

CHAPTER EIGHT (*Dai hasshō* 第八章)

ROOT CASE¹ 【本則】

第八祖、佛陀難提尊者、值七祖婆須密多尊者曰、今來與師論義。尊者曰、仁者論即不義。義即不論。若擬論義、終非義論。師知尊者義勝、悟無生理。

The Eighth Ancestor, Venerable Buddhāndiya, encountering the Seventh Ancestor, Vasumitra, said, “Now, Master, I have come to *debate the truth*² with you.” The Venerable [Vasumitra] said: “Gentleman, if there is debate, then it is not truth; the truth is not a matter of debate. If you propose *debating truth*, then ultimately it is not truth that is debated.” The Master [Buddhāndiya], knowing that the Venerable [Vasumitra]’s truth was superior, awakened to the principle of non-arising.

PIVOTAL CIRCUMSTANCES 【機縁】

師は

The Master³

迦摩羅國の人なり。姓は瞿曇氏。頂上に肉髻あり。辯捷無礙なり。

[Buddhāndiya] was a man of the Country of Kamāla. His clan was Gautama. He had a *fleshy topknot* on the crown of his head, and his rhetorical skill was unimpeded.

第七祖婆須密多尊者、行化して迦摩羅國に至て廣く佛事を興す。師、寶座前に於て自ら謂らる。

¹ **Root Case** (*honsoku* 本則). The Chinese passage quoted here finds a close precedent in the biography of Vasumitra that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* (T 2076.51.208b11-17). Vasumitra’s words are also cited as a *kōan* in the *Records that Mirror the Axiom*, compiled in 961 (T 2016.48.656c4-5), but they are attributed there to an unnamed “ancestral teacher.”

² **debate the truth** (C. *lunyi* 論義; J. *rongi*). The Kenkon’in manuscript of the *Denkōroku* gives *rongi* 論議, which simply means to “debate.”

³ **The Master** (*Shi wa* 師は). The block of text that follows these words is a Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し) of an identical Chinese passage that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* under the heading “Eighth Ancestor, Buddhāndiya”:

《景德傳燈錄》迦摩羅國人也。姓瞿曇氏。頂有肉髻辯捷無礙。(T 2076.51.208c2-3).

The Seventh Ancestor, Venerable Vasumitra, carrying out conversions, arrived in the Country of Kamāla and widely promoted buddha-activities. The Master [Buddhanandiya] himself announced in front of [Vasumitra's] jeweled seat:

我を佛陀難提と名く、今師と論義せんと。尊者曰く、仁者論ぜば即ち義ならず、義は即ち論ならず。

"I am named Buddhanandiya.¹ Now, Master [Vasumitra], I would like to debate the truth with you." The Venerable [Vasumitra] said, "Gentleman, if you debate, then it is not truth; the truth is not a matter of debate."

INVESTIGATION 【拈提】

實に夫れ眞實の義は論すべきに非ず。眞實の論は又義を帶せず。故に論あり義あるは、是れ義に非ず論に非ず。故に謂ふ、若し論義せんと擬せば、終に義の論に非ずと。終に一法の義とすべきなく、一法の論とすべきなし。

In fact, the truth about reality should not be debated. Debates about reality, moreover, do not encompass truth. Therefore, having debate and having truth is neither truth nor debate. Thus he said, "If you propose debating the truth, ultimately it is not a debate about truth." Ultimately, there is not a single dharma to be regarded as truth, and not a single dharma to be debated.

然も佛に二種の語なし。故に佛語を見るは佛身を見るなり。佛身を見るは佛舌を證するなり。然れば縦ひ心境不二と説くも、猶是れ眞實の論に非ず。設ひ變易せずと謂ふとも、猶ほ是れ義に非ず。故に言の演ぶべきなく、理の顯はすべきなしと謂ふとも、猶ほ是れ義通ずるに非ず。性は即ち眞なり、心は即ち正なりと説くも、又是れ何の論ぞ。然も光境共に亡ずと謂ふも、猶ほ是れ眞實の論に非ず。光境共に亡ぜざるも、又是れ義に非ず。然れば實と説き主と説き、一と説き同と説くも、重ねて是れ義の論に非ず。

Moreover, the Buddha did not have two types of speech. Therefore, to perceive the sayings of the Buddha is to perceive the body of the Buddha. To perceive the body of the Buddha is to realize the tongue of the Buddha. This being so, even if one explains that "mind and its objects are not

¹ "I am named Buddhanandiya" (ware wo Butsudanandai to nazuku 我を佛陀難提と名く). The block of text that begins with these words is a Japanese transcription (yomikudashi 読み下し) of a nearly identical Chinese passage that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* under the heading "Seventh Ancestor, Vasumitra":

《景德傳燈錄》自稱我名佛陀難提。今與師論義。師曰。仁者論即不義。義即不論。(T 2076.51.208b15-17).

dual,”¹ this still is not a debate about reality. Even if one says it “does not change,” this is still not the truth. Thus, even if one says, “we should not explain using words and should not reveal any principle,” this still is not a penetration of the truth. Even if one says that “inherent nature is what is real,” or that “mind is what is true,”² what kind of debate is that? Moreover, even if one says “light and sense objects together disappear,” this is still not a debate about reality. As for “light and sense objects together do not disappear,”³ this too is not the truth. This being so, saying “guest,” and saying “host”; and saying “one,” and saying “same,” is still not a debate about truth.

此に到て文殊大士、無言無説と説くも、是れ眞實の宣に非ず。維摩大士、據座默然せしも、又是れ義の論に非ず。此處に到りて文殊猶見錯り、維摩猶云、錯と。何に況や智慧第一の舍利弗、神通第一の目犍連、此義を見ること、未だ夢にだも見ず。恰か生育の物色を見ざるが如し。然も佛の言く、佛性は聲聞縁覺の夢にも未だ知ざる所なり。

Arriving at this, even though Mañjuśrī Bodhisattva said, “no speaking, no explaining,” this was not an explanation of reality. Although Vimalakīrti Bodhisattva responded by occupying his seat in silence,⁴ this was not a debate about truth. At this point, it was as if Mañjuśrī’s view were incorrect, and as if Vimalakīrti said, “Incorrect.”⁵ How much more, then, did

1 “mind and its objects are not dual” (C. *xinjing buer* 心境不二; J. *shinkyō funi*). This argument is made in a work entitled *Essay on the Nonduality of Mind and Objects*, quoted in *Records that Mirror the Axiom* (compiled 961) and attributed there to “Reverend Yunju of the Foku school” (T. 2016.48.946b4-6). The Foku school was founded on Mount Tiantai by a Chan monk named Weizi 惟則 (J. Isoku; 751–830). According to DDB, s.v. 雲居, Yunju was a monk of the Oxhead Lineage of Chan who stayed at the Yunju Monastery on Mount Tiantai. The idea that “mind and its objects are not dual” is found in a number of later Tiantai school commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra*.

2 “mind is what is true” (C. *xin ji zheng* 心即正; J. *shin wa sunawachi shō nari* 心は即ち正なり). The source of this quote remains unidentified.

3 “light and sense objects together do not disappear” (*kō kyō tomo ni bō zezaru* 光境共に亡ぜざる). This statement plays off of Dongshan Liangjie’s 洞山良价 (J. Tōzan Ryōkai; 807–869) comment on a kōan involving Panshan Baoji 盤山寶積 (J. Panzan Hōshaku; 709–788), who said, “When light and sense objects together disappear, what thing is recovered?” → “light and sense objects together disappear.”

4 occupying his seat in silence (C. *juzuo moran* 據座默然; J. *kyōza mokunen*). This was Vimalakīrti’s famous response to the question, “What is the bodhisattva’s dharma gate that leads into nonduality?” → “no speaking, no explaining.”

5 as if Vimalakīrti said, “Incorrect” (Yuima nao iwaku, shaku to 維摩猶云、錯と). Vimalakīrti, of course, did not speak the word “incorrect”: he said nothing at all. Keizan’s point here is that Vimalakīrti’s silence was the equivalent of saying that Mañjuśrī’s

Śāriputra, foremost in wisdom, and Maudgalyāyana,¹ foremost in supernatural powers, fail to see the truth, even in their dreams? It is just like someone who, blind from birth, cannot see the form of things. This being so, the Buddha said, “Buddha-nature is something that śrāvakas and pratyeka-buddhas do not know even in their dreams.”

(大般涅槃經卷八の如來性品に云く、善男子是の如き佛性は唯だ佛のみ能く知しめす、諸の聲聞縁覺の及ぶ所に非ず。)

(The “Tathāgata Nature Chapter” in Fascicle 8 of the *Sūtra of the Great Nirvāṇa*² says: “Good sons, in this way, buddha-nature is something that only buddhas are able to understand. Neither śrāvakas nor pratyeka-buddhas are up to it.”)

十住の菩薩、猶ほ遠く鶴を見て、是れ水なるか、是れ鶴なるかと誤る。且らく計較思惟して、良これ鶴なりと見ると雖も、猶ほ是れ決定ならず。

Bodhisattvas of the tenth abode who see cranes in the distance mistakenly wonder if it is water or if it is cranes. After thinking about and reflecting on it for a while, even if they decide that they have truly seen cranes, they are still not certain.

(同經同品に云く、善男子、譬へば渴せる人の曠野を行くに、是人迷悶して是れ水か是れ樹かを分別すること能はず、諦かに観ずること已まざれ

view was incorrect, and that it therefore did not escape the fundamental defect of all signifying, whether verbal or nonverbal.

¹ Śāriputra... and Maudgalyāyana (Sharihotsu... Mokukenren 舍利弗... 目犍連). Two bodhisattvas who appear prior to Mañjuśrī in Chapter 9 of the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra*, expressing their views on the question, “What is the bodhisattva’s dharma gate that leads into nonduality?” Keizan’s point in this sentence is that if even Vimalakīrti and Mañjuśrī before him failed to express the truth, then the bodhisattvas who spoke before them must have been even more off base, because the text arranges their comments in ascending order of profundity, culminating with Vimalakīrti. → “no speaking, no explaining.”

² *Sūtra of the Great Nirvāṇa* (C. *Daba niepan jing*; 大般涅槃經; J. *Daihatsu nehan gyo*; S. *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*). This quotation from the *Sūtra of the Great Nirvāṇa* (as well as the subsequent quotations of that text) does not appear in early manuscripts of the *Denkōroku*. The quotations probably originated as glosses added by a copyist to identify the source of the vocabulary and metaphors mentioned in the text. When Busshū Sen’ei 佛洲仙英 (1794–1864) compiled his 1857 woodblock edition of the *Denkōroku*, he included these notes as part of the text, but in small-size type as interlinear notes. In the Shūmuchiō edition of the *Denkōroku*, the quotations from the *Sūtra of the Great Nirvāṇa* are rendered in Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し), not the original Chinese, and incorporated as full-size text, distinguished from the original text only by being placed inside of parentheses.

ば、乃ち白鶴及び叢樹なるを見るが如し、善男子、十住の菩薩、如來の性に於て少分を知見すること、亦復た是の如し。)

(In the same chapter of the same *Sūtra*, [the Buddha] says: “Good sons, suppose there is a thirsty person traveling across a vast plain. That person, becoming confused, is unable to distinguish between water and trees. It is such that, if his ability to perceive clearly had not ended, then he would see that it is white cranes as well as a grove of trees. Good sons, with regard to the small amount that they know about the *tathāgata-nature*, *bodhisattvas of the tenth abode* are also like this.”)

然も十住の菩薩の、猶ほ是れ佛性を見ること明了ならず。

Bodhisattvas of the tenth abode still do not clearly understand how to see the *buddha-nature*.

(同經同品に云く、十住の菩薩は己が身に於て如來の性を見ると雖も、亦復た是の如く大に明了ならず。)

(In the same chapter of the same *Sūtra*, [the Buddha] says: “Even when *bodhisattvas of the tenth abode* see the *tathāgata-nature* in their own persons, still they do not clearly understand this.”)

然も少しく如來の所説に依て、自性あることを知て、歡喜して曰く、我れ無量劫、生死の間に流轉して、此常住なることを辨まへざりしことは、無我の爲に惑亂せられてなり。

Moreover, when as a result of the Tathāgata's preaching they know even slightly that they have their own-nature, they are joyful and say, “That we have transmigrated through birth and death for innumerable kalpas, unable to thoroughly discern this eternal abiding, is because we were confused about no-self.”

(同經同品に云く、十住猶ほ未だ所有の佛性を見ること能はず、如來既に説て即便少しく見る、是れ菩薩摩訶薩既に見ることを得る、已に咸く是言を作す。甚だ奇なり。世尊、我等無量生死に流傳して常に無我の爲に惑亂せらる。)

(In the same chapter of the same *Sūtra*, [the Buddha] says: “[*Bodhisattvas of the tenth abode* are unable to see the *buddha-nature* they possess. When the Tathāgata has preached, then they see just a bit. Once these *bodhisattvas*, *mahāsattvas*, have been able to see it, then all of them make this statement: ‘How wonderful! World-Honored One, we have circulated through innumerable births and deaths, always confused about no-self.’”)

然も見聞を絶し身心を忘じ、迷悟を避け、染淨を離れたりと云とも、此義を見ること夢にも又見ることを得ず。故に空中に向て求むること勿れ、色中に於て求むること勿れ。何に況や佛に求め祖に求めんや。

Moreover, even if you say that you have eliminated seeing and hearing, forgotten body and mind, avoided delusion and awakening, and separated from defilement and purity, you cannot see this truth even in your dreams. Therefore, do not seek it amidst emptiness. Do not seek it amidst form. How, then, can you possibly seek it in buddhas or seek it in ancestors?

然も諸仁者、曠大劫より以來、今日に到るまで、幾回か生死を経歷し、幾回か身心を起滅し來る。或は思ふべし、此生死去來は夢幻妄想なりと。殊に笑ふべし、是れ何の説話ぞ。抑も生死去來する者あるか。何を眞實の人體と謂はんや、何を夢幻妄想なりと謂ん。故に虚妄とも會すべからず、眞實とも會すべからず。若し虚妄と會し、眞實と會せば、此處に到りて始終不是なり。

And so, gentlemen, from vast kalpas past until today, how many times have you passed through birth and death, and how many times have your body and mind arisen and ceased? Or do you suppose that these births and deaths, comings and goings, are dreamed illusions and deluded conceptualizing? How laughable! What kind of story is that? Is there anyone who is born and dies, comes and goes? What do you call the “body of the real person”? What do you call “dreamed illusions and deluded conceptualizing”? Thus, you should not understand in terms of what is empty delusion, and should not understand in terms of what is real. If you understand in terms of what is empty delusion and understand in terms of what is real, then your arriving at this place is, from beginning to end, mistaken.

故に此一段の事、于細に須く參徹して始て得ん。漫に空を擬し正を擬して、以て恁麼の處と思ふこと勿れ。設ひ平坦の水の如く、清潔清淨なりと明らめて、虚空染淨なきが如くなりと謂ふとも、卒に未だ此處を明らめ得んや。

Therefore, with regard to this singular matter, you will first grasp it only when you have, in detail and of necessity, thoroughly investigated it. Do not idly feign emptiness or feign correctness and suppose that it is such a place. Even if you explain that it is clear and pure like level water, or undefiled like empty space, in the end you still will not have been able to clarify this place, will you?

洞山和尚、瀉山雲巖に參じて忽ち萬法と同參し、全身說法すと雖も、猶是れ不具なることありき。之に依て、雲巖重て慰めて曰く、這事を承當せん

こと子細にすべしと。之に依て疑猶ほ残ることありて、暫く雲巖を辭し、他所へ往きしに、水を渡る時、影を見て速に此事を得て、偈を説て曰く、

Reverend Dongshan sought instruction from Weishan and Yunyan. He immediately trained together with the myriad dharmas, but although he grasped that the entire body preaches the dharma, nonetheless [his understanding] was not thoroughgoing. As a result, Yunyan repeatedly encouraged him, saying, “In your attempt to accede to this matter, you must be meticulous.” Because doubts still remained, he took leave of Yunyan for a while and traveled elsewhere. When crossing over water, he saw his reflection, instantly grasped this matter, and uttered the following verse:¹

切忌隨他覓。迢迢與我疎。我今獨自往。處處得逢渠。渠今正是我。我今不是渠。應須恁麼會。方得契如如。

Do not seek by following others,
lest you become far, far alienated from your self.
I now proceed all alone,
yet in place after place I am able to meet him.²
He, now, is truly me,
but I, now, am not him.
There must be such an understanding:
only then will you be able to tally with thusness.

是の如く解して、卒に雲巖の嫡子として洞宗の根本たり。然も全身説法を會するのみに非ず。露柱燈籠、塵塵爾り、刹刹爾り、法法爾り。三世一切説を會すと謂ふとも、猶ほ至らざる處ありて慰めき。

Resolving matters in this way, in the end he became Yunyan's legitimate heir and the originator of the Dong Lineage.³ Nevertheless, do not simply understand that the entire body preaches the dharma, for bare pillars and lanterns and every mote of dust do so as well, as do land after land,⁴ and dharma after dharma. Although it is said that he understood all preach-

¹ uttered the following verse (*ge wo toite iwaku* 偈を説て曰く). For the full context of this verse in Chinese sources, see Chapter 38 of the *Denkōroku*, which treats Dongshan, the Thirty-eighth Ancestor in the Sōtō Lineage according to the *Denkōroku*.

² him (C. *qu* 渠; J. *kyo*, *kare*). This pronoun can also mean “leader” or “boss.” In this context, the word is highly ambiguous. It clearly refers to Dongshan's own reflection, which he saw in the water, but because that moment of seeing occasioned his awakening, it can also refer to his innate buddha-mind or buddha-nature.

³ Dong Lineage (C. Dongzong 洞宗; J. Tōshū). Better known today as the Sōtō Lineage.

⁴ land after land (C. *cha cha* 刹刹; J. *setsu setsu*). The reference is probably to buddha-lands, which are said to be countless.

ing in the *three times*, there was a place that he had not yet reached, so [Yunyan] urged him on.

何に況や、今人知見の中に會して、心是佛と會し、身是佛と會し、或は佛道如何なるべしとも會せず、唯春の華開くを見、秋の葉散るを見、法住法位と思へり、是れ笑ふに堪たる者なり。佛法是の如くならば、何に依て釋迦出世し、達磨西來せん。然るに上み釋尊より、唐土以來の祖師、佛祖位中に別なし。誰か是れ大悟せざりつる。人毎に依文解義以て義とし論とせば、幾ぞばくの佛祖かあらん。故に彼を擲げ棄て、此處を參徹して、自ら佛祖なることを得ん。故に祖師の道、殊に大悟大徹せずんば其人に非ず。

How much more, then, is this the case with people nowadays, whose understanding remains within their own knowing and seeing? They understand that “*mind is buddha*,” or understand that “*body is buddha*,”¹ without even understanding that one should ask, “What is the way of the buddhas?” They merely see the opening of blossoms in spring, or see the scattering of leaves in autumn, and think that “*dharma rest in their dharma positions*.” They make me laugh. If the *buddha-dharma* is this way, then why would Śākyamuni appear in the world or Bodhidharma come from the west? Moreover, beginning with the World-Honored One Śākyamuni down through the ancestral teachers of China, there has been no distinction among the ranks of buddhas and ancestors. Which of them was not greatly awakened? But if people always relied on texts to comprehend truth, taking this to be truth and taking that to be debate, how could there have been any buddhas or ancestors? Therefore, throw those [deluded ideas] away, thoroughly investigate this place, and thereby enable yourself to become a buddha and ancestor. Thus, the ancestral teachers say, “If you have not greatly awakened and greatly penetrated, then you are not ‘that person.’”

故に純清絶點にも住まらず、虚空明白にも住まらず。故に船子和尚曰く、直に須らく身を藏す處蹤跡なく、蹤跡なき處、身を藏すことなかるべし。吾れ三十年藥山に在て祇だ斯事を明らむ。純清絶點はれ身を藏す處に非ず。光境共に忘ずと謂ふとも、猶ほ此處に藏身すること勿れと謂ふ。更に古勞と説くべき所なし、迷悟と論ずべきことなし。恁麼に參徹する時、十方壁落なく四面又門なし。處處脱白露淨なり。故に大に須らく子細にすべし。卒爾なること勿れ。

¹ “*body is buddha*” (C. *shen shi fo* 身是佛; J. *shin ze butsu*). An abbreviation of “my body is buddha” (C. *wo shen shi fo* 我身是佛; J. *ga shin ze butsu*), an expression that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* (T 2076.51.218a13) and elsewhere.

Thus, do not dwell in *unblemished purity*; do not dwell in the obviousness of empty space. Thus, Reverend Chuanzi said:¹

“You must leave no traces in the place where you conceal yourself, but you must not conceal yourself in a place that has no traces. In my thirty years of residing at Mount Yao, I have clarified this affair only.”

“Unblemished purity” is not a place to conceal oneself. Even if one says “light and sense objects together disappear,” he [Chuanzi] nevertheless says “do not conceal yourself in that place.” Moreover, there are no perennial topics to discuss, and no *delusion and awakening* that should be debated. When you thoroughly investigate in this way, “the ten directions have no walls or fences; the four quarters, too, have no gates.” Every place is husked white, bare and pure. Therefore [as Yunyan said to Dongshan] you must be extremely meticulous. Do not be impetuous.

今朝、此因縁を説破せんとするに卑頌あり。聞かんと要すや。

This morning, in trying to fully explain this episode, I have a humble verse. Do you wish to hear it?

VERSE ON THE OLD CASE 【頌古】

善吉維摩談未到。目連驚子見如盲。若人親欲會這意。鹽味何時不的當。

Subhūti and Vimalakīrti’s conversations have yet to reach anywhere, while Maudgalyāyana and Śāriputra see as if blind.²

¹ Reverend Chuanzi said (*Sensu Oshō iwaku* 船子和尚曰く). The quotation that follows these words is a Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し) of two sentences spoken by Reverend Chuanzi, the “Boat Captain,” in a dialogue between him and his *dharma heir* Jiashan Shanhui 夾山善慧 (J. Kassan Zenne; 805–881). The Chinese original of this dialogue appears, among other places, in the biography of “Chan Master Chuanzi Decheng of Huating in Xiuzhou” in *Collated Essentials of the Five Flame Records*:

《五燈會元》汝向去直須藏身處沒蹤迹。沒蹤迹處莫藏身。吾三十年在藥山。祇明斯事。(CBETA, X80, no. 1565, p. 115, c6-7 // Z 2B:11, p. 88, c9-10 // R138, p. 176, a9-10).

For the Chinese original and English translation of the longer passage in which this exchange occurs, → Chuanzi Decheng.

² Subhūti and Vimalakīrti... Maudgalyāyana and Śāriputra (Zenkichi, Yuima... Mokuren, Shūshi 善吉維摩... 目連驚子). These four figures all express their opinions about nonduality in Chapter 9 of the *Vimalakīrti Sūtra*, entitled “Dharma Gate that Leads into Nonduality.” → “no speaking, no explaining.”

If people for themselves wish to understand this intention,
when has the flavor of salt¹ ever been inaccurate?

¹ **flavor of salt** (C. *yanwei* 鹽味; J. *enmi*). All teachings of the *buddhas* are said to be of a single flavor, just as all waters of the ocean are of a single flavor. The single flavor of the ocean is salt, while the single flavor of Buddhist teachings is *liberation*. In the present context, the point seems to be the following: just as one can only know the briny flavor of seawater by traveling to the ocean and tasting it for oneself, one can only understand the point of Chan/Zen *episodes* by gaining *awakening* oneself.