

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN (*Dai nijūnana shō* 第二十七章)

ROOT CASE 【本則】

第二十七祖、般若多羅尊者、因二十六祖曰、

The Twenty-seventh Ancestor was Venerable Prajñātāra. On one occasion the Twenty-sixth Ancestor [Puṇyāmītra] said,¹

汝憶往事否。師曰、我念遠劫中。與師同居。師演摩訶般若、我轉甚深修多羅。今日之事。蓋契昔因。

“Do you remember past matters or not?” The Master [Prajñātāra] said, “I recollect that in a distant *kalpa*, I had the same dwelling as you, Master. You, Master, explained *mahā-prajñā*, and I revolved the extremely profound *sūtras*.² Today’s matter no doubt tallies with past causes.”

PIVOTAL CIRCUMSTANCES 【機縁】

師は

The Master [Prajñātāra]³

東印度の人なり。

was a man of East India.

時に不如密多、

¹ said (C. *yue* 曰; J. *iwaku*). The quotation in Chinese that follows is nearly identical to one that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* under the heading “Twenty-sixth Ancestor, Venerable Puṇyāmītra” (T 2076.51.216a6-8).

² You, Master, explained *mahā-prajñā*, and I revolved the extremely profound *sūtras* (C. *Shi yan mohe bore, wo zhuan sheshen xiuduoluo* 師演摩訶般若、我轉甚深修多羅; J. *Shi wa maka hannya wo nobe, ware jinjin shutara wo tenzu* 師は摩訶般若を演べ、我れ甚深修多羅を轉ず). The expression “extremely profound *sūtra*” is used to describe a number of texts in the perfection of wisdom genre of *sūtras*, including the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* (C. *Mohe bore boluomiduo jing* 摩訶般若波羅蜜多經; J. *Maka hannya haramitta kyō*; S. *Mahā-prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra*).

³ The Master (Shi wa 師は). The sentence that begins with these words is a Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し) of an identical Chinese line that appears in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame* under the heading “Twenty-seventh Ancestor, Prajñātāra”:

《景德傳燈錄》東印度人也。(T 2076.51.216a19).

At that time, Puṇyamitra¹

東印度に到る。彼の王を堅固と名く。外道を奉じて長爪梵志を師とす。尊者、將に到らんとするに暨て、王と梵志とく白氣の上下を貫ぬくを覩る。王曰く、斯れ何の瑞ぞや。梵志、預め尊者の境に入るを知て、王の善に遷らんことを恐れ、乃ち曰く、此は是れ魔來るの兆のみ。何の瑞か之れ有らん。既に諸徒衆を鳩めて議して曰く、不如密多、將に都城に入らんとす。誰か能く之を挫かん。弟子曰く、我等各呪術あり。以て天地をも動し水火にも入るべし。何をか患へんや。尊者、至て先づ宮牆に黑氣あるを見て、乃ち曰く、小難のみ。直に王所に至る。王曰く、師來て何をか爲さんとす。尊者曰く、將に衆生を度せんとす。曰く、何の法を以て度せん。尊者曰く、各其類を以て之を度せん。時に梵志の言を聞て其怒に堪へず。即ち幻法を以て大山を尊者の頂上に化す。尊者之を指す。忽ち彼の衆の頭上に在り。梵志等、怖懼して尊者に投ず。尊者、其愚惑を愍て、再び之を指すに化山隨て滅す。乃ち王の爲めに法要を演説して、眞乘に趣かしむ。又王に謂て曰く、此國、當に聖人ありて我に繼ぐべし。是時に婆羅門の子あり、二十許、幼より父母を失て名氏を知らず。或は自ら瓔珞と言ふ。故に人、之を瓔珞童子と謂ふ。閭里に遊行し丐求して日を度る。常不輕の類の如し。人、汝行くこと何ぞ急なると問へば、即答て曰く、汝行くこと何ぞ慢なる。或は何の姓ぞと問へば、乃ち曰く、汝と同姓と。其故を知るることなし。後に王、尊者と同車して出づ。瓔珞童子の前に稽首するを見て、尊者曰く、汝往事を憶ふや否や。乃至、蓋し

¹ At that time, Puṇyamitra (toki ni Puṇyomitta 時に不如密多). 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, “Twenty-sixth Ancestor, Puṇyamitra”:

《景德傳燈錄》至東印度。彼王名堅固。奉外道師長爪梵志。暨尊者將至。王與梵志同覩白氣貫于上下。王曰。斯何瑞也。梵志預知尊者入境。恐王遷善乃曰。此是魔來之兆耳。何瑞之有。即鳩諸徒衆議曰。不如密多將入都城。誰能挫之。弟子曰。我等各有呪術。可以動天地入水火。何患哉。尊者至先見宮牆有黑氣。乃曰。小難耳。直詣王所。王曰。師來何爲。尊者曰。將度衆生。曰以何法度。尊者曰。各以其類度之。時梵志聞言不勝其怒。即以幻法化大山於尊者頂上。尊者指之忽在彼衆頭上。梵志等怖懼投尊者。尊者愍其愚惑。再指之化山隨滅。乃爲王演說法要俾趣眞乘。又謂王曰此國當有聖人而繼於我。是時有婆羅門子。年二十許。幼失父母。不知名氏。或自言瓔珞。故人謂之瓔珞童子遊行閭里勾求度日。若常不輕之類。人問汝何行急。即答云。汝何行慢。或問何姓。乃曰。與汝同姓。莫知其故。後王與尊者同車而出。見瓔珞童子稽首於前。尊者曰。汝憶往事否。曰我念遠劫中與師同居。師演摩訶般若。我轉甚深修多羅。今日之事蓋契昔因。尊者又謂王曰。此童子非他。即大勢至菩薩是也。此聖之後復出二人。一人化南印度。一人緣在震旦。四五年內却返此方。遂以昔因故名般若多羅。(T 2076.51.215c16-216a12).

昔因に契へり。尊者、又王に謂て曰く、此童子は他に非ず。即ち大勢至菩薩、是なり。此聖の後に二人を出さん。一人は南印度を化し、一人は縁、震旦に在り。四五年の内に此方に返らんと欲す。遂に昔因を以ての故に、般若多羅と名く。

arrived in East India. The king there was named Steadfast. He revered an *other path* and regarded Brahmaṇa Long Nails as his master. When the Venerable [Punyanmitra] was about to arrive there, the king and the Brahmaṇa [Long Nails] alike observed a white vapor trail that connected the sky and earth. The king said, “What kind of auspicious omen is this?” The Brahmaṇa, already knowing that the Venerable [Punyanmitra] had entered the realm, and fearing that the good favor of the king might shift [to the Buddhist monk], then said, “This is just a sign of the coming of a demon. How could it be an auspicious omen?”

Having gathered his congregations of followers, [Brahmaṇa Long Nails] consulted with them, saying, “Punyanmitra is about to enter the city. Who can crush him?” The disciples said, “We each have *incantations*, by means of which we can move heaven and earth, or enter into fire and water. What could trouble us?”

When the Venerable [Punyanmitra] arrived, he saw black vapor around the palace walls and said, “Just a small difficulty.” He proceeded directly to where the king was. The king said, “What did you come here to do, Master?” The Venerable [Punyanmitra] said, “I will work to *deliver living beings*.” [The king] said, “What method will you use to *deliver* them?” The Venerable [Punyanmitra] said, “I will *deliver* each according to his type.”

When he heard these words, the Brahmaṇa [Long Nails] could not control his anger. He then used magical techniques to conjure up a large mountain on top of the Venerable [Punyanmitra]’s head. The Venerable [Punyanmitra] pointed at it, and suddenly it was on the heads of his [the Brahmaṇa’s] congregation. The Brahmaṇa and others were frightened and surrendered themselves to the Venerable [Punyanmitra]. The Venerable [Punyanmitra], taking pity on their foolishness, pointed at it a second time, and the chimerical mountain disappeared. He then explained the *essentials of the dharma* to the king, inclining him toward the *true vehicle*. He also said to the king, “There is a sage in this country who is to succeed to me.”

At that time, there was the son of a *brahmana*, a bit over twenty, who had lost his parents while very young and did not know his given name or family. Sometimes he referred to himself as “Diadem.” Therefore people called him “Youth Diadem.” He passed his days wandering about the countryside practicing mendicancy. He was of a type with Never-Disparaging.¹ When people asked him, “Why are your actions so urgent?” he answered, “Why are your actions so leisurely?” Or, when they asked, “What is your clan?” he said, “The same clan as yours.” No one knew the reason why.

Later, the king and the Venerable [Pun̄yamitra] went out in the same chariot. When they saw Youth Diadem bowing to the ground before them, the Venerable [Pun̄yamitra] said, “Do you remember past matters or not?”...and so on, down to...² “no doubt tallies with past causes.” The Venerable [Pun̄yamitra] also said to the king, “This boy is none other than Mañāsthāmaprāpta Bodhisattva. As followers of this sage, two people will appear. One will convert people in South India, and one has a karmic connection with Cīnasthāna.³ Within four or five years, he will want to return to this region.” Thereupon, based on past causes, he [Pun̄yamitra] named him Prajñātāra.⁴

¹ **Never-Disparaging** (C. Changbūqing 常不輕; J. Jōfugyō; S. Sadāparibhūta). The name of a bodhisattva who appears in the *Lotus Sūtra*. → *Never-Disparaging*.

² **and so on, down to** (*naishi* 乃至). This expression indicates that part of this repetition of the Root Case has been elided to save space, but that the intention is to quote the entire thing.

³ **one has a karmic connection with Cīnasthāna** (*hitori wa en, Shintan ni ari* 一人は縁、震旦に在り). The reference is to the Twenty-eighth Ancestor, Bodhidharma, who was destined to transmit the Chan/Zen Lineage to China.

⁴ **based on past causes, he named him Prajñātāra** (*sekiin wo motte no yue ni, Hannyataru to nazuku* 昔因を以ての故に、般若多羅と名く). The “past causes” mentioned here are those stated in the Root Case of this chapter. That is to say, Pun̄yamitra in a former life “explained *mahā-prajñā*” while Youth Diadem, who was his acolyte in that former life, “revolved *sūtras*.” The name “Prajñātāra” is said to reflect those “past causes” because its first two glyphs derive from the *prajñā* (C. *bore* 般若; J. *hannya*) that Pun̄yamitra explained, while its final two glyphs derive from the *sūtras* (C. *xiuduoluo* 修多羅; J. *shutara*) that Youth Diadem revolved. There is also a suggestion here that the relationship between the wisdom of the Buddha and the *sūtras* that he preached is analogous to the relationship between master and disciple. From the point of view of critical scholarship, it is obvious that the “past causes” explained in the Root Case were suggested by the name “Prajñātāra,” not the other way around.

INVESTIGATION 【拈提】

夫れ傳佛心印の祖師、心地開明の聖者、或は羅漢、或は菩薩なることは、不昧本來の道なる故に、久遠成の如來なるもあり。設ひ初機後學に似たりとも、一念若し機を廻せば、本來具徳を顯はして、一毫も都て欠たることなし。如來と同共し、諸尊と和合す。一出一沒するに非ざれども、共に一隻手を出すに非ず。多種なく別條なし。

Now, the ancestral teachers who transmitted the seal of the buddha-mind, and the sages who shed light on the mind-ground, were either arhats or bodhisattvas. That is because they were not in the dark about the original way. Some had also become *tathāgatas* in the remote past.¹ Even if they seem like latecomer students with beginners' abilities,² when in a single moment of thought they return to their [former] abilities and manifest their originally endowed virtues, then they do not have even an iota of deficiency. They are together with the *tathāgatas* and in harmony with the many venerables. This is not a case of "one emerges, one submerges," nor is it a case of "together, each extending a single hand." They are not of many different kinds, nor are they separate items.

故に今日を見るは久遠を見るなり。久遠を顧りみれば今日を護るなり。汝と同生せり、我と同居せり。絲毫も離ることなく、片時も伴はずといふことなし。這箇の田地に到り得る時、古來今の法に非ず、根境識の事に非ず。故に謂ふ、嗣法は三際を超越し、證契は古今に連綿たり。是の如くなる故に金針玉線密密として串通す。子細に見來れば、何れか是我、何れか是我。織機も顯はれず、機鋒も露はすことなし。此に到りて得坐せざるなし。必ず傍らに分ち來る。

Therefore, to see the present day is to see the remote past,³ and to look back at the remote past is to protect the present day. They [the ancestral

¹ become *tathāgatas* in the remote past (*kuon jō no nyorai* 久遠成の如來). According to Tiantai (J. Tendai) school commentaries on the *Lotus Sūtra*, the awakening of the Buddha Śakyamuni was "actually attained in the remote past" (C. *jiuyuan shicheng* 久遠實成; J. *kuon jitsujō*), so his attainment of buddhahood beneath the bodhi tree after a period of ascetic training was merely a provisional reenactment performed by his "transformation body" (C. *huashen* 化身; J. *keshin*; S. *nirmāṇakāya*).

² seem like latecomer students with beginners' abilities (*shoki kōgaku ni nitari* 初機後學に似たり). That is to say, in the Pivotal Circumstances sections of the *Denkōroku* and the Chinese Chan hagiographies on which those are based, the ancestral teachers are depicted as relative novices who gain awakening only when they encounter the Chan masters who eventually recognize them as *dharma heirs*.

³ remote past (*kuon* 久遠). This is the same word that appears above, in the statement that "some [ancestral teachers] had also become *tathāgatas* in the remote past."

teachers] are born together with you, and they have the “same dwelling that I do.”¹ There is not the tiniest bit of separation from them, and not half a moment without their companionship. When you gain arrival at *this standpoint*, it is not a *dharma* of past, future, or present, and it is not a matter of *sense faculties*, *sense objects*, and *consciousness*. Therefore, it is said that *inheritance of the dharma transcends the three times*, and that *verification and tallying link together the past and present*. Because things are like this, the “golden needle and jade thread” penetrate with precision as they string things together. When you come to see in detail, then what is “other” and what is “self”? The delicate workings are not revealed, nor is the needle tip ever exposed.² Arriving here, you will not fail to obtain a seat. One to the side will surely be shared with you.³

故に適來の因縁にも、師は摩訶般若を演説し、我は甚深修多羅を轉ず。若し色清淨なれば一切智智清淨なり。異もなく別もなし。衆生即佛性なり。佛性即衆生。彼れも外物を入れず、此も内法を運ばず。兩機恁麼に分れたりと雖も、多數終に異ならず。故に般若多羅と曰ふ。上の婆舍斯多の如し。

Thus, in the aforementioned episode, too, we find: “You, Master, explained *mahā-prajñā*, and I revolved the extremely profound *sūtras*.” “If form is pure, then knowledge of everything is pure.”⁴ There is no differ-

¹ “same dwelling that I do” (*ware to dogo* 我と同居). The sentence that ends with this phrase sounds like it involves Keizan calling his audience “you” and calling himself “I,” but the phrase is a quotation of the Root Case, where Prajñātāra says, “I had the same dwelling as you, Master.”

² The delicate workings are not revealed, nor is the needle tip ever exposed (*senki mo arawarezu, kiha mo arawasu koto nashi* 纖機も顯はれず、機鋒も露はすことなし). There is a complex play on words here that is based on Wansong Xingxiu’s 萬松行秀 (J. Banshō Gyōshū; 1166–1246) commentary, in Case #44 of the *Congrong Hermitage Record*, on the verse by Hongzhi Zhengjue 宏智正覺 (J. Wanshi Shōgaku; 1091–1157) that contains the expression “golden needle and jade thread.” → “golden needle and jade thread.”

³ One to the side will surely be shared with you (*kanarazu katawara ni wakachi kuru* 必ず傍らに分ち来る). This alludes to the episode in which the Buddha invited the First Ancestor, Mahākāśyapa, to sit next to him. → share the seat.

⁴ “If form is pure, then knowledge of everything is pure” (*moshi shiki shōjō nareba issaichi chi shōjō nari* 若し色清淨なれば一切智智清淨なり). The insertion of this quotation from the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra* at this point in the text of the *Denkōroku* implies that form and the knowledge of everything relate to one another in a way that is analogous to the relationship between the revolving of *sūtras* and *prajñā*, which in turn are emblematic of the relationship between master (Puṇyamitra) and disciple (Prajñātāra).

ence, and there is no discrimination.¹ Living beings are the *buddha-nature*, and the *buddha-nature* is living beings. “That one” does not bring in any external *things*, and “this one”² does not move around any internal *dhar-mas*. Although the two functions are separated like this, for the most part there is no difference in the end. “Therefore he [Puṇyāmitra] called him Prajñātāra.”³ This is like Vasiṣṭa, as discussed above.⁴

古今分つべからず。空有豈異ならんや。故に古人曰く、此中若し了じて全く無事ならば、體用何ぞ妨げん、分不分と。虚空を借りて森羅萬像の體とすれば、一絲一毫の面目に對する底なし。森羅萬像を借て虚空の用とすれば、一絲一毫の異路なし。故に此に到て師資道傳、佛祖の印可、尚ほ多種なりと解するも、節目あるに似たり。兩般なしと會するも尚ほ是れ板漢なり。子細に驗點商量すれば、鶯鶯、雪に立て同色に非ず。明月蘆華、他に似ず。恁麼に游踐して、銀椀に雪を盛りもてゆき、明月に鶯を藏しもてゆく。

¹ **There is no difference, and there is no discrimination** (*i mo naku betsu mo nashi* 異もなく別もなし). Although couched in slightly different words, this statement echoes the text of the *Great Perfection of Wisdom Sūtra*, which repeatedly states that:

If knowledge of everything is pure, then there are no binaries, no dualities, no discrimination, and no cutting off.

《大般若波羅蜜多經》若一切智智清淨、無二、無二分、無別、無斷故。(T 220.5.1046, a2-3).

→ “If form is pure, then knowledge of everything is pure.”

² “That one”... “this one” (*kare... kore* 彼れ... 此). This combination can be interpreted as referring to the relationship between master (“that one”) and disciple (“this one”). When seen from the disciple’s point of view, the master is “external” to the disciple, whose own “internal” state needs to be changed.

³ “Therefore he called him Prajñātāra” (*yue ni Hannyatara to iu* 故に般若多羅と曰ふ). This is a repetition of the statement that appears above in the Pivotal Circumstances section: “Therefore he named him Prajñātāra” (*yue ni, Hannyatara to nazuku* 故に、般若多羅と名く), which corresponds to the Chinese original: 故名般若多羅 (T 2076.51.215a12).

⁴ **This is like Vasiṣṭa, as discussed above** (*kami no Bashashita no gotoshi* 上の婆舎斯多の如し). This refers to the line in Chapter 25 of the *Denkōroku* that reads: “Because of his previous karmic conditions, he [Siṃha] named him Vasiṣṭa” (*zen’en wo motte no yue ni Bashashita to nazuku* 前縁を以ての故に婆舎斯多と名く). As that chapter explains, Siṃha combined the name of the boy with the jewel in his clenched fist, Sita, who was to become his disciple, with the name of the youth to whom he had given a jewel in a past life, Vasi. Both Prajñātāra and Vasiṣṭa, in short, were given names by their teachers that alluded to events in their past lives.

The past and the present are not to be separated. How, then, could emptiness and existence possibly be different? Thus an ancient said:¹

“Right here, if you realize that absolutely *nothing* matters, what could prevent the distinguishing, or not distinguishing, of *substance and function*?”

If you borrow “empty space”² and regard it as the *substance* of the *luxuriant web of myriad phenomena*, then there is nothing, not one thread or one iota, which stands opposite your *face*. If you borrow the “*luxuriant web of myriad phenomena*” and regard it as the *function* of empty space, then there is not one thread or one iota of a *deviant path*. So, arriving here, if you persist in interpreting the transmission of the way of master and disciple and the seal of approval of the buddhas and ancestors as having many varieties, then it seems as if there is some system of differentiation. But if your understanding is that there is no dualism, then you are still a guy shouldering a plank. If you meticulously investigate and consider:

Egrets standing in the snow do not have the same color;³
the bright moon and the inflorescence of reeds do not resemble each other.

Roaming about in such a way, you may go on with “*filling a silver bowl with snow, hiding an egret in the bright moon*.”⁴

¹ Thus an ancient said (*yue ni kōji iwaku* 故に古人曰く). The “ancient” in question was Sanping Yizhong 三平義忠 (J. Sanbei Gichū; 781–872). The sentence that follows these words is a Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し) of the second two phrases of a famous verse attributed to him. For the entire verse and details of its provenance, → Sanping Yizhong.

² borrow “empty space” (*kokū wo karite* 虚空を借りて). To “borrow” (*kariru* 借りる) in this context means to make use of as a provisional (conventionally true) concept.

³ Egrets standing in the snow do not have the same color (*roji, yuki ni tate dōshiki ni arazu* 鶺鴒、雪に立て同色に非ず). The verse that begins with this line is a Japanese transcription of a Chinese verse attributed to Chan Master Tongan Cha 同安察 (J. Doan Satsu) in the *Jingde Era Record of the Transmission of the Flame*:

《景德傳燈錄》鶺鴒立雪非同色、明月蘆華不似他。(T 2076.51.455c15-16).

The idea is that although an egret — also called a white heron (C. *bailu* 白鶺; J. *bakuro*, *shirasagi*) — is white in color, it is still distinguishable against the background of white snow if one looks carefully. The “reeds” (*lu* 蘆; J. *ro*; Latin, *Phragmites communis*) mentioned in the second line are marsh plants that have large white tassels (C. *hua* 華; J. *ka*), an inflorescence that superficially looks like the moon.

⁴ “filling a silver bowl with snow, hiding an egret in the bright moon” (*ginwan ni yuki wo mori, meigetsu ni ro wo kakusu* 銀盃に雪を盛り、明月に鶺鴒を藏す). A line of verse from the *Jewel Mirror Samādhi*; → “silver bowl filled with snow, bright moon hiding

適來の因縁を辨別せんとするに、適ま卑語あり。大衆、聞かんと要すや。

To try to *distinguish* the aforementioned episode, I happen to have some *humble words*. Great assembly, do you wish to hear them?

VERSE ON THE OLD CASE 【頌古】

潭底蟾光空裏明。連天水勢徹昭清。再三撈漉縱知有。寬廓旁分虛白成。

The light of the pool-bottom moon-toad is bright across the sky;
connecting heavens and waters, its powerful penetration is clear and pure.
Twice or thrice, you scoop it from the water and filter it, as if you knew it
were there;
vast and open, when you lean toward one bit of it, you come up empty.

an egret.” The original Chinese saying reads: “Silver bowl filled with snow, bright moon hiding an egret” (C. *yinwan sheng xue, mingyue zang lu* 銀盃盛雪、明月藏鶩). The Japanese transcription (*yomikudashi* 読み下し) given in the *Denkōroku* slightly misconstrues the grammar of the original. This line is also quoted in Chapter 15 of the *Denkōroku*. In the present context, the verse counters the one quoted just before: “Egrets standing in the snow do not have the same color.”