² See for example, Michael Goodrich, *Vita Perfecta: The Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century*, Stuttgart, 1982; Donald Weinstein and Rudolph M. Bell, *Saints and Society: The Two Worlds of Western Christendom 1000-1700*, University of Chicago Press, 1982; Stanley Jeyaraja Tambiah, *The Buddhist Saints of the Forest and the Cult of Amulets*, Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Dōgen, or Hakuin. The gaps between such giants are filled by the biographies of lesser lights in the lineages and by discussions on cultural or institutional dimensions, especially in the volume on Japan. The lineage-based approach has been criticised not merely for its teleological presuppositions, but also because individuals cannot always be properly accredited with specific teachings (MCRAE 1986, pp. 7–8). Moreover, such “great men” need to be seen in their historical and social contexts, something usually ignored with respect to the saint’s teaching.

The question of what is “authentic” Zen and what is to be the subject of a history of Zen is even more problematic. Dumoulin declares his topic to be “the Zen school of Mahāyāna Buddhism” (1, p. xix), restricting that mainly to matters of religious development rather than institutional history (2, p. 47, note 105). He rejects the designation “sect” and rightly declares that “a generational line of succession is central to Zen Buddhism” (2, p. 69), but this applied only to the elite monks, for many of the lay followers and patrons were largely oblivious to such concerns, as were some monks. What constitutes the “school” is never defined, except perhaps indirectly as the totality of members of a believed lineage, historical or pseudohistorical (cf. 1, p. 8). Even the term “school” has been questioned (BUSWELL 1989, p. 6 note 6, p. 9 and note 11), and sociologically the subject of this designation changes from an ill-defined movement to an order, and in Japan, something occasionally akin to a denomination. To reject some of the terms derived from a Christian context, including ideas such as orthodoxy and heterodoxy, may be wise (cf. 2, p. 69), but the alternatives are not much more helpful.

Moreover, Zen hagiographers frequently adopted independent individuals, such as Han-shan or Pao-chih, who had no demonstrable or even plausible connections with any Zen lineage, into collections such as the *Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu* 景德傳燈錄. What, then, is “authentic Zen”? Are lineages all that important? The modifiers “authentic” or “pure” exclude or downgrade those accused of “syncretism,” those who did not teach “unadulterated Zen,” and monks like Tsung-mi, who Dumoulin declares “cannot be considered a Zen master” (1, p. 285; cf. p. 159). This opinion was largely dictated by Japanese teleology and is a view not shared by most Korean Zen Buddhists, who deeply respect Tsung-mi and the syncretic, or rather harmonized, approaches he and others took (cf. BUSWELL 1983, p. 92 note 201; KEEL 1984, p. 61). In fact, it gravely undervalues Tsung-mi’s contributions to the scholastic aspect of Zen and other “schools” (cf. BUSWELL 1983, p. 47 and YOSHIZU 1985, pp. 337–58). Moreover, Chinul (1158–1210), the “restorer” of Korean Zen, “never received transmission from a recognized teacher in the tradition” (BUSWELL 1983, p. 39; KEEL 1984, p. 26). Although this occasioned some questioning, Chinul is widely accepted as a Zen master. Even Musō Kokushi (1275–1351) is considered to have achieved enlightenment

“without a master” (2, p. 156), all of which prompts the conclusion that lineage was not the sole determinant of Zen membership.

In these respects the Japanese orientation of the majority of studies of Zen has blinkered researchers to many of the specifically Chinese cultural contexts of Zen, especially the Confucian contexts. Taoism is frequently appealed to, not always correctly, and almost always vaguely. Moreover, there was a broader context that was “East Asian” and not a conglomerate of “separate national traditions” (BUSWELL 1989, p. xiv). In fact, Silla Koreans played a significant role in the formation of T’ang-dynasty Zen and in the revival of the scholastic underpinnings for Sung-dynasty Zen, which is rarely acknowledged. In future, the history of Zen will have to be written in this broader context.

As a consequence of the Japan-centered approach, Dumoulin glosses over post-Sung Zen in China, not just because it became more syncretic, diffuse, and popularistic, but also because Chinese contributions to Japanese Zen, with the exception of the Ōbaku lineage, declined markedly after this period, along with Japanese respect for Chinese civilization in some circles. Space limitations may have dictated this cutoff, but even the Sung is given rather cursory treatment, despite its having been the immediate source of most Japanese and much Korean Zen. It was during the Sung that most of the features of modern Zen were formed (BUSWELL 1987, p. 327). Thus, since the publication of Dumoulin’s first volume in German in 1983, Japanese scholars have increasingly returned to this period as an object of study. For example, ISHII Shūdō has tried to answer the question of why Japan had to assimilate Sung-dynasty and not T’ang-dynasty Zen by comparing them, and then comparing Sung Zen with that of Dōgen (1987, preface v–viii). As his subtitle, *Chūgoku Sōtōshū to Dōgen Zen* [Chinese Ts’ao-tung School and Dōgen Zen] likewise indicates, this research has been partly motivated by “sectarian” teleological concerns.

The impact on Tokugawa Japan of Ming-dynasty Zen and lay scholarship brought by Ōbaku Zen monks is underestimated (2, pp. 305, 308). Although the Zen establishment in Japan rejected much of Ōbaku Zen, its indirect influence on Japanese Zen and other scholarship was considerable. For example, Tominaga Nakamoto (1715–1746), who studied Buddhism while helping proofread the newly compiled Ōbaku Tripiṭaka, founded critical Buddhist scholarship; the Myōshin-ji monk Mujaku Dōchū (1653–1745) used the Chinese philological methodology introduced by Ōbaku to establish the Zen scholarship on which many of the modern critical editions of Zen classics, such as the *Lin-chi lu* 臨濟錄 (J. *Rinzai roku*), is based; and the Shingon-lineage monk Ji’un Sonja (1718–1804) wrote detailed commentaries on the *Mumonkan* 無門關 and Bodhidharma’s legendary refutation of six errant teachers in the *Keitoku dentō roku* (Ch. *Ching-te ch’uan-teng lu*), lectured on the *Rinzai roku*, eval-

uated the authenticity of the *Platform Sūtra*, as well as made the first thorough study of Sanskrit in Japanese history. As some items have to be omitted from summary histories, Dumoulin's emphasis on the "mind transmission" from master to disciple has tended to deny scholastic achievements the accolade of "authentic" Zen and post-Sung Chinese Zen its proper place.

Even geographic boundaries are blurred. For example, the Zen of the Ryūkyū islands, which dates from the mid-fifteenth century and is a blend of Japanese and Chinese Zen that came under the strong influence of Nanzen-ji, is not mentioned. The periphery of Japan is sacrificed to the center. Likewise, China is ill-defined, for it is stated to have formerly included Vietnam (1, p. xviii). China only ever "controlled" the northern third of modern Vietnam until the tenth century; the remainder was part of Champa or Cambodian territory. Thereafter, Vietnam was no longer part of Chinese territory, although it was a tributary much of the time.

Fuzzy definition reappears in the introduction in the guise of "Asian spirituality" and the "stark otherness of Asia" (1, p. xxii), a myth Dumoulin himself dispels later (1, p. 4). However, this is symptomatic of an essentialist approach that describes Zen as "one of the purest manifestations of the religious essence of Buddhism" (1, p. xvii)—something not assented to by a few commentators who have concluded that "Chinese Zen is not Buddhism" (see for example ISHII 1987, ix)—yet would make it an "other." "Others" tend to be conflated and essentialized, and have to be interpreted, but interpretation or translation is always problematic (1, p. xxii). Moreover, because most of the Zen texts were written in a medieval Chinese colloquial or vulgate, Japanese, Koreans, and Vietnamese needed translations, commentaries, and other aids to understand the texts. Thus Zen remained an "other" for many Asians also.

Even Japanese Zen monks and modern specialists frequently misunderstood the Chinese Zen texts, reading colloquial Chinese in a Classical Chinese manner, with the aid of *kaeriten* and *okurigana*. Ordinary colloquial Chinese words that appeared frequently in *goroku* (even those by Japanese), such as *shen-mo* 甚摩 (what) or *tsuo-mo-sheng* 作摩生 (why, how), were translated as *nanzo* or transliterated into meaningless syllables like *somosan*. These sources of confusion made Zen texts written in Chinese even more difficult for a modern Japanese readership, which is increasingly less versed in *kanbun* or Classical Chinese (YANAGIDA 1974, pp. 20–21 and 1971a, p. 199)—especially when some of the words could not be found in even the best Sino-Japanese dictionaries, or the "translations" into modern Japanese retain the original Chinese characters, sometimes without a gloss (see 1, note 34 on pp. 205–206, and p. 252). The problem then of interpretation remains almost as great for many East Asians as for foreigners, and accounts for the many Buddhist translation projects

in Japan and Korea. Thus, although the context of Zen should be better understood by Japanese and Chinese, for example, modernization and the move into a “religionless” age has eroded even this contextual understanding.

Indeed, the problem of language has been present from the very beginning of the introduction of Zen into Japan. Dialogues between Chinese and Japanese have been recorded in Classical Chinese or colloquial Chinese, in Japanese, and even in odd mixtures of all of these. For example, Dōgen, who first wrote his *Shōbōgenzō* in Classical Chinese, later rewrote most of his own comments, though not citations of texts, in Japanese (2, p. 73). In a record of a conversation with a Chinese monk, Dōgen reports his own speech in Japanese: *ima* (or *nyokon*) *tarehito ka kore o taiji seru* 如今タレ人カコレヲ帶持セル (Now who has it?); and he reports the reply of the monk in colloquial Chinese (here indicated in Chinese transliteration), followed by Japanese: *t'ang-t'ou lao-han, na-li yu hsiang-ssu. Nochi ni shinshutsu nengoro niseba, sadamete mi-suru koto aran* [Paraphrase: The old abbot seems to have it. Later if you kindly request its divulgence, you will probably get to see it] 堂頭老漢、那裏有相似ノチニ請出ネンコロニセハ、サタメテミスルコトアラン (TAISHŌ SHINSHŪ DAIZŌKYŌ, hereafter T, vol. 82, 70b27-c1). Later he quotes a Chinese master saying to him in a hodgepodge of Chinese and Japanese: *wu na-li* (J. *go nari*) *ni ichi-juku no koseki ari, jen-mo tz'u-ti nari, yü lao-hsiung k'an* 吾那裏ニ一軸ノ古蹟あり 恁摩次第ナリ 與老兄看 [I there have a scroll of old writings, and when there is such an occasion, I will show it to you] (T 82.69a10–11). This precedes a quote in pure Classical Chinese (T 82.70b12ff.). How Japanese readers coped with this requires investigation, and it may account for the Japanese Zen masters' advice to ignore texts and “just sit!” (YANAGIDA 1971a, p. 199 and 1974, p. 21).

India and China

Dumoulin begins his history with the Indian background, especially on yogic elements, the Buddha, and the Mahāyāna sūtras, plus the Sung-dynasty formulations of the “lamp transmission.” While one may concede that “Yoga and Taoism converge in Zen Buddhism” or have an “eventual marriage in Mahāyāna Zen” (p. xviii), such sweeping statements require concrete examples as proof and are dependent on definitions.

Yoga, for example, seems to be equated with meditation technique, so that there is even a “Christian Yoga” (p. 13). D. T. Suzuki correctly stated that Zen must be sharply distinguished from Yoga (p. 21), no matter how loosely defined. Meditation is a widespread phenomenon, and, although there are variations in practical techniques, it is the informing dogma that determines meditation's ends and interpretation (GIMELLO 1983, p.

63). From the very inception, Zen texts denied Zen is the four dhyānas, a sitting method, or any control or fixing of the mind (HU 1968, pp. 236, 239), although the latter is permitted in the *Vimālakīrti-nirdeśa sūtra* and by the fourth patriarch of Zen, Tao-hsin (YANAGIDA 1971b, p. 241). Zen, like Buddhism, is not a “yoking” (yoga) with any Ātman or Īśvara for it completely denies the self, and so contradicts the essential Indian theme of union with a higher self. It certainly is not “the rooting of the self in the realm of the absolute” (2, p. ix).

Thus Zen denies the means and the ends of Yoga, both the system and the general Indian notions of spiritual praxis (yoga). Indeed, the history of Buddhism, including Zen, was in its early stages a constant battle against Sāṅkhya, the philosophical support for the system of Yoga (here capitalized to distinguish it from the vague term “yoga” used for various practices; Dumoulin or the translators fail to differentiate them), and allied ideas. This was particularly crucial for Yogācāra Buddhists, especially in respect of the *Laṅkāvatāra sūtra*, a text on the periphery of the Yogācāra school that introduced the *tathāgatagarbha* (J. *nyōraizō*) into the *ālayavijñāna* (TAKASAKI 1982, p. 565), which exposed it to charges of preaching the existence of an eternal essence or self. Zen, which early in its history was closely associated with this sūtra, had to defend itself against allegations of the Sāṅkhya heresy, something even alleged against the *Platform Sūtra*,³ as the self-nature (*tzu-hsing* 自性) that Zen practitioners tried to see in meditation could be confused with the Sāṅkhyan *prakṛti*, which was rendered in some translations of the *Laṅkāvatāra* as *tzu-hsing*. Even in India (?), treatises such as the *Leng-ch'ieh ching chung wai-tao hsiao-sheng nieh-p'an lun* 楞迦經中外道小乘涅槃論 [Treatise on the nirvāṇa of the non-Buddhists and Hīnayāna in the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*] had to be written as a defence. Therefore the “object” of meditation in Zen had to be clearly distinguished from the delusions of Sāṅkhya, a theme repeatedly stressed by such Zen leaders as Nan-yang Hui-chung, Shen-hui (HU 1968, p. 231), perhaps Ma-tsu Tao-i (IRIYA 1984, p. 24), and Dōgen, who also attacked comparisons of Buddhism with the Taoism of the *Chuang-tzu* and the *Lao-tzu* (T 82,298b–299b). As the original chaos (混沌 *hun-tun*) or One of Taoist theory was akin to Sāṅkhyan *prakṛti*, Taoism was similarly rejected.

Therefore, the allegations of yogic or Taoist influence on Zen must be treated with extreme caution and only be made with references to specific persons and doctrines. Tao-hsin, for example, tried to avert criticism of Taoist influence on Zen over its alleged hypostasization of the One,⁴ a criticism made by the Ch'ung-hsüan Taoist school. In fact, Fa-

³ For other allegations against this sūtra, see volume 1, p. 145.

⁴ YANAGIDA 1971b, p. 264. This is a complex topic. See FAURE 1986b, pp. 112–14, and BUSWELL 1989, pp. 138–39.

ch'ung (587–665?), an early Zen master of the so-called Laṅkāvatāra school, engaged Ts'ai Tzu-huang, a leader of the Buddhist-influenced Ch'ung-hsüan school, in debate.⁵ Later, in Szechwan, the Zen master Wu-chu (714–774) also confronted Taoist leaders (YANAGIDA 1976, pp. 276–78). However, Shen-hui agreed with the Taoists on spontaneity (1, p. 148). Hence each assertion of influences on Zen needs to be more specific and placed in proper context.

Loose generalizations and characterizations such as “pessimistic naturalism” (1, p. 49) or “negative theology” (1, p. 44) need qualification or explanation. Many statements also follow Zen “mythology” and require greater scepticism. For example, “Thus are all Zen masters reluctant to express enlightenment . . . in words and signs” (1, p. 51) is contradicted by the numerous enlightenment gathas or verses and collections of enlightenment incidents and dialogues in the “lamp histories,” which rather suggests an eagerness, or at least a compulsion, to express enlightenment, not a reluctance.

The emphasis on the influence of the sūtras and the imitation of Buddha in this first section is commendable, for it provides a counter to those who would create a Christian Zen, for example, and to those who would extract Zen from its context and make it another reified mysticism of the universal or perennial philosophy type. Necessarily brief and superficial, covering only a few sūtras, this section does have minor errors. For example, I know of no scholar now who would claim that the “Avatamsaka sūtras presuppose the work” of Mādhyamika and Yogācāra (1, p. 46); rather, the reverse (TAKASAKI 1983, p. 14).

Part two of volume 1 commences with a discussion of the Chinese background, including some pertinent remarks on Seng-chao (384–414) and Tao-sheng (ca. 360–434), who many scholars think paved the way for Zen. Although it is correct that modern scholarship has not established a direct line between Tao-sheng and early Zen, traditional Japanese (or Chinese?) scholarship did so in a genealogical table, the *Sanron genryū keifu* 三論源流系譜 (HSÜ TSANG CHING vol. 73, p. 347), which traced a lineage from Tao-sheng to Fa-ch'ung, the Laṅkāvatāra school master.

The account then shifts to the obscure beginnings of Zen, or at least to the figures tradition asserts were the pioneers: Bodhidharma and his heirs. Much of the legend of Bodhidharma (1, pp. 86, 91) has its origin in attacks by Shen-hui (684–758) on materialistic Buddhism, something not mentioned until later (1, p. 112).

From here on throughout the history, excerpts of some of the texts used in evidence are provided in translation, although there are occa-

⁵ *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* T 50, 666a25. Cf. ROBINET 1977, pp. 104–105.

sional inaccuracies. For example, in a text attributed to Bodhidharma a paragraph is missing, distorting the sense. "These four works" (1, p. 89) refers to four practices mentioned in the deleted paragraph and not to any implied writings.

It is here in chapter 6, where the first skeleton biographies appear, that there should have been some treatment of the nature of the hagiographical evidence and the methodological difficulties of using this material. The nature of these "Zen chronicles" is only hinted at (1, pp. 7–9), and they are "historically unreliable" (p. 98 and note 59), so they do not have to be relied on for the history of Zen to the extent Dumoulin implies (p. 98). The "chronicles" provide one sort of evidence, especially of changes in rhetoric, pedagogy, and mythopoeia. A slightly different form of evidence can be found in the funerary inscriptions and encomia written for Zen monks by laymen and clerics of other orders. While these too belong to a similar stream of hagiography, they frequently provided the basis for non-Zen "chronicles" or hagiographical collections such as the *Sung Kao-seng chuan* 宋高僧伝 .

Thus, the *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, like the earlier *Hsü Kao-seng chuan*, but unlike the Zen "chronicles," uses hagiographical techniques derived from secular history such as "praise and blame," which may partly explain why Shen-hsiu of "Northern" Zen appears to have been given three biographies in it (cf. MCRAE 1986, p. 46). Not having been edited or homogenized by Sung-dynasty "editors" as nearly all Zen texts from the ninth century on had been (YANAGIDA 1985–86, pp. 216, 583, 588), these encomia by laymen, especially those of the T'ang dynasty, often provide insights into arenas of Zen history that are usually ignored (YANAGIDA 1985–86, pp. 449–50), in particular the role of lay patrons.

Yet soon after stating that we must rely on these "historically unreliable chronicles" for the 320 years between the *Hsü Kao-seng chuan* and *Sung Kao-seng chuan*, Dumoulin uses a funerary inscription by the eminent official Ch'ang Yüeh (*sic*, for Chang Yüeh 張說; 1, p. 108), which begs the question, What role did such politically powerful individuals play and how did social changes affect the development of Zen, and did their writings affect the writing of the "chronicles"? Some such matters are given but the most cursory attention (for example, pp. 117, 155, 179, 186), and yet were of great significance for the survival of Zen, the creation of genealogies, and, in Sung times, even the compilation or editing of Zen texts and chronicles.

The next section of the history (pp. 107–58) deals with the issues created by Shen-hui and with the origins of the *Platform Sūtra*, and is a competent and useful summary of earlier research, especially that of Yanagida Seizan. As it is a topic and period of great complexity and much controversy, the subtleties of the issues involved are more than a short section can cope with. Recent studies, such as Luis O. GOMEZ's

“Purifying Gold: The Metaphor of Effort and Intuition in Buddhist Thought and Practice” (1987) and John R. McRAE’s “Shen-hui and the Teaching of Sudden Enlightenment in Early Ch’an Buddhism” (1987), demonstrate some of the immense problems in interpreting the issues and trying to make historical sense of the data.

For this period, even the borders between legend, fact, and individuals are indistinct, with the Hsing-t’ao who was supposedly the guardian of Hui-neng’s stupa (p. 131) sharing the same name (one radical differing) with Hui-neng’s father as it appears in another account (KOMAZAWA DAIGAKU ZENSHŪSHI KENKYŪKAI 1978, pp. 103–104). I even have suspicions as to whether Shen-hui or Yin-tsung ever met Hui-neng (pp. 111–12, 129, 134). Such problems of identity and event for readers are not helped by the misprints here, with the Chang Wei of p. 134 meant to be Wang Wei, and the Chang of note 61 on p. 152 probably indicating Wing-tsit Chan. Internal contradictions, such as Ching-chüeh being dated 683–750 on p. 88 but 683–c.760 on p. 109, and his *Leng-ch’ieh shih-tzu chi* dated 713–716 on p. 88 but circa 723 on p. 110, should have been resolved. There are also some half-translations, such as the literal “seventh leaf” (p. 114), which should be fully translated as “seventh generation.”

The following period, the interval between Hui-neng or Shen-hui and Lin-chi (d. 866), is made up of a few fleeting glimpses of very important figures such as Ma-tsu Tao-i and Nan-yang Hui-chung (1, pp. 159–77). Again there are doubtful propositions and an easy acceptance of tradition. I doubt whether Hui-chung was a pupil of Hui-neng (p. 160; cf. YANAGIDA 1989, pp. 248–49). Furthermore, there is no explanation of the gulf in rhetoric, texts, and organization between the period before the first half of the eighth century and the period thereafter (cf. McRAE 1987, p. 229).

This critical period is served only by a mixture of brief biographies, a few characterizations, and/or excerpts from the teachings of the masters. Institutions receive scant attention, and the material used to describe the development of monastic discipline (p. 170) is either legendary or late. Although reasonably accurate in summation, it neglects the fact that that part of Pai-chang’s rule was simply a confirmation of existing customary practices in the Chinese Buddhist establishment that were not sanctioned by the Indian vinaya, while removing Indian practices not suited to Chinese conditions. It was also intended to maintain unity in the Zen order (Tso 1982, pp. 317–36). Moreover, the alleged productivity of Zen monks (p. 211) should be taken with a grain of salt, as part of an ideal or myth created to obvert Confucian social criticism, for the major portion of monastic income was likely derived from donations of land, buildings, and goods.

Early in this transitional period, the political patronage of Zen did not

stop. Contrary to Dumoulin (pp. 155, 212–13, 265), Zen had considerable political connections with the court even after the An Lu-shan rebellion, with monks like Huai-hui (756–816), Ta-i (746–818), and Wei-k'uan (756–817) of the Hung-chou lineage, Fa-ch'in (714/5–793) of Niu-t'ou, Yün-t'an (709–816), Hui-chien (719–792), and Tsung-mi of the Ho-tse lineage, and Pen-ching (667–761) and Nan-yang Hui-chung (c. 676–776), who claimed to be pupils of Hui-neng, all appearing at court. The majority of Zen monks during the T'ang dynasty had high-ranking officials and regional military commanders or warlords as patrons.

When T'ang China began to fragment, leading Zen monks such as Lin-chi, Chao-chou Ts'ung-shen, Fa-yen Wen-i, and T'ien-t'ai Te-shao all had close relationships with the local leaders. Consequently, the coverage of the Five Houses of Zen does not sufficiently recognize the political factors during the Five Dynasties interregnum (907–960), and the statement that the Yun-men and Fa-yen houses had “by the beginning of the Sung period . . . already dissolved” (pp. 213–14) is certainly not correct (cf. p. 233).

The latter part of this volume, like much of the work on post-eighth-century Zen in China and Japan, is constituted of skeleton biographies, short discussions of a few books, notably the *Platform Sūtra* and *Lin-chi lu*, and their themes, and enlightenment incidents. These same incidents are frequently repeated by the many works on Zen in English. That is partly due to the nature of the subject and in accordance with the hagiographical tradition. Occasionally some of the cryptic sayings could be further elucidated by being placed in context (for example, the dialogue between Yang-shan and a monk claiming to understand the *Book of Changes*, which relies on knowledge of the hexagrams),⁶ although such detail is probably best left to translations or studies of Zen teaching.

The section on the Sung dynasty and later conforms to the tendency of Japanese scholars to see the period as one of decline (pp. 244–45, 248, 252) due to systematization, syncretism, the dearth of creative figures, and the introduction of nenbutsu (pp. 284–87), which disguises the positive achievement of the greater penetration of Zen into lay circles. The valuable input of Sung laity, including prominent political and literary figures such as Su Shih, Wang An-shih, and Huang T'ing-chien, is overlooked, as is the political tone of Ta-hui Tsung-kao's Zen (cf. pp. 248–65). Ta-hui's Zen, which attracted many lay people, came to predominate in later China, Korea, and Rinzai circles in Japan, and it certainly did not cause a decline in Zen any more than did the actions

⁶ Vol. 1, p. 218. Quoted from Chang Chung-yuan, *Original Teachings of Ch'an Buddhism*, New York, 1969, the Chinese source should be emended to T vol. 51 (p. 237 note 27). There is an explanation in LU 1961, p. 79. The hexagrams are numbers 34 and 36.

of Shen-hui.⁷ Ta-hui's attack on Hung-chih Cheng-chüeh for "quietism" (pp. 256–57) has an implication of "pacifism," while his own advocacy of "activism" smacks of pandering to patriotism. Ta-hui equated bodhi-mind with loyalty to the state, and he made references in Zen exchanges to recovering the north from the enemy. He was accused of belonging to an antigovernment clique because of his associations with critics of the appeasement or "pacifist" policy of the court and chief ministers (NUKARIYA 1923–25, vol. 2, pp. 367–68).

There is a basic and not very illuminating section on the relation of Zen with Neo-Confucianism. The idea that appears here and elsewhere that Zen has its main force in elitism, which finally succumbed to the vulgar, is typical of the normative "church history" that thinks only of the resistance to the relentless pressures from the vulgar below by the virtuosi above, forgetting the constructive role of popular aspects of religion and the elite encouragement of it in many cases.

Finally, I find the notion that Zen had more impact in Japan than in Korea, for example (p. 287), questionable, and a confirmation of the Japan-centered view and the concomitant need for a definition of Zen, a task not as facily accomplished as some would imagine.

Japan

In contrast to China (vol. 1, pp. 63–301), the entire volume on Japan (2, pp. 5–423) is far more detailed and comprehensive, covering Zen from its introduction up until a few decades ago. It is the better volume for the detail, with more biographical information and occasional psychological insights into individuals like Hakuin and Dōgen (p. 104), or others like Musō Kokushi (p. 153) and Ikkyū (pp. 193–96). It also has more on the social, political, and institutional framework.

Many fascinating personages have had to be passed over: Mujaku Dōchū, for example, receiving only one line (p. 326), while the towering figures of Dōgen (pp. 51–119) and Hakuin together with a few pupils (pp. 367–99) get a chapter each, and slightly "lesser" masters such as Eisai (pp. 14–21), Musō (pp. 153–68), Ikkyū (pp. 192–97), Takuan (pp. 274–89), Bankei (pp. 310–25), and Shidō Munan (pp. 326–32) receive some coverage. This makes up over a third of the volume, with "minor" figures, institutional problems, scholarship, art and culture, and relations with Christianity making up the remainder of the text.

This volume is divided into three sections: broadly, the first on Kamakura (early), the second up to the mid-sixteenth century (medieval), and the third on Tokugawa to recent times (modern).

⁷ For Ta-hui's popularity see LEVERING 1987, pp. 181, 198.

The early section (pp. 5–49) seems virtually meant to set the scene for Dōgen and his disciples (pp. 51–147). The initial attempts to introduce Zen were probably doomed to failure because the atmosphere was wrong, as was true initially in Korea because of the resistance of the established “scholastic” schools. The later use of Zen by Saichō (p. 6) may have been primarily for lineage purposes rather than Zen content (YANAGIDA 1969, p. 89), and, if for no other reason, Hui-man, the Zen teacher of Dōshō (628–678), should be listed not as a pupil of Hui-k’o (p. 5), but as a pupil of Hui-k’o’s pupil Seng-na.

Dumoulin introduces readers to a fascinating group, the Daruma-shū, who have only recently become a subject of research. The Daruma-shū exercised much influence on the formation of Japanese Zen, introducing T’ang-dynasty-style notions and texts, which incurred the opposition of Eisai, who had brought Sung-dynasty Rinzai Zen into Japan. The group also posed a problem for Dōgen when ex-members of the “school” joined his congregation. Both Eisai and Dōgen deplored the fact that Nōnin, Daruma-shū’s founder, lacked a genealogical link with a Chinese Zen master, which perhaps explains the supposed relics of the first six Chinese Zen patriarchs and the robe of Ta-hui that this “school” kept (p. 13). These sacred keepsakes seem to have been used as a bulwark against attack, or they may reflect a more devotional aspect of their Zen. But even the presence of these items could not preserve the status of Nōnin (unlike Chinul in Korea, who remained influential without any such props). This suggests some weakness in the school, or a different environment, something future research may answer.

Interpretation of Dōgen, now a major industry, takes up much of this volume. Dōgen’s personal flaws are alluded to, as is his idealization by his followers (p. 104), but as with all the studies of Zen masters, these faults are treated gently and apologetically. Nowhere do we see such trenchant, even hostile, psychological assessments or ideological analyses as those made of Luther by Erik Erikson in *The Young Luther* or Norman O. Brown in chapter 14 of *Life Against Death*, or of Mohammed by Maxime Rodinson in his *Mohammed*.

Thus Dumoulin describes Dōgen as broadly tolerant, quoting him as saying that it is only the authenticity (*shin-gi* 真偽) of practice that matters (p. 58). But it was this very question that highlighted his intolerance (pp. 63–66, 86). Despite the declaration that Dōgen denied sectarianism and lacked the notion of heterodoxy (pp. 68–69), Dōgen clearly associated his Daruma-shū and Rinzai school opponents, especially Ta-hui, with heresy (*gedō* 外道), literally, of being off the Buddhist path (KIM 1975, pp. 150–54, 155). The emphasis on *kenshō* 見性 (seeing the nature) by the Rinzai master Enni (p. 27), and by Ejō of the Daruma-shū (pp. 126, 144 note 21), later to be Dōgen’s heir, is condemned and implied to be tainted with the heresy of Śrenika, which Hui-chung had detected

in the false text (*gisho* 偽書), the *Platform Sūtra*,⁸ and the lack of a sanctioning teacher, as was alleged against Nōnin and Ta-hui (pp. 63–64), was denigrated as falling into the heresy of “naturalism.”⁹ Indeed, here Dōgen follows in the mould of Hui-chung, the champion of the sermon of the insentient and opponent of the heresies of Śrenika and others that appeared in early Zen. But Dōgen’s specious claim of a lineage document in the blood of Hui-neng and Ch’ing-yüan (pp. 68–69) is a “sectarian” fabrication made for the aggrandizement of his lineage.

The coverage of Dōgen is generally sound, providing a good, easy introduction to the thought of this complex man, although there are a few trifling errors. For example, note 103 on p. 111 says “Ta-hui Tsung-kao completed a different collection of Dōgen’s work. . . ,” which is chronologically impossible. What is meant is that Dōgen wrote a work with a title identical to the work written earlier by Ta-hui. Some of the characterizations, such as “cosmotheistic” (p. 100) seem inappropriate, especially when “pantheistic Buddha” is rejected on the next page. Other items need elucidation, such as where Dōgen is stated to have brought a copy of the *Pi-yen lu* to Japan (p. 47 note 112), which has been judged legendary (KODERA 1980, p. 75).

In this volume, the evaluation of the Ōbaku school is very unclear. There is an apparent contradiction between calling the Ōbaku school “reactionary,” a “countercurrent” to the leading “progressive, rationalistic” intelligentsia (p. 305), while simultaneously saying that it “inspired a revitalization of Zen in general and introduced a modernizing force into Japanese intellectual life, especially into the Sōtō school of Zen” (p. 336). Were, then, the other schools even more reactionary, or did it provide a challenging negative example? It was probably the new forms of Chinese scholarship, in particular philology, introduced by Ōbaku monks that made them a modernizing force, while their Zen teachings were seen as outmoded and tainted with syncretism by the Japanese, who were beginning to gain a new self-esteem vis-à-vis the Chinese.

The dominance of Chinese culture in the medieval Gozan literature began to give way to a dislike of the Chinese “foreigners,” the Ōbaku leaders (p. 301), although this was coupled with respect for their “secular” abilities (p. 305). Later, monks like Bankei saw a need to distance themselves from the Chinese language, at least, in order to get back to the earlier, and by now much idealized, Chinese spirit of the T’ang and Sung (pp. 321–23). Bankei was probably right, for in attempting to read

⁸ *Shōbōgenzō* T 82.19a-c, especially on *reichi* 靈知 and Śrenika, 19b9ff.; on the false *Platform Sūtra* see T 82.298b13–29. This chapter also condemns Taoism, T 82.92a22ff.

⁹ *Shōbōgenzō* T 82.71c7–9; on Ta-hui’s alleged lack of authorization see T 82.254c23–255a1, where Dōgen uses a term meaning a soul that is dependent on vegetation while waiting for rebirth—a half-baked greenhorn practitioner.

many of the earlier Japanese Zen works written in Chinese, Japanese creativity was being stultified and the audience unduly limited. Bankei was thus progressive, like the T'ang and Sung Zen writers who used a mixed colloquial and literary Chinese, or like Dōgen, who wrote predominantly in his native language, unlike most of his Buddhist contemporaries. Yet the writers in the vernacular were outnumbered by those who wrote in the literary style, and the Zen colloquial Chinese "lingua franca" became an ossified vulgate or substitute classical style. This latter process was aided by the endless repetition of the same incidents, phrases, or *kōan*, a tedium of the conservative tendency in Zen.

Every reader surely has his own wish-list for a history of Zen in Japan. I would have liked to have seen more on the Fuke-shū, and not just a few lines (p. 30), and something on the Sōtō school's role in attempting to make Korean Buddhism conform to Japanese Buddhist practices during the colonial era; and less on the marginal (for Zen) dialogues between Christian missionaries and Zen monks (p. 265). The Christian-Zen encounter must be a favorite topic among other readers, however.

Other Issues

DECLINE

One theme detectable throughout the two volumes is that of decline (1, pp. 244, 248, 252, 277, 284, 287; 2, pp. 172, 299) and the constant threat of "adulteration" by other forms of Buddhism and popularization (1, p. 284; 2, pp. 19, 30, 35, 137, 192, 197, 213–14, 303–304, 385, 387). Here Dumoulin is mirroring his sources, for even by late T'ang times, leading masters such as Chao-chou were lamenting the decline of Zen's originality and potency (AKIZUKI 1972, p. 38)—perhaps the second patriarch Hui-k'o's prediction of the degeneration of the interpretation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* into mere name and form started this—and the constant harping on the correct lineage, a sign of insecurity, was linked to the issue of pure, unadulterated Zen and the danger of the dilution of Zen by the passage of time. Thus Pai-chang Huai-hai (749–814) remarked to his pupil Huang-po Hsi-yün:

If your insight is the equal of your teacher's, you diminish your teacher's power by half; if your insight surpasses that of your teacher you may receive the transmission.

Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu,
T 51.249c17

ART

Dumoulin also takes an excursion through the arts related to Zen, although the section on China is too short (1, pp. 277–84) and should have been expanded with an essay on Zen and poetry. Moreover, the material is rather general, reflecting the usual impressionistic and often romantic view of art adopted by most lovers and critics of art. The paintings become “ciphers of transcendence,” and “simple concrete things become transparent to a timeless present and an absolute reality” (1, p. 283), phrasing typical of the modern philosophical interpretation of Zen and its Absolute-speak.

Theories do underlie some of Zen-inspired art, though it is not always made explicit. For Dumoulin, in “stone gardens the manifoldness of the world with its ten-thousand things is set forth symbolically,” and “this strikingly barren desert garden is mysteriously animated from within. The stones are alive” (2, p. 230). These words are reminiscent of Zen expression, although Meister Eckhart’s “desert of the godhead” is misplaced (cf. KATZ 1983, pp. 38–39 and note 91 p. 57). The last line of the quote brings to mind the popular Chinese story, the *Shih-t’ou tien*, in which inanimate stones bow to Tao-sheng when he taught them about the Buddha-nature of the *icchantika*, which can be traced back to the Buddhist “chronicle,” the *Fo-tsu t’ung-chi* 佛祖統紀 (T 49, 266a12–25). As Dumoulin says, much of the art is really an expression of the Buddha-nature in Nature, or of Nature as the body of the Buddha (2, p. 237), an idea that was first expounded at length in Japan by Dōgen in chapters of the *Shōbōgenzō* such as the “Mujōseppō” [Insentient Preaching the Dharma] or “Sansui-kyō” [The Landscape Sūtra]. These doctrines that support “Zen art” should be aired.

The gardens designed by Zen masters, then, were meant to express the notion that “mountains, rivers, grass, and trees all become Buddha” (TAKEUCHI 1976, p. 241). Thus the famous garden planner and Zen leader Musō Kokushi (2, pp. 227–28) wrote of one of the ten views of the Tenryū-ji garden he had created:

The sounds of the rapids spout forth, the broad long tongue (of the Buddha).

Do not think that deep conversation resides in the mouth.

Day and night it flows, transmitting the 80,000 verses.

Obviously not a single word has been proclaimed.

(Musō Kokushi *goroku*

T 80.481a26–27)

This poem echoes that by the illustrious Sung-dynasty literatus Su Shih (1037–1101), who was deeply interested in Zen. Su’s poem of 1084 was well known, appearing as the introduction to the *Shōbōgenzō* chapter

“Keisei sanshoku” [Stream Sounds and Mountain Hues]. The poem was presented to Zen master Ch’ang-tsung:

The sound of the stream is the broad, long tongue [of Buddha].
 Are not the hues of the mountain those of the pure Body?
 At nightfall the 84,000 gathas,
 Another day how could I present them to someone?

(*Shōbōgenzō* T 82. 38c1–3).

Such an idea later sustains Matsuo Bashō (1644–1694), who finds the universe in “every grain of dust,” as Kegon (Ch. Hua-yen) theory proclaimed. The same theory that Musō Kokushi appealed to was a motive also for Bashō’s haiku, as his pupil Shikō testified:

For sentient (*yūjō* 有情) things it goes without saying, but even insentient (*mujō* 無情) grasses and trees, tiles and stones, up to and including utensils and coverings, each is provided with a fundamental emotion (*honjō* 本情) that truly should not be differentiated from human emotion (*ninjō*). People who do not attain that fundamental emotion/feeling, facing the moon and flowers do not know them, and even though they possess utensils they resemble people who lack them.¹⁰

This “fundamental emotion or feeling” resembles the “basic nature” (*honshō* 本性) or Buddha-nature of Zen. Thus Bashō felt “the life of the Buddha” in a frog, which plunging “into the pond vivifies the universe” (2, p. 353). Bashō’s famous haiku on the frog, *furu ike ya*, may have also been a reflection of the enlightenment poem of the Neo-Confucian scholar Chang Chiu-ch’eng (1092–1159), later to become a close friend of the Rinzai master Ta-hui Tsung-kao, for Bashō was widely read in Chinese poetry. Chang had been battling with a *kōan* one night, when he had to go out to the privy. He heard a frog croak and was enlightened. He wrote in part:

On an autumn moon night, the sound of a frog,
 Surprised the firmament and earth all together.
 At such a time, who can understand?¹¹

The discussion of the arts and Zen should be placed in historical and doctrinal context, and not be abandoned to the neo-Zen-speak or the purple prose of much of the writing on the subject.

Greater cognizance also should be taken of Confucian themes in art.

¹⁰ SHIKŌ 1929, p. 19. Cf. BLYTH. 1964, p. 13 for a free translation and some other relevant quotes. Like Bashō, Shikō’s relations with Buddhism are complex, with allegations of influence from Bankei. See HORIKIRI 1982, pp. 22ff.

¹¹ NUKARIYA 1923–25, vol. 2, p. 366. The second line could also read “Smashed together the firmament and earth.”

Sansui (mountains and waters), or landscape painting, is not merely the representation of Taoist yin and yang (2, pp. 228, 251–52 note 18), for many of the major Chinese artists were Confucian literati who could justify their art, and attract Buddhists to the landscape, by reference to the *Lun-yü* 論語 (J. *Rongo*) of Confucius, which states: “The humane delights in mountains, the wise delights in the waters” (VI.21). Bashō surely knew the line, for he had studied Neo-Confucianism (2, pp. 365–66 note 190).¹²

Technical Problems

Given books of this size (349 + 509 pp.), with their dense text and myriads of notes and foreign names, the tasks of the translators and editors would have been prodigious, so it is not surprising that a few errors would creep in. The most vexing is the frequent lack of care with the transliterations of Chinese names. The inconsistency and lack of discrimination between aspirated and unaspirated initials (or rather voiced and unvoiced), and between the final *n* and *ng*, this latter a common difficulty for Japanese, is annoying. Even when an English source has the correct transliteration, the transliteration may be wrong in the book.¹³

For the translation into English, proofreaders should have eliminated mistakes such as “his sites were set on” (2, p. 17) or quaint expressions such as “popular author of the first water” (2, p. 201), and have provided translations for technical terms such as *Shang-tso* 上座 and *Ho-shang* 和尚 (1, p. 182), both clerical titles, or *avidyā* (1, p. 200), “ignorance,” which were left unexplained.

There is also an inconsistency in the translations from case 45 of the *Mumonkan* that appear in 1, p. 11 and 1, p. 247, which hinges on the different meanings of the Chinese word *t'a* 他. Anachronisms such as the genealogy of Tsung-mi (780–841) given by Shen-hui (684–758) should have been detected (1, p. 58 note 40; cf. p. 117 note 2), and obscure relationships such as that between the samurai and the “three hundred years of the Pax Tokugawa” and the reality of death in battle for the samurai contemporaries of Suzuki Shōsan (1579–1655) should have been clarified (2, p. 342). Typographical errors such as Kukakusa for Fukakusa (2, p. 13) should also have been removed.

There are also minor infelicities in the choice of words, such as calling the Sung a “Kingdom” (2, p. 38), though this may have been Japanese

¹² For details of Bashō's broad reading, see SATŌ 1973.

¹³ Cf. 1, p. 186, and p. 205 note 25. It should be Ts'un-chiang, not Ts'ung-chiang, and Kung-ch'eng I, not Kung-ch'en I.

usage, or titling Oda Nobunaga “emperor” (2, p. 230). This may reflect sixteenth-century European usage and understanding of Japan, which probably explains why “prince” is adopted for the son of a daimyo (2, p. 264). Other translations into English, such as “sciences” for some of the scholarship of Zen monks (2, pp. 262, 37), do not match the connotations of the presumed German original, *Wissenschaft*, which is much broader than the English “science.”

Note also that recent evidence has meant the revision of the dates of Shen-hui from 670–762 to 684–758 and of Ma-tsu Tao-i from 709–788 to 706/7–786.

Final Remarks

These volumes, packed as they are with facts, biographies, and with extensive footnotes and genealogical tables, will be very useful as a reference work rather than as a general introduction to Zen history for readers with just a passing interest. It is not easy or light reading.

There are some deficiencies and oversights in the coordination of the two volumes. For example, the first volume really required a biography of Chung-feng Ming-pen (1263–1323),¹⁴ whose influence on Japanese Rinzai appears in the second volume to have been pervasive. These deficiencies can be remedied in part by using Isshū Miura and Ruth Fuller Sasaki’s *Zen Dust* as a companion reference, for Dumoulin refers to it often. The two volumes of the history are clearly a set (2, p. 421), although the complete bibliography promised in volume 1, p. xvi, does not eventuate for reasons of space (2, p. x).

No major library or student of Zen history can afford to be without these volumes, for they are a product of immense scholarship, summing up much of the mountain of studies of Zen. Although Dumoulin’s work may be outdated already and have faults of omission and methodology, like Nukariya Kaiten’s pioneering two-volume *Zengaku shisōshi* published between 1923 and 1925, which is now truly outdated and was ignorant of the Tun-huang material, it will continue to be a solid reference work for generations to come. Although there is much to criticize, and much more to be wished for, like Nukariya’s work, which I still use, Dumoulin’s volumes will provide initial guidance for many researchers in the future and will no doubt be seen as one of the pioneering classics in English in the field.

¹⁴ A study has been made by Yü Chün-fang (1982).

REFERENCES

- AKIZUKI Ryōmin 秋月龍珉
 1972 *Jōshū roku: Zen no goroku* 趙州錄：禪の語錄 11. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- BLYTH, R. H.
 1964 *A History of Haiku*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press.
- BUSWELL, Robert E., Jr.
 1983 *The Korean Approach to Zen: The Collected Works of Chinul*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
 1987 The “short-cut” approach of *K’an-hua* meditation. In *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., 321–77. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
 1989 *The Formation of Ch’an Ideology in China and Korea: The Vajrasamādhi-Sūtra, a Buddhist Apocryphon*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- FAURE, Bernard
 1986a Bodhidharma as textual and religious paradigm. *History of Religions* 25/3: 187–98.
 1986b The concept of one-practice samādhi in early Ch’an. In *Traditions of Meditation in Chinese Buddhism*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., 99–128. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- GIMELLO, Robert M.
 1983 Mysticism in its contexts. In *Mysticism and Religious Traditions*, Steven T. Katz, ed., 61–88. New York: Oxford University Press.
- GOMEZ, Luis O.
 1987 Purifying gold: The metaphor of effort and intuition in Buddhist thought and practice. In *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., 67–165. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- HORIKIRI Minoru 堀切 実
 1982 *Shōfū hairon no kenkyū—Shikō o chūshin ni* 蕉風俳論の研究—支考を中心に [Studies of Bashō School haiku treatises, centered on Shikō]. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.
- HSÜ TSANG CHING 續藏經
 Reprint of *Dai Nihon zoku zōkyō* in 150 vols. Taipei: Hsin-wen feng ch’u-p’an she.
- HU Shih 胡適
 1968 *Shen-hui Ho-shang i-chi: fu Hu Hsien-sheng wan-nien te yen-chiu* 神曾和尚遺集：附胡先生晚年的研究 [The extant works of Master Shen-hui]. Ma Chün-wu, ed. Taipei: Hu Shih chi-nien kuan.

IRIYA Yoshitaka 入矢義高

- 1984 *Baso no goroku* 馬祖の語録 [The recorded sayings of Ma-tsu].
Kyoto: Zenbunka Kenkyūjo.

ISHII Shūdō 石井修道

- 1987 *Sōdai Zenshūshi no kenkyū* 宋代禪宗史の研究 [Study of Sung-dynasty Zen School history]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

KATZ, Steven T.

- 1983 The "conservative" character of mystical experience. In *Mysticism and Religious Tradition*, Steven T. Katz, ed., 3–60. New York: Oxford University Press.

KEEL Hee-Sung

- 1984 *Chinul: The Founder of the Korean Sōn Tradition*. Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series.

KIM Hee-Jin

- 1975 *Dōgen Kigen—Mystical Realist*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

KODERA, Takashi James

- 1980 *Dōgen's Formative Years in China*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

KOMAZAWA DAIGAKU ZENSHŪSHI KENKYŪKAI, comp. 駒澤大學禪宗史研究會

- 1978 *Enō kenkyū* 慧能研究 [Studies of Hui-neng]. Tokyo: Daishūkan Shoten.

LEVERING, Miriam

- 1987 Ta-hui and lay Buddhists: Ch'an sermons on death. In *Buddhist and Taoist Practice in Medieval Chinese Society*, David W. Chappell, ed., 181–206. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

LU K'uan Yü

- 1961 *Ch'an and Zen Teachings: Second Series*. London: Rider and Company.

MCRAE, John R.

- 1986 *The Northern School and the Formation of Early Ch'an Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- 1987 Shen-hui and the teaching of sudden enlightenment in early Ch'an Buddhism. In *Sudden and Gradual Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese Thought*, Peter N. Gregory, ed., 227–78. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

MARALDO, John C.

- 1985 Is there historical consciousness within Ch'an? *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12: 141–72.

NUKARIYA Kaiten 忽滑谷快天

- 1923–25 *Zengaku shisōshi* 禪學思想史 [History of Zen thought], 2 vols.
Tokyo: Meicho Kankōkai reprint (1969).

ROBINET, Isabelle

- 1977 *Les commentaires du Tao tō king jusqu'au VIIe siècle*. Paris: Institut de Hautes Études Chinoises.

SATŌ Madoka (En) 佐藤 圓

- 1973 *Bashō to Zen* 芭蕉と禅 [Bashō and Zen]. Tokyo: Ōfūsha.

SHIKŌ 支考

- 1929 *Zoku goron* 續五論 [Continued five treatises]. In *Shōmon haiwa bunshū* 蕉門俳話文集 [Collected writings on haiku talks of the Bashō School], Nihon Haisho Taikai, vol. 4. Kanda Toyoho 神田豊穂 ed., 19–34. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TAISHŌ SHINSHŪ DAIZŌKYŌ 大正新修大藏經

- 1922–33 [New compilation in the Taishō era of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka]. Takakusu Junjirō et al., eds. Daizō Shuppankai.

TAKASAKI Jikidō 高崎直道

- 1982 Sources of the *Lankavatāra* and its position in Mahāyāna Buddhism. In *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on His Sixtieth Birthday*, L. A. Hercus et al., eds., 545–68. Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, The Australian National University.
- 1983 *Kegon shisō no tenkai* 華嚴思想の展開 [The development of Hua-yen thought]. In *Kōza Daijō Bukkyō* 3, Hirakawa Akira et al., eds., 1–44. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

TAKEUCHI Michio 竹内道雄

- 1976 *Nihon no Zen* 日本の禅 [Japanese Zen]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.

Tso Sze-bong 曹 仕邦

- 1982 The transformation of Buddhist Vinaya in China. Ph.D. diss. Canberra: The Australian National University.

YANAGIDA Seizan 柳田聖山

- 1969 *Nihon Zen no tokushoku* 日本禅の特色 [The characteristics of Japanese Zen], *Zengaku kenkyū* 57: 53–99.
- 1971a *Rinzai nōto* 臨濟ノート [Notes on Lin-chi]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- 1971b *Zen no goroku 2: shoki no Zenshi 1: Ryōgashijiki, Denhōbōki* 初期の禅史 1: 楞伽師資記 : 伝法宝紀 [Early Zen histories 1: Leng-ch'ieh shih-tzu chi, Ch'uan-fa-pao chi]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.
- 1976 *Zen no goroku 3: shoki no Zenshi 2: Rekidai hōbōki* 初期の禅史 2: 歴代法宝記 [Early Zen histories 2: Li-tai fa-pao chi]. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō.

1985–86 Goroku no rekishi 語録の歴史 [The history of the recorded conversations], *Tōhō gakuho* 57: 211–663.

1989 Katakū Jinne to Echū 荷澤神会と惠忠 [Ho-tse Shen-hui and Hui-chung], *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 38/1: 247–54.

YANAGIDA Seizan et al., eds.

1974 *Zen goroku* 禅語録 [Zen recorded conversations]. In Sekai no Meicho series, Zoku 3 [Great Books of the World, Supplement 3]. Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha.

YOSHIZU Yoshihide 吉津宜英

1985 *Kegon-Zen no shisōshiteki kenkyū* 華嚴禅の思想史的研究 [Thought-historical researches on Hua-yen Ch'an]. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppansha.

Yü Chün-fang

1982 Chung-feng Ming-pen and Ch'an Buddhism in the Yüan. In *Yüan Thought: Chinese Thought and Religion under the Mongols*, Hok-lam Chan and Wm Theodore de Bary, eds., 419–77. New York: Columbia University Press.