

KŌANS IN THE DŌGEN TRADITION: HOW AND WHY DŌGEN DOES WHAT HE DOES WITH KŌANS

Steven Heine

Institute for Asian Studies, Florida International University

Coming Home “Empty-Handed”

According to a frequently cited passage in the *Eihei kōroku*, Dōgen returned to Japan from his travels in China in the fall of 1227 “empty-handed” (*kūshu-genkyō*), that is, without having collected the material artifacts of Buddhism—such as icons, scriptures, relics, and regalia—that preoccupied so many of the other Japanese monks who visited China.¹ Instead, he came back only with his experience of awakening and his understanding of the Dharma. As Hee-Jin Kim writes, “Unlike other Buddhists who had previously studied in China, Dōgen brought home with him no sutras, no images, and no documents. His sole ‘souvenir’ presented to his countrymen was his own body and mind, his total existence, which was now completely liberated and transformed. He himself was the surest evidence of Dharma.”²

Yet Dōgen’s literary records show that on his return he was by no means empty-headed (although he may have had a head full of emptiness). Indeed, Dōgen came back to Japan with a remarkable familiarity and facility with diverse genres of Zen writings—kōan collections, recorded-sayings texts, transmission-of-the-lamp hagiographies, and monastic regulations—which he used critically and creatively in his sermons and other works. Dōgen’s great and profound knowledge of Chinese Ch’an literature, especially kōan records, is symbolized by the legend of the “One Night Blue Cliff Record” (*ichiya Hekiganroku*) that he supposedly copied, guided and assisted by the Mount Hakusan deity, Hakusan Gongen, just before he left China. Hakusan is in the region where Eihei-ji (Eihei Temple) was established and is the “mother” peak in the sacred network of mountains that included the site for Dōgen’s temple. The question of the authenticity of the “One Night Blue Cliff Record” has been much debated. It is clear that the reporting of this event developed in Dōgen hagiographies at a rather late date, thus tending to refute the veracity of the account.³ Yet a manuscript that was for a long time kept secret and held for centuries by the Sōtō sect has been inspected by D. T. Suzuki and others in modern times. But this version differs in the sequence and some of the wording of the cases from standard versions of the text.⁴ The impact of the legend—whether or not Dōgen actually ever copied the *Blue Cliff Record*—has been to highlight the fact that Dōgen single-handedly introduced to Japan the kōan tradition. This was expressed through a variety of texts that he produced in the first half of the thirteenth century, shortly after the peak period of the creation of kōan collections in Sung China.

What is the most significant and distinctive feature of Dōgen’s use of kōans? One of the best treatments of this topic remains Kim’s essay, “The Reason of Words and

Letters': Dōgen and Kōan Language," in which he argues that Dōgen developed a realizational model of interpretation.⁵ According to Kim, Dōgen does not necessarily abandon the instrumental approach that characterizes the D. T. Suzuki presentation of the Rinzai school emphasis on kōans as a pedagogical means to the end of attaining enlightenment. Yet, the realizational model goes beyond this dimension in expressing the enlightenment experience through the use of—rather than by denying or negating—language. "In his treatment of the kōan," Kim writes, "Dōgen always posits a duality of meaning: on the one hand, he deeply appreciates the legacy of the old-paradigm kōan (*kosoku kōan*) used as an expedient to bring about enlightenment; yet he also wants to lend new significance to the realization-kōan as absolute truth dynamically present in life."⁶

I agree with some key elements of Kim's argument, particularly as it is shown that Dōgen's approach is not based on a dichotomy of zazen training versus kōan instruction, or of language used in kōan cases and the silence of enlightenment. Kim is convincing and compelling in his discussion of "linguistic experimentation and transformation . . . executed within the realizational milieu of total exertion."⁷ However, I also maintain that Kim's view is somewhat misleading because, while he emphasizes the diversity in the linguistic styles Dōgen uses in interpreting old-paradigm kōan cases, he fails to see the remarkable variety of aims and intentions underlying Dōgen's utilization of the numerous cases handled in collected sermons and related works. That is, I will show that Dōgen does not have a single, simple or uniform method of kōan interpretation, but he varies rhetorical and narrative strategies to bring out particular ideas concerning specific items of doctrine and ritual.

Before demonstrating examples of the hermeneutic diversity in Dōgen's approach, I will first provide a brief historical overview of his appropriation of kōan literature.

The Role of Kōan Interpretation in Dōgen's Thought

The real proof of Dōgen's mastery and importation of the kōan tradition of Sung China is his extensive and creative use of dozens of kōan cases throughout his collected writings, especially the *Shōbōgenzō* (collection of Japanese vernacular sermons), the *Shōbōgenzō sanbyakusoku* (collection of three hundred kōans in Chinese without commentary), the *Shōbōgenzō zuimonki* (collected evening sermons), and the *Eihei kōroku* (collected sermons in Chinese).⁸ The use of kōans by Dōgen after his return to Japan can be analyzed in terms of several stages leading up to the development of a uniquely innovative approach to kōan interpretation.⁹ One of his earliest works, the "Genjōkōan" fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō*, written as an epistle to a lay disciple from Kyushu in 1233, uses kōans in two distinctive ways. First, its title highlights the doctrine that appears in some Sung texts about the "clear-cut" (*genjō*) kōan, or the true meaning of kōans disclosed in everyday practice, although this notion is not explicitly discussed in the main body of the fascicle. Second, the "Genjōkōan" cites a relatively obscure kōan case on the relation between waving a fan and the circulation of the wind at the conclusion of the fascicle as a way of

illustrating a philosophical argument about the inseparability of daily activity and fundamental reality.

At this early juncture, Dōgen's approach to interpreting kōans was not particularly novel or unique, although one finds flashes of innovation in the *juko* or verse commentaries in the *Eihei kōroku* as well as the prose commentaries in the *Shōbō-genzō zuimonki*. The following example, "A snake appears in the relic box," is a kōan-like anecdote from the *Hsü kao-seng chuan* that Dōgen comments on to deliver a message regarding rituals and morality.

A monk was always carrying around with great reverence a golden image of the Buddha and other relics. Even when in the assembly hall or dormitory, he constantly burned incense to them and showed his respect with prostrations and offerings. One day the Zen master said, "The Buddha image and relics that you are worshiping will be of no use to you later." The monk disagreed.

The master continued, "This is the handiwork of demons. You must get rid of these items at once." The monk grew indignant and started walking off. The master called after him, "Open your box and look inside." When the upset monk stopped and looked in the box, he found a poisonous snake coiled inside.

The narrative, cited in *SZ*, volume 2, record 1 (*DZZ* 7:64), culminates in a compelling element of melodrama and surprise when the true identity of the snake is revealed to the monk. The supernatural appearance of the snake is evoked, deliberately yet ironically in *setsuwa* fashion, to defeat an attachment to a ritual that has become merely superstitious. This approach to overcoming illusion is an example of "using poison to counteract poison," to cite a prominent Zen saying about the function of kōans.

This case also has important implications for understanding the role of rituals in Zen, especially in regard to the worship of the Buddha in various halls in the monastic compound. The basic aim in the development of the Zen school's approach to religious training was a transition from devotion and worship to meditation and contemplation. There was also a transition from venerating images of the Buddha as an otherworldly symbol of enlightenment to respecting and honoring the temple abbot or master as a concrete, here-and-now, this-worldly appearance of a "living Buddha."

These transitions also involved a shift from the Buddha Hall as the primary site in the monastery to the Dharma Hall, where the master delivered his daily round of sermons. The rules attributed to Pai-chang call for eliminating the Buddha Hall from the Zen monastic compound and replacing it with the Dharma Hall alone. Dōgen's commentary is rather neutral. His own temple, Eihei-ji, had both a Buddha Hall and a Dharma Hall. Dōgen is by no means entirely dismissive of worshiping images and relics, which he admits have value in representing the power of the Buddha and delivering the devotee from the effects of evil karma. Yet he also argues, "expecting enlightenment by worshiping icons is an error that leads you into the hands of demons and poisonous snakes."

By 1240, Dōgen's unique approach became evident in many of the fascicles of

the *Shōbōgenzō*, and throughout the decade he continued to interpret in often innovative and insightful ways dozens of cases in the sermons of both the *Shōbōgenzō* and the *Eihei kōroku*. In many instances, *Shōbōgenzō* fascicles treat lesser-known or otherwise untreated passages of encounter dialogues (*kien-mondō*) cited from transmission-of-the-lamp histories as *kōan* cases, as in the “Raihaitokuzui” on “Mo-shan opens her mouth,” the “Dōtoku” on “A hermit’s ‘The mountain torrent runs deep, so the ladle is long,’” the “Sesshin sesshō” on “Tung-shan’s ‘Disclosing mind, disclosing nature,’” the “Ikkyū myōjū” on “One luminous pearl,” the “Jinzū” on “Kuei-shan turns his face to the wall,” the “Tajinzū” on “The Tripitaka monk claims to read others’ minds,” and the “Kankin” on “Chao-chou reciting the sūtras.” Dōgen’s intensive discussions of previously obscure cases, or cases beyond the scope of the standard Sung *kōan* collections, expand the definition and the range of what constitutes *kōan* records. Dōgen was eager to introduce the lexicon of Chinese Ch’an literature so quickly and dramatically at this critical juncture in the history of Zen Buddhism in Japan, and he took the liberty of selecting encounter dialogues that he considered particularly relevant for his audience.

At the same time, as a result of this, Dōgen’s texts served not just as a repository of both well-known and lesser-known *kōans*. Perhaps the major feature of Dōgen’s approach to interpretation is his vigorous and sustained effort to modify the rhetorical and narrative structures of numerous *kōans* and thereby to alter the outcome of these cases. For example, according to Dōgen, Huang-po did not deserve to slap Pai-chang in the epilogue to the “fox *kōan*,” Ma-tsu was correct in sitting still to become a Buddha in “polishing a tile,” and Hui-k’o’s response was not superior to the other disciples of the first patriarch in “Bodhidharma’s ‘skin, flesh, bones, marrow.’” Dōgen’s hermeneutic method lessens the gap between the case seen as a textual paradigm and the interpretive process, as well as between the winner and the loser of the encounter. His approach, which turns the structure of cases upside down and inside out, does violence to conventional readings. This parallels the slapping, shouting, cutting, and leaping that characterize *kōan* narratives, and thereby extends and refines the game of one-upmanship that lies at the root of encounter-dialogical situations.¹⁰ For Dōgen, the loser may well be the winner and the winner often wins by losing, yet losing is not really winning. Or, the winner may really lose by winning, or no one either wins or loses—in the end, either no contestant, or at the other extreme everyone involved, is at once both correct and/or incorrect.

An example of Dōgen’s method is his reading of “Huang-po’s single staff,” cited in *MS* case 91 (*DZZ* 5 : 172) and also included in the *Lang-yen yü-lu*, which is based on the symbolism of the Zen staff. According to this case, Huang-po said while giving instructions to the assembly, “The ancient Venerables of all directions are all located on the tip of my staff,” and one of the monks prostrated himself. Some time later, this monk went to the place where Ta-shu was staying and told him about what Huang-po had said. Master Ta-shu remarked, “Huang-po may have said that, but has he actually met all the Venerables in the ten directions?” The monk returned to Huang-po and told him about Ta-shu’s comment. Huang-po reaffirmed his position: “What I previously said has already become famous throughout the world.”

Then, some time later, Master Lang-yen remarked, “Ta-shu seemed to have excellent perception but he was really blind. The single staff of Huang-po could not be broken even if everyone in the world chewed on it.” In other words, Lang-yen is skeptical of Ta-shu’s critique of Huang-po. However, in *EK*, volume 1, record 12 (*DZZ* 3 : 10), in his characteristic approach of rewriting encounter dialogues the way he feels they could or should have developed, Dōgen challenges and suggests reversing Lang-yen’s critical comments. Agreeing with Ta-shu, Dōgen asks, “Why didn’t Lang-yen say, ‘Huang-po’s staff can be broken as soon as everyone in the world sets about trying to break it?’”

When Dōgen intercedes and alters the rhetoric or the narrative of a kōan in order to reinterpret drastically the outcome of the case, what is the underlying point he is trying to make about what kōans mean, and what are the techniques he uses to make his argument? What is the relation between his style or methods and the conclusions or aims of his interpretation? Does he, in the final analysis, support a position of radical relativism and the indecipherability of truth claims? An analysis of various examples of Dōgen’s strategies indicates that there does not appear to be a single, underlying aim or agenda, such as a promoting a philosophy of relativism. Rather, he reinterprets kōans to support several different didactic and metaphysical positions concerning the doctrines, rituals, and practices of Zen monastic life.

Rhetorical and Narrative Strategies of Interpretation

Dōgen uses a variety of strategies to alter the rhetorical and/or narrative structure of kōans in order to provide a way to diverge from the conventional interpretations of the case. The most extreme example is when Dōgen deftly rewrites the case of Ma-tsu polishing the tile. In the original version in *CCL*, volume 5, Ma-tsu appears to be struggling to gain enlightenment when he is criticized by his teacher Nan-yüeh for prolonged sitting in meditation, which is likened to the attempt to make a mirror by polishing a tile. But in Dōgen’s version in *MS* case 83 and *KS* “Kokyō” (*DZZ* 1 : 237–239), he is already enlightened at the time of their conversation. This reverses the traditional view that Ma-tsu is foolhardy in his vain effort to sit in zazen, an approach that emphasizes sudden awakening and the futility of continual cultivation. According to Dōgen, “When polishing a tile becomes a mirror, Ma-tsu becomes a Buddha. When Ma-tsu becomes a Buddha, Ma-tsu immediately becomes Ma-tsu. When Ma-tsu becomes Ma-tsu, zazen becomes zazen. That is why the tradition of making a mirror by polishing a tile has been perpetuated through the bones and marrow of the ancient Buddhas. That being the case, there is an ancient mirror (*kokyō*) by virtue of the act of polishing [a tile].” Dōgen’s rewriting of the case justifies his emphasis on the practice of just-sitting as the unity of practice-cultivation (*shushō ittō*), and his method illustrates the interconnectedness of interpretive style and substance, as well as philosophy and polemics.

Dōgen uses two main rhetorical techniques: (1) atomization, which involves breaking down key passages into their basic linguistic components of individual kanji or kanji compounds and analyzing or rearranging the lexical components of

speech,¹¹ and (2) capping phrases (*jakugo*), which is the composition of brief, pithy, and allusive commentaries on particular words or passages in kōan cases.¹² An example of a capping phrase is a two-line *kanbun* verse Dōgen wrote as a comment on the contradictory sayings attributed to Ma-tsu in two kōans dealing with the doctrine of Mind as an indicator of fundamental reality, one asserting that “Mind itself is Buddha” and the other offering the negation “No Mind, no Buddha” (*WMK* cases 30 and 33). According to Dōgen’s verse (*EK* 10.63c):

“Mind itself is Buddha”—difficult to practice, but easy to explain
“No mind, no Buddha”—difficult to explain, but easy to practice.

The method of atomization is seen in several prominent *Shōbōgenzō* fascicles, especially “*Sesshin sesshō*,” “*Shinfukatoku*,” “*Sokushin zebutsu*,” and “*Muchū setsu-mu*.” In this approach Dōgen twists and turns the meaning of words by taking them out of their original context and then isolating and changing or reversing their meaning, following this by reinserting them back into the kōan narrative now seen in a new conceptual light. A key example focuses on a case known as Tung-shan’s “*Disclosing mind, disclosing nature*,” in which Tung-shan reveals an affinity with death. This kōan is included in Dōgen’s *MS* case 62 (*DZZ* 5 : 158–160) and is also the basis of an entire *Shōbōgenzō* fascicle, *KS* “*Sesshin sesshō*” (*DZZ* 1 : 449–456). The kōan record revolves around several subtle wordplays. One time, when Tung-shan was traveling with Shen-shan Seng-mi, whose name literally means “mountain god,” he pointed to a roadside temple and said, “There is someone inside the temple who is disclosing mind, and disclosing nature.” The way this transpires suggests a mysterious intuition that connects Tung-shan to the preacher in the chapel. The term used for “disclosing” (*setsu*) can also be translated as “explaining,” “preaching,” or “giving discourse,” and the terms “mind” (*shin*) and “nature” (*shō*) are often used interchangeably to refer to the fundamental level of reality.

Shen-shan responds, “Who is it?” This could be interpreted as a simple, innocent question—or it could also be rendered as a philosophical declarative “It is who.” Tung-shan then says, “When I just heard your simple question, elder brother, I attained a state of perfect death,” indicating a condition of deep meditation beyond the dichotomy of life and death. Shen-shan asks, “Who is disclosing mind, and disclosing nature?” This again could be understood as a declarative, “The one disclosing mind and disclosing nature is who.” In response to the question Tung-shan says, “It is he who is alive within the realm of death.”

In his extensive commentary on this relatively obscure case, Dōgen continues the wordplay through an atomization that divides the act of disclosure into four categories represented by his characteristic literary technique of changing the order of characters in a four-character phrase: “disclosing mind of no person,” “no person disclosing mind,” “disclosing mind is itself the person,” and “this person itself is disclosing mind.” Basing his argument largely on a sectarian agenda, Dōgen praises the handling of Shen-shan’s questions by Tung-shan (one of the founders of his Sōtō lineage) and criticizes Lin-chi (founder of the rival Rinzaï sect) for misrepresenting a

duality between mind as representative of evanescent individuality and nature as symbolic of substantive universality.

Dōgen's approach to altering the narrative structure of kōans often involves interceding in or extending the original narrative as well as presenting a demythological interpretation of supernatural elements in the narrative. An example of interceding in the narrative structure is found in Dōgen's interpretation of the following case, "A Hermit's 'The mountain torrent runs deep, so the ladle is long':

A monk built a hermitage at the foot of Mount Hsüeh-feng and lived there for many years practicing meditation but without having his head shaved. Making a wooden ladle, the solitary monk drew and drank water from a mountain torrent.

One day, a monk from the monastery at the top of the mountain visited the hermit and asked, "What is the meaning of Bodhidharma's coming from the West?" The hermit responded, "The mountain torrent runs deep, so the handle of a wooden ladle must be appropriately long." The monk reported this to the master of Hsüeh-feng Temple who declared, "He sounds like a strange character, perhaps an anomaly. I'd better go at once and check him out for myself."

The next day, Master Hsüeh-feng went to see the hermit while carrying a razor and was accompanied by his attendant monk. As soon as they met he said, "If you can express the Way, I won't shave your head." On hearing this, the hermit at first was speechless. But then he used the ladle to bring water to have his head washed, and Hsüeh-feng shaved the hermit's head.

Verse Commentary

If someone asks the meaning of Bodhidharma coming from the West,
It is that the handle of a wooden ladle is long, and the mountain torrent runs deep;
If you want to know the boundless meaning of this,
Wait for the wind blowing in the pines to drown out the sound of koto strings.

This kōan is cited in *EK*, volume 9, case 71 (*DZZ* 4:230), and it is also included in *MS* case 183 (*DZZ* 5:218). Although it does not appear in the major Sung kōan collections, the case is contained in a wide variety of sources including transmission-of-the-lamp records, especially the *Tsung-men t'ung-yao chi*, volume 8, and the *Tsung-men lien-teng hui-yao*, volume 3, as well as the *Cheng-fa yen-tseng* (Jpn. *Shōbōgenzō*) kōan collection of master Ta-hui. In addition to citing it in the *EK* and *MS* collections, Dōgen discusses the case in several *KS* fascicles, including "Gyōji," "Bodaisatta shishōbō," and especially "Dōtoku."

In an extensive discussion in the *Shōbōgenzō* "Dōtoku," Dōgen characteristically alters the significance of the hermit's status by remarking that Hsüeh-feng should not and would not have asked or expected the irregular practitioner to "express the way" (*dōtoku*) unless he already knew that the hermit was enlightened. Unlike his interpretation of a case, cited below, in which he asserts the literal meaning of the dialogue that refutes the Tripitaka monk's supranormal powers, this time Dōgen reverses the literal standpoint in both the *EK* verse commentary and the *KS* prose commentary by arguing that the hermit should not be considered a *pratyeka*

Buddha and should be acknowledged for his authentic spiritual status. Although Dōgen accepts the hermit's authenticity, he also agrees that the silent response indicates the superiority of Hsüeh-feng despite the hermit's considerable spiritual attainment. Hsüeh-feng earns the right to test and domesticate the hermit. The *EK* verse commentary steers from endorsing or disputing the spiritual powers of the irregular practitioner, who has been adopted through the master's administration of the tonsure into the legitimate Zen lineage.

Another approach to altering the narrative structure is the technique of demythologization, which changes the focus and direction of the reading of the text. This approach is seen in Dōgen's interpretation of "Kuei-shan turns his face to the wall," another rather obscure kōan that became the basis for a lengthy discussion in the *Shōbōgenzō*. The original case deals with the interpretation of a master's dream by two disciples:

Kuei-shan was lying down one day when he was approached by Yang-shan with a question. The master, still lying down, turned his back to Yang-shan. Yang-shan asked, "Why do you behave like that with one of your disciples?" As the master started to stand up, Yang-shan went to leave the room. The master called out, and Yang-shan turned his head. The master said, "Let me tell you about a dream. Please listen." Yang-shan lowered his head and listened to the master's dream. The master said, "Please interpret the dream for me." Yang-shan took a bowl of water and a towel to the master. The master scrubbed his face, and then sat for a while.

Then Hsiang-yen came into the room. The master said, "Just now Yang-shan demonstrated a supreme ability in supranormal powers. This ability is not like that of the Hinayanists." Hsiang-yen said, "I was in the other room, but I clearly perceived this." The master said, "Now it's your turn to interpret." Hsiang-yen made a cup of tea and brought it to the master.

Then the master said, "You two disciples have supranormal powers that are beyond the abilities of Sariputra and Maudgalyayana."

This kōan, which was contained in *CCL*, volume 9 (*TSD* 51:265c), and other transmission-of-the-lamp records such as the *Tsung-men t'ung-yao chi*, volume 4, and *Tsung-men lien-teng hui-yao*, volume 7, is cited in *MS* case 61 (*DZZ* 5:158), and it is also discussed extensively in the *KS* "Jinzū" fascicle (*DZZ* 1:392–402). Unlike other kōans, such as "The sermon from the third seat" (*WMK* 25 and *TJL* 90), in which Yang-shan's dream of bodhisattva realms is fanciful and mythical, the dream imagery here has an esoteric quality. The dream of Kuei-shan that Yang-shan is asked to interpret becomes the basis for a possible intuitive, occult connection between master and disciple, who are especially known for their strong emotional attachment as the core members of the Kuei-Yang house or lineage. The content and nature of the dream itself is never disclosed, and this heightens the sense of mystery and uncertainty surrounding the oneiric experience as well as Yang's interpretation of it.

The challenge and responses, however ironic, occur in the context of a tradition in which it was taken for granted that masters and disciples enjoyed a distinctive intuitive bond. In some of the more prominent examples, second patriarch Hui-k'ō

was led to find Bodhidharma by the vision of a spirit, Chü-chih established his connection with the master who taught him the One Finger method through a dream, and Dōgen was led to discover his mentor in China by a dream that took place at a time of disillusionment when he was on the verge of returning prematurely to Japan. Yet, in the *KS* “Jinzū,” Dōgen offers a thoroughly demythological interpretation of the current case by arguing that the so-called supranormal powers are minor abilities compared to the genuine mystical insight of a disciple receiving transmission into the teachings of his master. Dōgen evokes the saying attributed to Layman P’ang that genuine supranormal powers are nothing other than “carrying water and chopping wood.”

The case of “Te-shan and the woman selling rice cakes” is an example of an interpretation at once extending the narrative structure and atomizing the rhetorical structure. The case deals with Te-shan’s comeuppance at the hands of an elderly laywoman:

Te-shan was traveling to the south in search of the Dharma when he came across a woman on the roadside selling refreshments and asked, “Who are you?” She responded, “I am an old woman selling rice cakes.” He said, “I’ll take some rice cakes.” She said, “Venerable priest, why do you want them?” He said, “I am hungry and need some refreshments” (Chin. *tien-hsin*, Jpn. *ten-shin*).

She said, “Venerable priest, what are you carrying in your bag?” He said, “Haven’t you heard I am ‘King of the *Diamond Sūtra*? I have thoroughly penetrated all of its levels of meaning. Here I have my notes and commentaries on the scripture.”

Hearing this the old woman said, “I have one question. Venerable priest, may I ask it?” He said, “Go ahead and ask it.” She stated, “I have heard it said that according to the *Diamond Sūtra*, past mind is ungraspable (Chin. *hsin-p’u-hua-te*, Jpn. *shinfukatoku*), present mind is ungraspable, and future mind is ungraspable. So, where is the mind (*hsin/shin*) that you wish to refresh (*tien/ten*) with rice cakes? Venerable priest, if you can answer, I will sell you a rice cake. But if, venerable priest, you cannot answer, I will not sell you any rice cake.”

Te-shan was struck speechless, and the old woman got up abruptly and left without selling Te-shan a single rice cake.

This kōan is cited in the prose commentary section of *PYL* case 4 (*TSD* 48:143b–144c), and it is discussed as the main topic of the *KS* “Shinfukatoku” fascicle (*DZZ* 1:82–86) on the “Ungraspable Mind.” Dōgen’s commentary tries to reverse the conventional understanding by criticizing the woman as well as Te-shan. Dōgen points out that while Te-shan thought that he was “checking out” the old woman, it turned out that she had checked him out and found him wanting. He challenges Te-shan for not asking in response to her query, “I cannot answer your question, what would you say?” But Dōgen then suggests that she should have said, “Venerable priest, if you cannot answer my question, try asking me a question to see if I can answer you.” He is quite critical of the old woman as well as those who automatically praise her handling of Te-shan. According to Dōgen, it is not clear that the woman is enlightened—she is a marginal figure who can challenge Zen monks, but should not be considered the equal of a Zen master. Dōgen seems particularly

reluctant to sanction the authority of a laywoman, although in his interpretation in “Raihaitokuzui” he praises a nun and attacks monks who deny the abilities of legitimately ordained women.

Through a combination of atomization and narrative extension, Dōgen argues that Te-shan should have said, “If you say so, then don’t bother to sell me any rice cakes.” Or, to be even more effective, he could have turned the tables on the woman by inquiring, “As past mind is ungraspable, present mind is ungraspable, and future mind is ungraspable, where is the mind (*hsin*) that now makes the rice cakes used for refreshment (*tien*)?” Then, the woman would confront Te-shan by saying, “You know only that one cannot refresh the mind with a rice cake. But you do not realize that the mind refreshes the rice cake, or that the mind refreshes [or liberates] the mind.” And just as Te-shan is feeling overwhelmed and bewildered she would continue, “Here is one rice cake each for the past ungraspable mind, the present ungraspable mind, and the future ungraspable mind.” If he should fail to reach out his hand to take the rice cakes, she should slap him with one of the cakes and say, “You ignorant fool, don’t be so absent-minded.” Dōgen concludes by arguing, “Therefore, neither the old woman nor Te-shan were able to hear or express adequately the past ungraspable mind, the present ungraspable mind, or the future ungraspable mind.” Yet, despite Dōgen’s playful, probing critique of the old woman, it seems clear that she has prevailed over the monk with one of the most effective puns in the history of Zen literature that is replete with diverse styles of wordplay.

On Reinterpreting the Outcome of Kōan Narratives

In reinterpreting and reversing the conventional reading of the kōan cases, what is Dōgen’s point? Does he espouse an underlying philosophy of relativism, in which the outcome of every case can invariably be examined from diverse perspectives with no clear winner in the contest, or do we find a different approach advocated for each of the cases, so that in some instances a winner can be upheld although this may vary from the conventional view? In other words, does Dōgen’s approach to kōans have a single main agenda or a variable series of references?

My analysis suggests that Dōgen’s approach can be understood in terms of two overriding and interrelated themes: (1) didactic concerns with moral and ritual issues in the monastic system including communal labor, asceticism, continual cultivation, gender, and the role of scriptures and sermons, and (2) metaphysical concerns with crafting a doctrine of nonduality or the equalization of all views based on the notions of emptiness and the use of expedient pedagogical means. Some of the conclusions Dōgen seeks to show are evident in the cases cited above—for example, his support for an irregular practitioner, his critique of the female opponent of Te-shan, his advocacy of demythology, and his refutation of a reliance on silence over scriptures. The cases cited below reveal more fully diverse components of Dōgen’s approach to reinterpreting the outcome of encounter dialogues.

A key example of didacticism is found in Dōgen’s interpretation of an obscure

case, “Nan-ch’üan sweeping on a mountain,” emphasizing a “let us cultivate our garden” ethic that evokes Pai-chang’s “no work, no food” injunction:

One day Nan-chüan was doing his chores and sweeping on the mountain. A monk approached him and asked, “Tell me the way to get to Mount Nan-chüan.” Nan-chüan raised his sickle and said, “I bought this for thirty cents.” The monk retorted, “I did not ask about the price of the sickle. What I asked about was the path to Mount Nan-chüan.”

Nan-chüan said, “Now, let me get back to chopping down weeds.”

Verse Commentary

The novice came and went on Mount Nan-chüan,
But, in trying to reach the peak, he had a wonderful experience,
He heard Nan-chüan’s remark about the sickle and it affected him deeply,
We should keep listening to this dialogue for years to come.

This kōan appears in *EK*, volume 9, case 81 (*DZZ* 4:238). It focuses on the importance of communal labor in the self-definition of the Southern school during its formative period in T’ang China. A wandering monk—referred to in the verse commentary as a “novice” (literally “water and clouds”)—sees Nan-chüan and, apparently without recognizing him, asks the way to the master’s mountain. His asking for the mountain means the same as if he were asking for the person. The monk does not expect that an abbot would be engaged in manual labor, and so he does not realize that he has just met the master he is looking for. When the monk does not get the point of Nan-chüan’s initial response that emphasizes the importance of working hard with simple tools, the master dismisses the wanderer and gets back to his chore of chopping down weeds. Note that the master’s indirect reproach is not the kind of harsh verbal or physical reprimand one might expect, and Dōgen’s verse commentary suggests that the monk probably did have an experience of sudden awakening stemming from this encounter.

Dōgen’s highlighting of yet another obscure kōan, “Hsüan-sha’s ‘One luminous pearl,’” focuses on the role of an irregular monk and the issue of demythologization in a case characterized by the winning of a game of one-upmanship over paradoxical expressions by a forest ascetic:

A priest asked master Hsüan-sha Tsung-i of Fu-chou district, “I have heard that you often say, ‘The whole universe in ten directions is one luminous pearl.’ How are we to understand the meaning of this?” Hsüan-sha replied, “The whole universe in ten directions is one luminous pearl. What is the point in trying to understand the meaning?”

The next day Hsüan-sha asked the priest, “The whole universe in ten directions is one luminous pearl. How do you understand the meaning of this?” The priest said, “The whole universe in ten directions is one luminous pearl. What is the point in trying to understand the meaning of this?”

Hsüan-sha taunted him, “I see you have been struggling like a demon in the cave of a black mountain.”

This kōan is cited in *MS* case 15 (*DZZ* 5:132), and it is also included with extensive commentary in the *KS* “Ikkyū myōjū” fascicle (*DZZ* 1:76–81). According to traditional accounts, Hsüan-sha throughout his career wore a patched robe made of

coarse fiber that he mended but never replaced. With a minimum of formal training he eventually became the successor of Hsüeh-feng and was known for his single-method teaching based on the phrase “one luminous pearl,” which means that there is a jewel amid the dusty world of saṃsāra or that the samsaric world itself has a bright, jewel-like quality. The reference to the cave of demons, whether implying supernaturalism or anti-supernaturalism, or praise or criticism of the monk’s attitude, must be understood in terms an awareness that caves were the likely lair of Hsüan-sha, the forest ascetic. Dōgen’s *KS* demythological prose commentary stresses a nondual outlook that legitimates the irregular practitioner, as in “Dōtoku” and *EK* 9.71, by asserting, “Forward steps and backward steps in a demon’s black mountain cave are nothing other than ‘one luminous pearl.’”

In his interpretation of the obscure “Nan-chüan is greeted by the Earth-deity,” Dōgen employs both a demythologization and a re-mythologization to argue for the need for continuing practice in a sectarian context:

Nan-chüan happened to be traveling through a vegetable garden when the monk charged with stewarding the garden came prepared to greet him. Nan-chüan said, “I usually travel without being noticed. How is it that you were prepared to receive me?” The monk replied, “Because last night the Earth-deity [or protector-spirit of the monastery compound] informed me you would be coming by.”

Nan-chüan said, “I must be lacking in the power of spiritual cultivation. That is the only explanation for why the Earth-deity saw me.” The monk said, “But you have already attained great wisdom. I do not understand why the Earth-deity could have seen you coming.”

Nan-chüan thought, “I’d better go and make an offering of rice to the Earth-deity.”

Verse Commentary

He once traveled freely, his presence unnoticed by others;
 He could not be distinguished from a god or demon;
 But finally caught, he confessed that he had lost his spiritual power,
 Though in the beginning his comings and goings were far from any crowd.

This *kōan*, originally contained in several of the transmission-of-the-lamp records including *CCL*, volume 8 (*TSD* 51 : 257c), is cited in *EK*, volume 9, case 63 (*DZZ* 4 : 224). This case appears in the record of master Hung-chih (*TSD* 48 : 34b), the original compiler of the cases that appear in the *TJL* collection. It is also included in *MS* case 19 (*DZZ* 5 : 134), and is discussed extensively in Dōgen’s *KS* “Gyōji,” part 1 (*DZZ* 1 : 145–170).

The discursive function of the case, whether mythological or demythological, lies in the context in which it is cited and interpreted. For example, when used in transmission-of-the-lamp texts such as the *CCL* it contributes to the genealogy of the master by establishing the authenticity of his credentials. The case is also mentioned in Dōgen’s “Gyōji” fascicle, the closest his *Shōbōgenzō* writings come to the transmission-of-the-lamp genre. He retells the history of his lineage in light of the doctrine of “sustained zazen practice” (*gyōji*), which has the spiritual power to support Buddhas and sentient beings, heaven and earth, self and other. Early in the

fascicle, Dōgen refers to masters Ching-ching and I-chang as being notable because they cannot be perceived by the native gods. Then he contrasts Nan-chüan, who has been spotted, with Hung-chih, before whom a local deity is literally stopped in its tracks. The god's feet will not budge, recalling the "immovable robe" in the legend of Hui-neng's escape from his opponents in *WMK* in case 23.

On the one hand, Dōgen seems to be scoring a sectarian point on behalf of Hung-chih, a predecessor of his mentor Ju-ching, while denigrating a master from a rival Rinzai lineage. Up to this stage, Dōgen is operating within, although at the same time refashioning, the standard mythological framework. But he then rationalizes demythology by commenting that the real meaning of being seen or not seen lies not in supranormal power in the literal sense but in the perpetuation of authentic discipline. This requires an ongoing process of detachment from, or casting off, conventional pursuits. Yet even Dōgen's turn to an anti-supernatural interpretation reveals an assumption of the efficacy of the indigenous spirit world. His verse commentary in the *EK* version is basically noncommittal about—but certainly does not deny—the issue of supernaturalism.

In highlighting and interpreting "Mo-shan opens her mouth," Dōgen returns to the issue of gender as also seen in "Shinfukatoku," discussed above, and "Kankin," discussed below. The case emphasizes the role of a female practitioner who appears superior in both rank and wisdom to her male disciple:

Chih-hsien was sent by his master, Lin-chi, to study with Mo-shan. On their first meeting she asked, "Where have you come from?" Chih-hsien answered, "The Mouth of the Road" (the literal meaning of the name of his village). Mo-shan retorted, "Then why didn't you close your mouth when you came here?" Chih-hsien prostrated himself and became her disciple.

Some time later he challenged her by asking, "What is the Summit of the Mountain" (the literal meaning of the name Mo-shan)? She replied, "The Summit of the Mountain cannot be seen." "Then who is the person on the mountain?" he demanded. "I am neither a male nor a female form," she responded. "Then," he asked, "why not transfigure into some other form?" "Since I am not a fox spirit, I cannot transfigure."

Once again Chih-hsien bowed and decided to serve as supervisor of Mo-shan's temple garden for three years, proclaiming her teaching the equal of [that of] Lin-chi.

This *kōan*, which originally appeared in *CCL*, volume 11 (*TSD* 51 : 289a), is cited in the *KS* "Raihaitokuzui" fascicle (*DZZ* 1 : 302–315), and it is also included in abbreviated fashion in Dōgen's *EK*, volume 9, case 32 (*DZZ* 4 : 202). There are other versions of the narrative in various transmission-of-the-lamp records that have different outcomes and ways of treating the question of whether the monk in the end defers to the authority and superiority of the nun, whose wisdom is expressed in ingenious wordplay.¹³

Dōgen devotes a complete fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō* to the case of Mo-shan and related anecdotes about the role of nuns. While he is critical of some of the Zen grannies who are lay and perhaps occult practitioners, as in his commentary on Te-shan and the rice cake, he defends Mo-shan, who is ordained, and severely attacks monks who reject the authority of women as "ignorant fools who deceive

and delude secular people” and therefore “can never become bodhisattvas.” Dōgen comments that he was struck by the “skin, flesh, bones, marrow” transmission story of first patriarch Bodhidharma, who interviewed four people, including a woman, before selecting his successor by transmitting his marrow, and Dōgen supports Mo-shan’s authority.

However, several factors call into question whether Dōgen is entirely consistent in his acceptance of a lineal model for women. First, in other fascicles, particularly “Shukke kudoku,” written late in his career, he tends to consider nuns unequal to men. Also, even in “Raihaitokuzui,” he makes ironic references that may undercut his support for women. For example, he announces that legitimate teachers can be found “whether man or woman, ancient or modern, stone pillars or shapeshifting foxes.”

One of Dōgen’s favorite cases, “Pai-chang meditates on Ta-hsiung peak,” is used as a vehicle to enunciate his own views on monastic rituals, especially the priority of sermons:

A monk asked Pai-chang, “What is the most extraordinary thing?” Pai-chang said, “Sitting alone on Ta-hsiung Peak.” The monk bowed, and Pai-chang hit him.

This case is cited in *PYL* 26 (*TSD* 48:166c–167b), and it gained prominence because it served as a topic for important commentaries by Dōgen and his Chinese mentor Ju-ching. Ju-ching reconsidered the leading query and rewrote the response as, “It is only to eat rice in a bowl at Ching-tsu-ssu Temple on Mount T’ien-t’ung.” He thereby shifted the focus from solitary zazen to everyday activities, as well as from Mount Pai-chang to his own mountain temple.

Dōgen reflected on this case at least five times in his works. In the earlier writings, the *KS* “Kajō” and “Ho-u,” he cites Ju-ching’s comments approvingly. But during a later sermon, Dōgen spontaneously rewrote the case by raising his staff, then throwing it down, and stepping off the dais. In *EK* 2.148 from 1245, he comments on the value of wielding the Zen stick, which metaphorically encompasses all aspects of reality. According to the record of the sermon, “Dōgen said, ‘I would answer by raising high my stick at Daibutsu Temple in Japan,’ and he put the stick down and stepped off the dais.” Several years later, he again rewrote the case with the remark that the most extraordinary thing is delivering sermons at Eihei Temple. In *EK* 5.378 he says, “I [Eihei abbot] will go to the lecture hall today.” Finally, in *EK* 6.443, from 1251, he asserts, “It is attending *jōdō* sermons on Kichijōzan.” This is intriguing in that Dōgen is primarily known for his emphasis on zazen meditation through the doctrine of “just sitting” (*shikan taza*) rather than for delivering sermons, whereas Pai-chang is known for stressing sermons in his monastic-rules text, which makes little mention of the need for sitting meditation. On the other hand, Dōgen often praised Ju-ching for his charismatic sermons, and Dōgen himself gave night-time sermons that became the *KS* “Kōmyō” and “Shohō jisso” fascicles.

While the *kōans* discussed above focus on moral issues such as communal labor, continuing practice, and attitudes regarding gender, Dōgen’s reading of “The Tripitaka monk claims to read others’ minds” delivers a message about the role of

supranormal powers in monastic life and also points to a philosophical doctrine of relativism:

The Tripitaka master Ta-erh came to the capital all the way from India and proclaimed, "I have the Dharma-eye that reads others' minds." Emperor Tai-tsung ordered the National Teacher Hui-chung to put him to a test. When the Tripitaka monk saw the National Teacher he at once bowed and stood to his right side.

The National Teacher said, "Do you have the power to read others' minds?" The monk responded, "No, far from it." "Tell me where I am right now." "You are a National Teacher. How can you see the boat race in the West River?"

This kōan, which originally appeared in *CCL*, volume 5 (*TSD* 51 : 244a), is cited in Dōgen's *EK*, volume 9, case 27 (*DZZ* 4 : 198–200), and it is also the main subject of the *KS* "Tajinzū" fascicle (*DZZ* 2 : 41–252). Dōgen refutes what evolved as the typical interpretation—which seems to reverse the overt meaning of the dialogue—that the Tripitaka monk's first two answers are actually correct and that even the silent response in the third part of the dialogue may be considered acceptable. Dōgen considers several commentaries by leading masters that justify why the Tripitaka master was silent at the end of the encounter. For example, he discusses Chao-chou's remark that the Tripitaka monk did not see the National Teacher in the third question because the master "was standing right on the monk's nostrils" and was therefore too close to be perceived. He also considers another comment that the National Teacher had gone into a state of samādhi or profound absorption and was imperceptible to the monk. According to Dōgen, all of these are convoluted ways of trying to reconcile the monk's inability, and he returns to a literal reading of the case.

Dōgen maintains an iconoclastic view with several components. According to Dōgen, supranormal powers do not lead to and are not really the result of enlightenment, and therefore they are not comparable in merit to everyday activities and simple chores, such as chopping down weeds. Also, reading minds is symbolic of intuitive insight, which is beyond having or not having powers, and knowing about others is actually based on self-knowledge. Therefore, reading the mind of another can only take place on the basis of "reading one's own mind" (*jijintsū*), or realizing one's true nature. The first two lines of Dōgen's verse commentary refer to similar situations of mind reading in other Zen dialogues or Chinese Buddhist anecdotes, and the final lines reiterate the National Teacher's critique of Ta-erh as someone who is fundamentally deceptive.

Dōgen's interpretation of the "The World Honored One ascends the high seat" uses atomization in support of the equalization of all points of view:

Pointer

A single lute string is plucked and he can name the whole tune. Such a person is hard to find even if you search for a thousand years. Like a hawk chasing a hare, the race goes to the swiftest. He expresses the universe of discourse in a single word, and condenses a thousand great worlds into a speck of dust. Is there anyone who can live the same way and die the same way, penetrating each and every hole and crevice? Now consider this.

Main Case

One day the World Honored One took the high seat to preach the Dharma. Mañjuśrī struck the gavel and said, “Clearly understand the Dharma of the King of Dharma. The Dharma of the King of Dharma is just like this.”

Then the World Honored One got down off his seat.

Prose Commentary (selected passage)

This took place before the World Honored One had raised the flower. From the beginning at Deer Park to the end at Hiranyavati River, how many times did he need to use the jeweled sword of the Diamond King? At this particular time, if there had been someone in the assembly with the true spirit of a patchrobed monk and with a supreme understanding, then it would have been possible to later avoid the sticky situation of having to raise the flower.

This kōan, originally contained in *CCL*, volume 11 (*TSD* 51:283b), and other transmission-of-the-lamp records, is cited from *PYL* case 92 (*TSD* 48:216b–216c). It is also included in *TJL* case 1 (*TSD* 48:227c–228b), *MS* case 141 (*DZZ* 5:200), and the kōan collection of master Ta-hui. In addition, this case is discussed extensively in Dōgen’s *KS* “Osaku sendaba” fascicle (*DZZ* 2:253–258).

Like numerous other commentaries on this case, including the *PYL* and *TJL*, Dōgen’s discussion deals with the notion of “Saindhava,” which evokes an ancient Sanskrit story of a king who asked his retainer for four items—a wash, a meal, a drink, and a ride—and is given, in an immediate, intuitive response, water, salt, a chalice, and a horse, respectively. Saindhava refers to an intuitive connection between master and disciple, but the commentaries caution against understanding this in a literal or facile way. The *PYL* mentions another kōan: When a monk asked Hsiang-yen, “What is the king asking for Saindhava?” Hsiang-yen said, “Come over here,” and the monk went. Hsiang-yen said, “Don’t be such a fool!” The monk later asked Chao-chou, “What is the king asking for Saindhava?” “Chao-chou got off his meditation seat, bent over, and folded his hands.” Dōgen cites this account and also tells the irreverent story of Nan-chüan, who saw his disciple coming and decided to up the ante about Saindhava by commanding him, “The pitcher is an object. It contains some water. Bring the water over to this old priest without moving the object. But the monk brought the pitcher to the master and poured water all over him.” Dōgen distances himself from the ritual implications and comments exclusively on the metaphysical significance of this act, “We must study the water in the pitcher and the pitcher in the water. Was it the water that was being moved, or was it the pitcher that was being moved?”

Conclusions: Tours, Détours, Retours

Dōgen’s interpretation of the following kōan, “Chao-chou recites the sūtras,” demonstrates many of the elements previously discussed. These include the rhetorical strategies of atomization and narrative intercession/extension as well as drawing conclusions that derive from reinterpreting the meaning of ritual in light of the doctrines of relativism and multiperspectivism:

In the district of Chao-chou, an old woman sent a message to the master with a donation and a request that he recite the entire collection of Buddhist sūtras. Hearing of this, the master stepped down from his seat and walked around the chair one time. Then he said, "I have finished reciting the collection of sūtras."

The messenger returned to the old woman and told her what happened with Chao-chou. The old woman said, "I asked Chao-chou to recite the complete collection of sūtras. Why did he recite only half the sūtras?"

This kōan, which appears in transmission-of-the-lamp records on Chao-chou's teachings, is cited in *MS* case 74 (*DZZ* 5:164) and it is also discussed briefly in *Ta-hui yū-lu*, volume 9, and more extensively in Dōgen's *KS* "Kankin" (*DZZ* 2:320–342). The main question Dōgen considers is whether Chao-chou is really in the wrong, and how this affects our understanding of the role of reciting rituals in the monastic routine. He reverses the conventional interpretation of the case. Dōgen says that Chao-chou walking around his chair really did represent the whole of the Buddhist sūtras, whereas the old woman was merely lost in her concern for the relative number of scriptures recited. At the same time, in contrast to this line of interpretation that is critical of the woman, Dōgen suggests that perhaps the old woman really wanted to see Chao-chou walk around the chair backwards, or in the opposite direction, to expose his appreciation of absurdity.

The "Kankin" also contains several other versions of the narrative culled from the transmission-of-the-lamp records. In one version, Master Shen-chao of Mount Ta-sui in I-chou also walks around the chair. But this time the old woman is criticized for not saying, "I asked him to recite the entire collection of the sūtras. Why did the master worry himself so much?" In another version, master Tung-shan Wu-pen first bows to the messenger who returns the bow, but then he walks around the chair with the officer and asks the officer if he understood. When the messenger replies "no," Tung-shan says, "Why can't you understand that I have read a sūtra with you?" In a fourth version, Dōgen relates how his Chinese mentor Ju-ching, who was once asked to read a lengthy sūtra and deliver a sermon, drew a big circle in the air with his fly whisk and said, "Now I have read it for you!" Then he cast away the fly whisk and descended from the dais.

In the rest of the "Kankin" fascicle Dōgen spends time outlining and analyzing the precise way the ritual of sūtra reading is to be conducted, including minute details about preparing and serving food as well as the time and place for the reading. But he also discusses other dialogues that highlight the futility and absurdity of the ritual. These are the reversals and re-reversals, the *tours*, *détours*, and *retours* (turns, de-turns, and returns) that characterize the use of kōans in the Dōgen tradition. In one example that is particularly intriguing for its irreverent tone, master Yüeh-shan is known for forbidding the recitation of sūtras and yet one day is discovered reading a sūtra himself. When asked by a disciple why he is doing precisely what he does not allow others he responds, "I am only trying to cover my eyes with the sūtra!"

Dōgen's handling of this case highlights the point underlying his interpretation of a wide variety of kōans: that there is no underlying point in that each particular

instance is unique and discrete. At the same time, the absence of an underlying point is not the point in that he is not necessarily endorsing a notion of radical relativism. Unlike Kim, who argues that Dōgen unifies the absolute and relative, my suggestion is that he dispenses with or casts off both the distinction and the unification. This is not based on constructing yet another meta-level of relativist metaphysics, but rather on the fact that each kōan provides an opportunity to explore a different arena of interpretive method and thematic intention. That is, the interpretation of a kōan for Dōgen is designed to be suited to that case and to the issues surrounding it, and this is not necessarily part of a general pattern regarding an overall approach to all kōans.

Notes

The following abbreviations are used in the text and Notes:

| | |
|------------|---|
| <i>CCL</i> | <i>Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu</i> (Jpn. <i>Keitoku dentōroku</i>). 1004. In <i>TSD</i> , vol. 50. |
| <i>DZZ</i> | <i>Dōgen zenji zenshū</i> . 7 vols. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1988–1993. |
| <i>EK</i> | <i>Eihei kōroku</i> . 1236–1253. In <i>DZZ</i> , vols. 3–4. |
| <i>KS</i> | <i>Kana Shōbōgenzō</i> . 1231–1253. In <i>DZZ</i> , vols. 1–2. |
| <i>LL</i> | <i>Lin-chi lu</i> (Jpn. <i>Rinzai roku</i>). Twelfth century. In <i>TSD</i> , vol. 47. |
| <i>MS</i> | <i>Mana Shōbōgenzō</i> . 1235. In <i>DZZ</i> , vol. 5. |
| <i>PYL</i> | <i>Pi-yen lu</i> (Jpn. <i>Hekiganroku</i>). 1163. In <i>TSD</i> , vol. 48. |
| <i>SZ</i> | <i>Shōbōgenzō zuimonki</i> . 1236. In <i>DZZ</i> , vol. 6. |
| <i>TJL</i> | <i>Ts'ung-jung lu</i> (Jpn. <i>Shōyōroku</i>). 1224. In <i>TSD</i> , vol. 48. |
| <i>TSD</i> | <i>Taishō shinshū daizōkyō</i> . 85 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai, 1924. |
| <i>WMK</i> | <i>Wu-men kuan</i> (Jpn. <i>Mumonkan</i>). 1228. In <i>TSD</i> , vol. 48. |

- 1 – *EK* 1.48, in *DZZ* 3 : 34, according to the Monkaku edition (in the Manzan edition this passage appears in *EK* 1.1). The main exceptions are, of course, Dōgen's transmission seal (see *Busso shōden bosatsukai kyōju kaibun*, in *DZZ* 6 : 212–231) as well as Myōzen's relics (see *Myōzen oshō kaichō okugaki*, in *DZZ* 7 : 236–237, and *Shari soden-ki*, in *DZZ* 7 : 216–218); other possibilities include the robe and portrait of Ju-ching.
- 2 – Hee-Jin Kim, *Dōgen Kigen—Mystical Realist* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1975), p. 46.
- 3 – Satō Shunkō, “Hakusan shinkō to Sōtō-shū kyō shi,” twenty-part series, *Sanshō* (1990–1991): 556–575. See also Bernard Faure, *Visions of Power: Imagining Medieval Japanese Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).
- 4 – Daitō, who was said to have copied the *CCL* in forty days, “must have been aware that he was not only transcribing the history of Zen but participating in it as well” (Kenneth Kraft, *Eloquent Zen: Daitō* [Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993], p. 48).

- 5 – Hee-Jin Kim, “‘The Reason of Words and Letters’: Dōgen and Kōan Language,” in *Dōgen Studies*, ed. William R. LaFleur (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 1985), pp. 54–82. See also G. Victor Sōgen Hori, “Kōan and Kenshō in the Rinzai Zen Curriculum,” in *The Kōan: Texts and Contexts in Zen Buddhism*, ed. Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 280–315; Hori applies Kim’s analysis back to the Rinzai approach.
- 6 – Kim, “‘The Reason of Words and Letters,’” p. 56.
- 7 – *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- 8 – Kagamishima Genryū, ed., *Dōgen in’yō goroku no kenkyū* (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1995).
- 9 – Some of the discussions of cases also appear in Steven Heine, *Opening a Mountain: Kōans of the Zen Masters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- 10 – This recalls yet contrasts with the kind of ritual violence examined in Maurice Bloch, *Prey into Hunter: The Politics of Religious Experience*, The Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- 11 – See Bernard Faure, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy: A Cultural Critique of Chan/Zen Buddhism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), pp. 113–114, and Kim, “‘The Reason of Words and Letters.’”
- 12 – Daitō was especially known for his use of capping phrases; see Kraft, *Eloquent Zen*.
- 13 – Miriam Levering, “Dōgen’s *Raihaitokuzui* and Women Teaching in Sung Ch’an,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 21 (1) (1998): 77–110.

Copyright of Philosophy East & West is the property of University of Hawaii Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.