

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO (*Dai nijūni shō* 第二十二章)

ROOT CASE¹ 【本則】

第二十二祖、摩拏羅尊者、問婆修盤頭曰、何物即是諸佛菩提。尊者曰、心本性即是。師又曰、如何是心本性。尊者曰、十八界空是。師聞開悟。

The Twenty-second Ancestor, Venerable Manorahita, questioned Vasubandhu, saying, “What kind of thing is the bodhi of the buddhas?” The Venerable [Vasubandhu] replied, “It is the mind’s original nature.” The Master [Manorahita] asked again, “What is the mind’s original nature?” The Venerable [Vasubandhu] said, “The emptiness of the eighteen elements.” The Master [Manorahita] heard this and awakened.

PIVOTAL CIRCUMSTANCES 【機縁】

師は

The Master [Manorahita]²

那提國、常自在王の子なり。年三十にして婆修祖師に遇ふ。

was a man of the Country of Nadi, the son of King Everlasting Sovereign. In his thirtieth year, he encountered the ancestral teacher Vasubandhu.

婆修盤頭、

Vasubandhu,³

¹ Root Case (C. *benze* 本則; J. *honsoku*). The passage given here is a block of Chinese text, but no part of it can be found in extant Chan/Zen texts that predate the *Denkōroku*, so whatever source Keizan may be quoting is unknown.

² 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 “Twenty-second Ancestor, Manorahita”:

《景德傳燈錄》那提國常自在王之子也。年三十遇婆修祖師。(T 2076.51.213c19-20).

³ Vasubandhu (C. *Poxiupantou* 婆修盤頭; J. *Bashubanzu*). The block of text that follows this name 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-first Ancestor, Vasubandhu”:

《景德傳燈錄》行化至那提國。彼王名常自在。有二子。一名摩訶羅。次名摩拏羅。王問尊者曰。羅闍城土風與此何異。尊者曰。彼土曾三佛出世。今王國有二師化導。曰二師者誰。尊者曰。佛記第二五百年有一神力大士出家繼聖。即

行化して那提國に到る。彼王を常自在と名く。二子あり、一をば摩訶羅と名け、次をば摩拏羅と名く。王、尊者に問て曰く、羅闍の土風と此と、何ぞ異なるか。尊者曰く、彼の土は曾て三佛出世す。今、王の國に二師ありて化導せり。曰く、二師とは誰ぞ。尊者曰く、佛記したまふ、第二の五百年に一りの神力の太子あり、出家して聖を繼ぐと。即ち王の次子摩拏羅、是れ其一なり。吾徳薄しと雖も、敢て其一に當る。王曰く、誠に尊者の言ふ所の如くならば、當に此子を捨てて沙門と作すべし。尊者曰く、善哉、大王能く佛旨に遵ふ。即ち與に受具せしむ。

carrying out conversions, arrived in the Country of Nadi, where the king was named Everlasting Sovereign. The king had two children. The first was named Mahallaka, and the second was named Manorahita. The king asked the Venerable [Vasubandhu], "How do the local customs of Rājagṛha differ from those here?" The Venerable [Vasubandhu] replied, "From that land, three buddhas have appeared in the world. In your country, King, there are two masters who convert and lead." [The king] asked, "Who are the two masters?" The Venerable [Vasubandhu] said: "The Buddha made a prediction that during the second five-hundred-year period, a great being with supernatural strength would go forth from household life and succeed to the sages. King, your second child, Manorahita, is one of them. Although my virtue is meager, I dare say that I am the other one." The king said, "If matters are truly as you say, Venerable, then I should give up this child, so that he can become a śramaṇa." The Venerable [Vasubandhu] said, "Splendid! You, great King, are well in accord with the Buddha's intent." Then he had [Manorahita] receive the full precepts.

其れより以來、婆修盤頭に給仕す。有時、問て曰く、何物か是れ諸佛菩提なる。尊者曰く、心の本性即ち是なり。

After that, he [Manorahita] served Vasubandhu. Once he asked, "What kind of thing is the bodhi of the buddhas?" The Venerable [Vasubandhu] said, "It is the mind's original nature."

王之次子摩拏羅是其一也。吾雖徳薄敢當其一。王曰。誠に尊者所言。當捨此子作沙門。尊者曰。善哉大王。能遵佛旨。即與受具。(T 2076.51.213c4-12).

INVESTIGATION 【拈提】

實に學道の最初に問ふべきは即ち此問なり。謂ゆる菩提と云は道なり。故に此問の意は、如何是道と問ふなり。今の人、虚心にして法を問ふことなく、初心にして師に參ぜざる故に此問なし。若し眞實の道念あらん時、然あるべからず。先づ問ふべし。如何なるか是れ佛と。次に問ふべし。如何なるか是れ佛道と。故に今此問あり。然るに示して曰く、心の本性是なりと。尚ほ志二つなく、毫髪の蓄へなきに依て、乃ち問ふ、如何なるか是れ心の本性と。答て曰く、十八界空是なりと。時に即ち開悟す。

Truly, what one should first ask as a *student of the way* is this question. “Bodhi” means the way. Therefore, the intent of this question is to ask, “What is the way?” Because people nowadays do not inquire about the *dharma* with a mind free of preconceptions and do not approach a master with *beginner’s mind*, they do not ask this question. When one has genuine *mindfulness of the way*, one will not be like that. One should first ask, “What is this ‘buddha?’” Next one should ask, “What is this ‘way of the buddhas?’” Thus, now there is this question. However, [Vasubandhu] said, “It is the *mind’s original nature*.” Without a second thought, without waiting for even a hair’s-breadth, [Manorahita] asked, “What is this ‘*mind’s original nature*?’” [Vasubandhu] answered, saying, “The *emptiness of the eighteen elements*.” At that moment, he [Manorahita] awakened.

夫れ佛といふは即心の本性なり。本性終に知不得、見不得なり。正に是れ無上道なり。然れば心に形なく立處なし。何に況や佛といひ道といふ、皆是れ強いて名け來る。故に佛も覺知に非ず、道も所修に非ず、心も識知に非ず、此田地、境なく根なし。識何の處にか立せん。

This “buddha” is the *mind’s original nature*. *Original nature* is ultimately unknowable and unseeable. Truly, it is the *unsurpassed way*. That being the case, *mind* has no form and no place to stand. How, then, can we call it “buddha” or “way”? All these are names that do violence in their application. Thus, even “buddha” is not *perceiving and knowing*; the “way,” too, is not something *practiced*; and “mind,” likewise, is not anything that is *consciously known*. From this *standpoint*, there are no *sense objects* and no *sense faculties*. On what *locus* could *consciousness* possibly stand?

故に謂ふ、十八界空是と。然れば這箇の田地、心境と論ずること勿れ。識知と辨まふること勿れ。此に到りて諸佛、卒に形を顯はさず、妙道また修持を用ゐず。然も見聞覺知は設ひ是蹤跡なしと雖も、聲色動搖また界畔あるべきに非ず。

1 **this question** (*kono toi nari* 此問なり). That is, the question posed by Manorahita in the Root Case: “What kind of *thing* is the *bodhi* of the buddhas?”

Thus, he [Vasubandhu] spoke of “the emptiness of the eighteen elements.” Thus, with regard to *this standpoint*,¹ do not discuss it in terms of *mind and its objects*, and do not understand it as *conscious knowing*. Arriving here, the *buddhas* ultimately do not manifest any form. The wondrous way, also, does not make use of any “practicing” or “upholding.”² Furthermore, even if we suppose that *seeing, hearing, perceiving, and knowing* leave no traces, it is not the case that the vacillations of *sound and form* must have *boundary lines*.

故に謂ふ、即ち、

Thus the saying, which goes as follows:³

是即見聞非見聞、更聲色無可呈君。此中若了全無事、體用何妨分不分。

This *seeing and hearing* is not *seeing and hearing*, but there can be no further revelation of *sound and form* to you. Right here, if you realize that absolutely *nothing matters*, what could prevent the *distinguishing, or not distinguishing, of substance and function*?

實に是れ聲は宮商角徵の解を爲すこと勿れ、色は青黄赤白の會を爲すこと勿れ、見は眼光の縁とすること勿れ、聞は耳根なりと思ふこと勿れ。人人總て眼の色に對するなく、耳の聲に待するなし。若し耳の聲に類するあり、眼の色を縁するありと言はば、是れ聲にも明らかならず、又眼にも暗し。故如何となれば、若し所對の法ありと言ひ、所待の物ありと言はば、聲豈に耳に入り、色豈眼に見んや。故に空の空に合し、水の水に合するが如くならずんば、聞くことも斷へず、見ることも斷へじ。

Truly, do not try to interpret sound as “do-re-mi-fa.”⁴ Do not try to understand *form* as blue, yellow, red, and white. Do not regard vision as depend-

¹ **this standpoint** (*shako no denchi* 這箇の田地). The awakened “standpoint” (*denchi* 田地) from which Vasubandhu spoke, which is an immediate, intuitive insight into the “mind’s original nature.” Because it is not the knowing of any kind of “object” by any perceiving “subject,” what is known cannot be named; it can only be referred to as “this” (*shako no* 這箇の).

² “practicing” or “upholding” (C. *xiuchi* 修持; J. *shuji*). Many Mahāyāna sūtras end with an exhortation to “practice and uphold” the teachings contained therein.

³ **which goes as follows** (*sunawachi* 即ち). The Chinese verse that follows these words is a famous one that is attributed to Sanping Yizhong 三平義忠 (J. Sanbei Gichū; 781–872) and quoted often in Chan/Zen literature. → *Sanping Yizhong*.

⁴ “do-re-mi-fa” (C. *gong shang jiao zhi* 宮商角徵; J. *kyū shō kaku chi*). The four glyphs given here represent the first four of the five notes in the ancient Chinese pentatonic scale (C. *wusheng* 五聲; J. *gosei*); the fifth is *yu* 羽 (J. *u*).

ing on the *light of the eye*. Do not think of hearing as the *faculty of the ear*. For every single person, without exception, the eye is not set against *form*, nor does the ear wait for sound. If you say that there is classification of sound by the ear, or dependence of the eye upon *form*, you lack clarity with regard to sound, and in your eyes, too, there is darkness. Why is this so? Because if you say that there are *dharmas* that are set against [an organ of perception], or that there are *things* that are awaited [by the senses], then how could sound possibly enter the ear,¹ and how could *form* possibly be seen by the eye? Therefore, if it were not like sky blending with sky, and like water blending with water, there would be no discontinuation of hearing, and there would be no discontinuation of seeing.²

爾らざる故に眼は色に通じ、耳は聲に通ず。和融して隔てなく混合して蹤跡なし。是の如くなる故に、設ひ天を響かし地を響かす聲なりと雖も、僅かに方寸の耳に入る。豈極大は小に同きに非ずや。僅に方寸の眼を以て盡界を照す。豈極小は大に同きに非ずや。豈眼の色なるに非ずや、又聲の耳なるに非ずや。是の如く知て是の如く辨ふる。此心、界畔邊表なし。故に眼もとより得ることなし、色も分つことを得ず。

Because this is not the case, the eyes are penetrated by *form*, and the ears are penetrated by sound. Harmoniously fused, they are not separate; blended together, they leave no traces. Because things are like this, even a noise that resounds through the heavens and resounds across the earth enters the tiny

¹ **could sound possibly enter the ear** (*koe ani mimi ni iri* 聲豈に耳に入り). A rhetorical question with the assumed answer that, if the ear and sounds were truly separate *dharmas* or “*things*” (as the conceptual model of hearing “subject” and heard “object” implies), then hearing would be impossible.

² **there would be no discontinuation of hearing, and there would be no discontinuation of seeing** (*kiku koto mo taezu, miru koto mo taeji* 聞くことも断へず、見ることも断へじ). The inflection of the verb *dan* 断 (to “cut off”) indicates that it is being used as a substitute for *taeru* 絶える, meaning to “end,” “die out,” “discontinue,” or “fail.” The verb is in the imperfective form (*mizenkei* 未然形) with the negative endings *zu* ず and *ji* じ; the latter controls the former and indicates a negative speculation, so *taeji* 断へじ means “there would probably be no cutting off.” This statement is problematic, because the context leads us to expect its exact opposite: to wit, that if it were not “like water blending with water,” then hearing and seeing *would* be “cut off.” Ishikawa (p. 409) suggests that if an external sense object moves inside the bodily sense organ, then the object would become lodged there so that the sensation it generates would never end. Other commentators provide no explanation, but simply interpret this line as meaning that hearing and seeing would become impossible. The grammar, as it stands, does not support that interpretation. Perhaps some additional words were lost — ones that would turn the statement into a rhetorical question: “how could there be no discontinuation of hearing and seeing?”

square inch of the ear. Is this not a case of “the huge is identical to the small”? The tiny square inch of the eye illuminates the entire world. Is this not a case of “the tiny is identical to the large”? Is not the eye itself form? Is not the ear itself sound? Know in this way and discern in this way: this mind has no boundary lines or demarcations. Thus, the eye fundamentally has no receiving [of form], and form, too, does not receive [from the eye] any distinguishing of it.

此三科是れ皆空なるに非ずや。故に此田地に到る時、聲と説くも得たり、眼と説くも得たり、識と説くも得たり、恁麼も得たり、不恁麼も得たり、恁麼不恁麼總に得たり。纖塵の外より來るなく、毫末の隔てもてゆくなし。故に聲と説くときは、聽說聲中に辨別し、色と説く時は能所色中に安排す。更に分外底なし。

As for these three categories, are they not all empty? Hence, when you arrive at this standpoint, you will be able to explain “sound,” able to explain “seeing,” and able to explain “consciousness.” You will have grasped “such,” grasped “not such,” and grasped “such” and “not such” together. There is no coming from outside of the finest mote of dust, and there is no going¹ that amounts to even a hair’s-tip worth of separation. Therefore, when we speak of “sound,” we distinguish hearing and speaking as things that exist within sound.² When we speak of “form,” we establish subject and object within form.³ There are no further phenomena outside this purview.

然るを諸人、此道理に達せず。或は思はく、聲色は妄りに立する虚假なり、須らく拂ひ掃ふべし。本心は本來常住なり、更に變動すべからずと。尤も笑ふべし。此處、更にか變不變あらん、何物か實不實あらん。故に此事を明らめずんば、唯聲色に暗きのみに非ず、又見聞にも達せず。故に眼を擧して見ざらんと思ひ、耳を塞げて聞ざらんとす。是れ則ち無繩自縛し、穴なきに又落ちもて行。故に情塵漏、免がれ難し。然れば子細に參到して、若し底に徹して見得明白ならば、頂に徹しても到ること亦た無礙ならん。

People, nevertheless, not penetrating this principle, may think that “sound and form” are mistakenly established provisional falsehoods that should be

¹ no coming ... no going (*kuru naku... yuku nashi* 來るなく... ゆくなし). In this context, “coming” refers to external sense objects *impinging* on the sense faculties, while “going” refers to sense faculties *reaching out* to grasp sense objects.

² distinguish hearing and speaking as things that exist within sound (*chō setsu shōchū ni benbetsu shi* 聽說聲中に辨別し). In other words, we analyze “sound” (which is all that actually exists) into speaking and hearing, which are merely conceptual categories.

³ establish subject and object within form (*nō sho shikichū ni anpai su* 能所色中に安排す). In other words, we analyze “form” (which is all that actually exists) into perceiver and perceived, which are merely conceptual categories.

swept away, or think that the *original mind* is fundamentally *permanent*. How utterly laughable! In this *location*, what kind of thing is there that could possibly change or be *unchanging*? What kind of thing is there that could possibly be *real* or *unreal*? Therefore, as long as you do not clarify this matter, not only will you be in the dark about *sound and form*, but also you will never penetrate *seeing and hearing*, either. Hence, you raise your eyes and try not to see, and you plug your ears and try not to hear. In this way, you tie yourself up without a rope and fall down where there is no hole. Thus, the *contamination* of the senses and their objects is difficult to evade. Therefore, *meticulously inquire until you arrive at understanding*. If you break through to the bottom and are able to see such that things become obvious, then you will also arrive, without obstruction, at breaking through to the top.

又卑語あり、此因縁を指説せんと思ふ。聞かんと要や。

Again I have some *humble words* to give an *indication* about this episode. Do you wish to hear them?

VERSE ON THE OLD CASE 【頌古】

舜若多神非内外。見聞聲色俱虚空。

God Śūnyatā¹ has neither inside nor outside.
Seeing and hearing, sound and form: all are empty.

¹ God Śūnyatā (C. Shunruoduo Shen 舜若多神; J. Shunnyata Shin). A “god” (C. *shen* 神; J. *shin*) whose name is a transliteration of the Sanskrit term *śūnyatā*, meaning “emptiness.” He is described in the *Heroic March Sūtra* as “having no body, yet having a sense of touch.”