include works in which Atsutane expounded positively upon his own worldview, it is telling that the principles of textual criticism and standards of rationality to which he subjected Buddhist scriptures are nowhere near as rigorously applied.

The only other issue I had with *A Storied Sage* was its portrayal of the dynamics between Western textual-critical scholarship of the nineteenth century, Christian missionaries and their Japanese converts, and Japanese Buddhists. Like many other authors of works on the Japanese history of this period, Auerback seems to be thinking of “more liberal versions of Christian theology” (194) when juxtaposing Christianity and Buddhism. In reality, the Protestant missionaries in 1870s and 1880s Japan as well as the early Japanese converts were certainly not representative of liberal Protestant Christianity by a long shot. Rather, they themselves were struggling with the “invocation of history” (180) in the explanation of religion, as the reaction to Ernest Renan’s *Life of Jesus* in 1860s and 1870s theological circles in Europe and North America amply attests to. Did Japanese Buddhists really only learn about the historicist relativization of revelatory religions from Christians in the 1880s? Although Auerback’s comment is certainly on the safe side when he states that he does not see “widespread acceptance of European-style historical scholarship” (182) before the 1890s, he ignores evidence that in the early 1870s, influential Japanese Buddhists traveling to Europe learned about Bible criticism, realizing how potent a weapon against mainstream Christian theology it was, but also recognizing the necessity to subject their own tradition to this kind of new scholarly approach.

Overall, this is a fine book that any student of the reception of Buddhism in Japan will have to consult. It offers compelling evidence of the processes of religious acculturation from the ancient period to the twentieth century and should be of interest to practitioners of art history, theater, literature, as well as more conventional Buddhist studies.

HANS MARTIN KRÄMER

Heidelberg University


Steven Heine’s new book is a focused introduction to the transmission of Chan from China to Japan in the thirteenth century with considerable information and summary of current scholarship on all aspects of Chan/Zen Buddhism. To date, there is no other book of comparable scope and coverage.

The Western world has been fascinated with Zen Buddhism as introduced by Japanese Zen teachers and propagators over the last century. Obviously, this version of Zen known in the West has its roots in Chinese Chan, which came to be known as Zen in Japan. But knowledge about this transformation has not yet been suitably summarized and introduced to the general public, even though Chan/Zen scholarship has advanced greatly in the past few decades. So far the most thorough and comprehensive
introduction is Heinrich Dumoulin’s two-volume *Zen Buddhism* (New York: Macmillan, 1988). Steven Heine’s new book, though it focuses only on an exciting 100-year period in the thirteenth century, complements this literature with an insightful introduction to the process of transmission as well as to Zen sectarian history, social history, Zen teaching and training techniques, and the development of Zen art in Japan.

The book covers the history of Chan/Zen from roughly 1225, the year Japanese Sōtō founder Dōgen (1200–1253) visited China, to 1325, when Japanese Rinzai Zen master Daitō (1282–1337) won a government-sponsored debate against Zen’s opponents from traditional Buddhist sects, such as Tendai. Conceptually Heine regards this event as the completion of the process of transition and transformation. The three parts of the book, which are further divided into eight chapters, treat such topics as Chan studies and methods, history and teaching, and monastic life and practice. These parts and chapters are organized with a clever play on “T-words,” whereby they are titled by words such as “transnational,” “tradition,” “transition,” “transmission,” “transplantations,” “transformations,” “teacher,” “temple,” “tone,” and so on. These T-words, and especially the “Trans”-words, imply the takeover of the Chan tradition by Japan and the decline of Chan in China.

Two chapters in Part I introduce both Chan/Zen studies in an international framework and also the historical background of the subject matter. Chapter 1 offers a useful overview of current scholarship on Chan/Zen and a short history of Chan studies in the West with considerable consideration of its role in the spread of Zen in the post-WWII era. Heine introduces current research on Chan/Zen in three categories: historical and institutional analysis, social political interdisciplinary methods, and critical or deconstructive approaches. As Heine points out, Chan/Zen studies in the West has been heavily influenced by Western politics and the cultural imagination of orientalism (26–29). Chapter 2 demystifies the legend of Chan patriarchs, whom Heine refers to as “Living Buddhas,” through the lens of social and political analysis. Both the Chinese and Japanese traditions are discussed with full attention to the geographical, sociopolitical, and cultural background of the traditions.

Part II covers three main phases of the transmission of Chan to Japan chronologically in three chapters. Chapter 3 starts with Dōgen’s arrival in China and the initial spread of Zen in Japan down to the middle of the thirteenth century, during which Japan’s ruling elite embraced the novel teaching and practice through the emigrant Chinese monks. A brief history of Chan in China and the Japanese social and political situations are introduced by Heine as well. However, the influence of Chinese monks declined in the subsequent decades of the thirteenth century as chapter 4 describes. The last great Chinese monk Yishan (1247–1317) marked the beginning of the last phase of “independence” because of the promotion of art and poetry, leading toward the final “maturity and autonomy” of Japanese Zen with the ascendency of a group of Japanese Zen monks represented by Daitō, Kokan (1278–1347), Kennichi (1241–1316), Musō (1275–1351), and Keizen (1264–1325) (chap. 5). In addition, Heine also introduces various Japanese Zen lineages derived from the Chinese emigrant monks and Japanese pilgrims (109–19).

Part III provides an overview of the religious life of this “matured” Japanese Zen, which is to say after the assimilation of theory and practice from the continent and their
spreading to all walks of Japanese society and all corners of the Japanese landscape. Chapter 6 highlights the role of teachers, whom Heine consistently calls “Living Buddhas,” in shaping the spiritual life of Zen practitioners through unconventional “Zen-style” questioning and examination. Chapter 7 offers a rare glimpse into the structure and organization of Zen temples in Japan, which has not been emphasized in other introductory histories of Zen. Finally, chapter 8 concludes the book with a discussion of the artistic expression of Zen in monochromatic painting and calligraphy, as well as literary creations, as a way to emphasize the unique transformation of Zen in Japan. These artistic and literary techniques, in written, verbal, and visual forms, include regulated poetry, rhyming couplets or quatrains, impressionistic paintings, the plum tree, motifs of renewal, dry rock gardening, ceremonial ritual art, Zen sayings and collections of records, the use of capping phrase (agyo or jakugo), and triptych displaying technique.

Overall, this is a fantastic book on Chinese Chan and Japanese Zen. Among its many merits, I want to highlight its value for research despite its being geared toward a popular audience and its lack of adequate space to develop scholarly themes in depth. First, Heine gives enough attention to social history of Chan/Zen by assimilating many social historical works on Chan/Zen. One of the central questions the book seeks to answer is the reason for Chan’s rise in China and its success in Japan as Heine laid out in chapter 2 (34–35). To answer this question, Heine favors a sociohistorical approach that is clearly influenced by the works of Japanese historians such as Takeo Tanaka 田中健夫, Amino Yoshihiko 網野善彦, and Shimao Arata 島尾新, as well as American Zen scholar Martin Collcutt. (Personally, I would also add Kuroda Toshio 黒田俊雄 to the list because his theory of kenmitsu taisei [顕密体制 exoteric-esoteric system] offers much potential for explaining the rise of Zen in Japan.) Heine suggests that these authors, though they did not focus on Zen entirely, heralded an approach that goes beyond the study of a few famous teachers and temples in order to “highlight undercurrent communal tendencies and shared occurrences” (16).

Second, Heine highlights Chan/Zen’s institutional history, more exactly Zen temples and sites, and their regional features. Macroscopically, Heine situates the development of Zen institutions within the unique East Asian Mediterranean maritime situation. Along this line, he explains the regional characteristics and geographical distribution of Zen temples in Japan along harbors, capital cities, rural sites in far-flung provinces, especially Hokuriku (203–9). In particular, ample attention is thus given to the geographical dispersal of the tradition with extraordinary effort to include various remade maps and illustrations. These visual devices make the book extremely accessible. On a smaller scale, he also provides institutional analyses of the formation of the Five Mountains, Ten Temples, and Forest Temple system (42–43). By doing so, Heine offers a novel analysis of the role of Zen temples in Japanese Zen spiritual life in five aspects: material culture, conceptual element of consecrated setting, metaphysical realm, ongoing deliberations and determinations, and regional networks of affiliated lineal temples.

My major overall concern with the book is the “linear development model” Heine seems to imply. The structural emphasis of “transfer” makes me uncomfortable because it may have unintentionally created another stereotype about the demise of Chan in China and the irrelevance of Japanese Zen’s root in the Edo period. On the contrary,
Chan in China after the “transfer” took another trajectory and the transformation of Zen in Tokugawa Japan should be considered as the direct source of today’s Zen in Japan and the West. (To be fair, Heine does suggest the later development of Zen sometimes and mostly discusses Japanese Zen in the Muromachi period and Sesshū’s visit to China in the section “aftermath accomplishments” [142–49]). Although Heine realizes the transmission process is not static, his narrative may leave readers with the impression of a linear progression.

Another one of my quibbles is about the use of the term “Living Buddha” to describe Chan patriarchs. Living Buddha is a term commonly used in Tibetan Buddhism to address “Tulku” as spiritual leaders. Heine may have his own reason to choose the usage in particular to highlight Chan patriarchs as self-enlightened Beings but some further qualification of this choice would have been welcome. (See the discussions on pages 50–56, and sections such as “Becoming a living Buddha” [156–64] and “Being a living Buddha” [169–74] in chapter 8.) Another point is that some readers will appreciate it if the sources of the fascinating illustrations and maps throughout the book are included, to allow them to trace their provenance. (Just a note: in figure P.2 on page xiv, the western area in the Southern Song and Jin Dynasties map was wrongly marked as “DALI,” which should be “Tibet” or “Tubo.”)

Overall, Heine’s new book is stimulating and inspiring. I am sure it will open many doors for students of Chan/Zen to embark on new research projects. I highly recommend it to students and scholars.

Jiang Wu

The University of Arizona