

Modern Narratives of Linji and the Linji lu: A Methodological Investigation

著者	He Yansheng, Translated by Joseph C. Williams
著者別名	HE Yansheng, English Translation by Joseph C. WILLIAMS
journal or publication title	INTERNATIONAL ZEN STUDIES
volume	9
page range	421-453
year	2022-02
URL	http://doi.org/10.34428/00013807

Modern Narratives of Linji and the *Linji lu*: A Methodological Investigation*

He Yansheng**

Translated by Joseph C. Williams***

Over a century ago a Japanese scholar visited the Linji Temple in Zhengding, Hebei; and back in Japan he published his firsthand account of the Linji Temple as follows:

The Linji Temple has only a single small hall, which is used for storage as the monks of the temple seem to depend on agriculture for their livelihood. The main statues of veneration, that of Shakyamuni flanked by his two great disciples, seem to be productions of the Ming. To the side of these are wooden statues which seem to depict Bodhidharma, and Linji, but they are nothing worth seeing. Both in front of and beside the statue of Shakyamuni Buddha are small statues of Guandi. A little outside the temple area is a pagoda which seems to have been built in the Jin. The shape of this pagoda differs from all of the previous three [the Linxiao, Xumi, and Hua pagodas], and in a state of perfect preservation is the so-

*Being a translation of “Kindaiteki na monogatari ni okeru Rinzaï oyobi *Rinzaï roku*: hōhōronteki kōsatsu” 近代的な物語における臨濟および『臨濟録』一方法論的考察.

**何燕生, Visiting Scholar, Wuhan University. Professor, Koriyama Women's University.

***Joseph C. Williams is a freelance translator-sinologist.

called Pure Pagoda (清塔), which is truly magnificent. In front of the pagoda is a holy bell, from the Tianshun reign era of the Ming, but with the loss of its bell tower, this bell has just been placed on the ground—a sight not particularly unique to Linji Temple, we saw bells left on the ground everywhere we went.¹

This scholar was named Tokiwa Daijō. To conduct research on the monuments of Chinese Buddhism, Tokiwa made a total of five trips to China, traveled extensively to all the celebrated mountains and great monasteries of Chinese Buddhism, and later compiled the results of this fieldwork in a series of publications which had a great impact on the scholarly community of Japan for both their observations and new “on the ground” method of studying Chinese Buddhism. Tokiwa wrote the above in his famous *Shina Bukkyō shiseki tōsaki* 支那仏教史蹟踏査記 (Fieldwork Record on the Buddhist Monuments in China), wherein he included a daily log indicating his survey of the Linji Temple was undertaken on October 24, 1920. Tokiwa also surveyed, that same day, the nearby Longxing 隆興, Tianning 天寧, Guanghui 廣惠, and Kaiyuan 開元 temples.² From the style of writing in the above description of the Linji Temple, it seems that Tokiwa was a little downhearted in his visit, yet the “wretched state” in which he found the Linji Temple did not disappoint this Japanese scholar who had traveled such a great distance on the name of this temple. On the contrary, it was just this “wretched state” of the temple which strengthened Tokiwa’s conviction that this was indeed the true home of Linji Yixuan 臨濟義玄, founder of the Rinzai/Linji school of Zen/Chan:

The Linji Temple was originally a small Zen temple along the Hutuo (滹

沱) River in the southeast corner of what was the city of Zhen Prefecture. The thunder of Linji's four shouts (四喝) echoed throughout the four hundred plus provinces, yet he lived only in this small Zen temple. Although it was just a small Zen temple, this is rather fitting for a great Zen teacher. I had thought from the location of the pagoda that the single small hall remaining now was in the past only a part of a seven-hall temple (七堂伽藍); yet looking back today, I think the Linji Temple was perhaps always just a small Zen temple. A greater investigation of the terrain in the vicinity of the temple is needed. If this had always just been a small Zen temple, then even this unsightly small hall would have an alluring historical background. I regret not having realized this at the time.

Discussion of “Linji's four (kinds of) shouts” (臨濟四喝) can be found in texts such as the *Linji lu* 臨濟錄 (Record of Linji), the first fascicle of the *Rentian yanmu* 人天眼目 (The Guide of Humans of Gods), and the *Jingde chuandeng lu* 景德傳燈錄 (Jingde Reign Era Lamp Transmission Record), and Tokiwa used the above texts and related texts to describe the unique Zen/Chan style of Linji as progenitor of the Rinzai/Linji lineage. Even as Tokiwa saw the wretched state of the Linji Temple in his on the ground investigation, rather than be disappointed by this, he found this to be the greatest evidence for his own confidence in the Zen/Chan of Linji. Obviously, Tokiwa had not formed this conviction, by the actual conditions of his own observations, but by an accumulated textual narrative which told him that, although Linji lived in a small temple, his “four shouts” had echoed throughout the “over four hundred prefectures.” By this faith, Tokiwa appealed to the Buddhists of Japan to place due importance on Linji's pagoda and Zhaozhao's pagoda at the

Bailin Temple stating:

“The Zen/Chan virtue of these two monks is brought to mind upon these pillars and pagodas, and no matter the historical course taken by stone pagodas, stone pillars, and brick pagodas, we can trace this history back so that the spirit of boundless suchness which expanded throughout society of that time can newly touch our hearts.”³

Tokiwa presented this fieldwork as objective scholarship, yet an overflowing of Buddhist religious sentiment underlies these writings. He saw a shabby little temple, yet felt it still held the spirit of Linji, which he claimed could be felt by visiting the present site of this monument. Thus, the boundaries of religious sentiment and academic rationality seem ambiguous in this description of the Linji Temple, and we find this same ambiguity in the title of his first publication on this fieldwork: *Shina busseki tōsa: Ko ken no ato e* 支那佛蹟踏查古賢の跡へ (An On the Ground Investigation of the Vestiges of the Chinese Buddhas: On the Footsteps of the Ancient Worthies). Tokiwa retitled this work *Shina Bukkyō shiseki tōsaki* 支那仏教史蹟踏查記 (Fieldwork Record on the Buddhist Monuments in China) eighteen years later.⁴ So, we must conclude that Tokiwa described the Linji Temple on the basis of his Buddhist faith. Moreover, Tokiwa viewed Linji not only as an historical figure of the Late Tang; but also, as an “ancient worthy,” and—seeming most importantly, as “founder” of the Rinzai/Linji school—even though Tokiwa belonged to the Shin denomination of Japanese Buddhism and was not involved with the Rinzai school of Zen.

Though Tokiwa was a historian of Chinese Buddhism, as is well known, he was certainly not a Zen/Chan specialist. Tokiwa wanted to

understand the entire situation of the Buddhist monuments of China at that time, so he surveyed the Linji Temple mostly because it was a part of the greater narrative of China-centered Buddhist studies.⁵ Tokiwa's research on Chinese Buddhism is characterized by his dissatisfaction with purely textual research, and his decision to leave his research office to "discover history" on the ground in China. While we would typically not doubt such an approach would, in both its attitude and methodology, be of greater modesty, impartiality, and objectivity than that of the armchair scholar buried in books all day; whether Tokiwa succeeded in implementing such an approach is a separate issue. At the very least, I think we can consider Tokiwa the first Japanese scholar to have surveyed the Linji Temple and combine this academic field work into a presentation of Linji Yixuan.

With that said, if we look back at modern scholarship on Linji and the *Linji lu*, we find that this methodology of combining surveys of historic monuments with textual research never became mainstream, and that the purely textual research model for studying Linji has continually monopolized the academic marketplace which has privileged its voice in methodological discussions. Still, I am fascinated by the fact that in all of this textual research on Linji is an academic trend which we should call a modern narrative. Hu Shi (Hu Shih) explained, for instance—from his perspective as a historian—that Linji was asserting a kind of "rationalistic mentality," which at its core was a "method" of his "iconoclasm," when he "called all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas and Patriarchs by very indecent names and swept them all aside."⁶ On the other hand, Zen/Chan scholars such as D. T. Suzuki and Yanagida Seizan saw Linji's *wuwei zhenren* 無位真人 (boundless true person) and *wuyi daoren* 無依道人 (independent great person) as modern rationalists

who aimed to break free of the traditional “establishment” by shouting their longing of “freedom,” soon interpreted the so-called “iconoclasm” of the words and actions of Linji as an early president of the pursuit of “freedom” and “personal liberation” by the ideal modern figure, and researched the *Linji lu* accordingly. For example, scholars such as Yanagida Seizan, Kinugawa Kenji, and Okimoto Kashimi deconstructed, or genealogized, the *Linji lu* layer by layer so that it became divided into such dualities as original and unoriginal, true and false, and so on.⁷ Seeing this book so completely transformed, we must ask: Who was Linji? Does this book called the *Linji lu* even exist?

Here I will review the methodological trends of modern *Linji lu* scholarship, especially that of Hu Shi and Yanagida Seizan. Hu Shi did not write extensively on Linji and the *Linji lu*, but he was the first to do so in the Zen/Chan research of Chinese language academia, and he clearly states his awareness of the issues at hand. Although we find Yanagida Seizan was greatly influenced by scholars like D.T. Suzuki in his discussion of Linji Yixuan’s thought, rather than simply repeating the narrative of this early scholarship, Yanagida is said to have continued this narrative in a way that reveals his own approach. Yanagida focused in particular on a symbolic figure from the *Linji lu* named Puhua 普化, simultaneously researched the *Kyōun shū* 狂雲集 (Crazy Cloud Collection) of Ikkyū 一休, and by this Yanagida used Linji, Puhua, and Ikkyū as symbols of the “prototypical” Zen/Chan thought of his own unique modern narrative.

I. The Methodology of Linji in Hu Shi’s Historicism

Hu Shi’s published research on Zen/Chan Buddhism focused on its

earliest history before its division into the so-called “five houses” in the Late Tang and Five Dynasties, and explored thematic rather than biographical issues. Hu Shi only briefly touched upon the later history of Zen/Chan, and this was a matter of both his personal interest and a reflection of the international scholarly concerns of his time. That said, Hu Shi aimed to write a comprehensive history Chinese Zen/Chan and developed his own ideas on the unique features of its entire historical development. We can infer the way in which Hu Shi understood the Zen/Chan of Linji from both his statements and the way Linji is reflected in his writing.

When I examined the writings of Hu Shi chronologically, I found that Hu Shi’s earliest mention of Linji was in his account of the intellectual history of medieval China.⁸ By Hu Shi’s own account, this intellectual history of medieval China what compiled from a series of lectures he gave at Peking University in 1931 and 1932. In the twelfth lecture of this series, *Chanxue de zuihou qi* 禪學的最後期 (The Final Period of Zennism), Hu Shi considers Linji Yixuan as an important representative of an “iconoclastic” Zen/Chan which was dismissive of the buddhas and progenitors by citing the relevant passages of the *Linji lu*. While this discussion of Linji was quite simple, Hu Shi gave a more detailed discussion of Linji in a series of four December 1934 lectures given at Beijing Normal University entitled *Zhongguo Chanxue de fazhan* 中國禪學的發展 (The Development of Zen Buddhism in China).⁹ In the final lecture of this series, Hu Shi discusses the Zen/Chan methodology of Linji as follows:

In the mid-ninth century arose two great masters. In the south there was Deshan Xuanjian (d. 865), and in the north there was Linji Yixuan (d. 868).

The discourse records of both of these masters are outstanding works of vernacular literature, in which they not only criticized the Zen which had preceded them, but even the scriptures and the Buddha. Here, there is no Buddha, nor Patriarch. Bodhidharma was that old stinking barbarian. The twelve divisions of the scriptures only sheets of paper fit only for wiping the pus off a carbuncle. Xuanjian taught the doing of nothing, only that one be an ordinary man, who eats, drinks, sleeps, and moves his bowels. Linji taught, “Do not be deceived by others,” and said, “My duty is to kill everything. When the Buddha is in my way, I’ll kill the Buddha. When the Patriarchs are in my way, I’ll kill the Patriarchs. When the Arhat is in my way, I’ll kill the Arhat. I’ll be free!” The methodology of Zen of these two great masters of the second revolution of the enigmatic Zen techniques—that of calling all the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas and Patriarchs by very indecent names—has often been misunderstood. They developed a pedagogic technique of their own, the essence of which consisted of urging the novice to seek his own awakening or enlightenment through his own thinking and living. No other salvation was possible.*¹⁰

In the above Beijing Normal University lectures, Hu Shi describes five methods of Zen/Chan.¹¹ The first was *bu shuopo* 不說破 “don’t tell.” Everyone has Buddha-nature, so there is nothing to seek outside, no dharma to seek, and no nirvana to prove. So if Zen/Chan was “told,” there was “real danger that the great ideas of the founders of the Chan schools were deteriorating into what has been called ‘chan of the mouth-corners’ (*koutou chan* 口頭禪).”¹² The second was *yi* 疑 (doubt): “by doubting we think for ourselves, while accepting everything without doubt is to not think at all.” The third was the “enigmatic gestures and

answers to questions” (*chanji* 禪機) which he described as a kind of hint which would sometimes answer “with seemingly meaningless or strikingly meaningful paradoxes.”¹³ The fourth was “traveling on foot” (*xingjiao* 行脚), which is traveling to teachers, inquiring of the way, and “learning by one’s own experience: by widening one’s experience.”¹⁴ Hu Shi gave the analogy of “a school trip” or “transferring schools,” and told the students at Beijing Normal University that this would be like going to Tsinghua University, and then National Central University, keeping this up until they were enlightened. Lastly, the fifth was *wu* 悟 (awakening); that is, going from “don’t tell” (*bu shuopo* 不說破) to the point of complete liberation, penetrating realization, and awakening. Of this Zen methodology as described by Hu Shi, at least the first method of don’t tell” (*bu shuopo* 不說破), and the third method of the “the enigmatic gestures and answers to questions” (*chanji* 禪機) would apply to Linji.¹⁵

According to Hu Shi, the methodology of Zen/Chan was a revolutionary rejection of the dhyana of India, and its Buddhism held some pedagogical value which the students at Beijing Normal University should all understand.¹⁶

Hu Shi further clarified his thinking in his 1953 “Ch’an (Zen) Buddhism in China Its History and Method”:

While Xuanjian 宣鑑 lived and taught in western Hunan, his contemporary and possibly his student, Yixuan 義玄 (died 866), was opening his school in the north—in the western part of modern Hebei. His school was known as the Linji School, which in the next two centuries became the most influential school of Chan.

The greatness of Yixuan seems to lie in his emphatic recognition of the

function of intellectual emancipation as the real mission of Chinese Chan.¹⁷

As before, Hu Shi here greatly affirms the figure of Linji Yixuan promoting “intellectual emancipation” and for beginning the Linji school which “became the most influential school of Chan.” He further illustrates this with a quote from the *Linji lu*, “Recognize yourself! Wherefore do you seek here and seek there for your Buddhas your bodhisattvas? Wherefore do you seek to get out of the three worlds? O ye fools, where do you want to go?”¹⁸

Hu Shi thought this “intellectual emancipation” was the “real mission of Chinese Chan,” and the writing of figures such as Linji Yixuan and Deshan Xuanjian in the “plain language (*baihua* 白話) of the people” represented a “Chinese Chan” which was “no Chan at all.”¹⁹

As Hu Shi saw it, the intellectual history of Chinese Chan developed from an initial era of “dangerous thinking, courageous doubting, and plain speaking,” to one where “the great masters, from Shenhui and Mazu to Xuanjian and Yixuan, taught and spoke in plain and unmistakable language and did not resort to enigmatic words, gestures, or acts”—which for Hu Shi was the “development of a pedagogical method”—and then to avoid the danger of deterioration to Chan “of the mouth-corners (*koutou chan* 口頭禪)—a “method of conveying a truth through a great variety of strange and sometimes seemingly crazy gestures, words, or acts” was developed as new “pedagogical method,” of techniques of which “Yixuan himself was probably the first to introduce” by “beating his questioner with a stick or shouting a deafening shout at him.”²⁰ Hu Shi continues, then, by stating that it “was probably no accident that his school, the Linji school, played a most prominent part during the next hundred years in the development of the peculiar

methodology of Chan instruction to take the place of plain speaking.”²¹

Thus, Hu Shi opposed describing this “methodology with all its mad techniques” as “illogical and irrational,” for he held that “beneath all the apparent madness and confusion” was “a conscious and rational method which may be described as a method of education” wherein “effort” and one’s own “own ever-widening life-experience” could allow one to “find out things.”²²

Hu Shi contrasted his “rational method” explanation with that of “pious Buddhists” who insisted this, “was not naturalism or nihilism and was certainly not meant be iconoclastic!” and that “these great masters never intended to convey the sense which their plain and profane words seem to convey” as they “talked in the language of Zen, which is ‘beyond the ken of human understanding!’”²³ We find in the beginning of Hu Shi’s paper that these “pious Buddhists” referred to D. T. Suzuki and his followers:

For more than a quarter of a century, my learned friend, Dr. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki, formerly of the Otani University, Kyoto, Japan, has been interpreting and introducing Zen Buddhism to the Western world. Through his untiring effort and through his many books on Zen, he has succeeded in winning an audience and a number of followers, notably in England. As a friend and as a historian of Chinese thought, I have followed Suzuki’s work with keen interest. But I have never concealed from him my disappointment in his method of approach. My greatest disappointment has been that, according to Suzuki and his disciples, Zen is illogical, irrational, and, therefore, beyond our intellectual understanding. The Chan (Zen) movement is an integral part of the history of Chinese Buddhism, and the history of Chinese Buddhism is an integral part of the

general history of Chinese thought. Chan can be properly understood only in its historical setting just as any other Chinese philosophical school must be studied and understood in its historical setting. The main trouble with the “irrational” interpreters of Zen has been that they deliberately ignore this historical approach.²⁴

Hu Shi then cites D. T. Suzuki’s *Living by Zen* with the following criticism:

The Chan (Zen) movement is an integral part of the history of Chinese Buddhism, and the history of Chinese Buddhism is an integral part of the general history of Chinese thought. Chan can be properly understood only in its historical setting just as any other Chinese philosophical school must be studied and understood in its historical setting. The main trouble with the “irrational” interpreters of Zen has been that they deliberately ignore this historical approach.²⁵

Regardless of whether D. T. Suzuki “deliberately” ignored “history,” Suzuki had described “irrationality” as a feature of Zen, and frequently described Zen as mysticism.

Although the Zen debate of Hu Shi and D.T. Suzuki is beyond the scope of this paper, I should point out that the modernist academic interpretation of the history and methodology of Zen by Hu Shi—wherein Linji’s “great variety of strange and sometimes seemingly crazy gestures,” like “shouting,” and so on are interpreted historically as a new “conscious and rational method which may be described as a method of education by the hard way”—was quite at odds with Suzuki’s characterization of an irrational and illogical Zen.²⁶

In short, the Zen/Chan of Linji Yixuan became the subject of a modern narrative in Hu Shi's historical writings. Hu Shi always viewed Linji as a historical figure whose teachings could be explained as a movement in the history of Chinese Buddhism. He thought of the development of Zen/Chan was by no means an isolated incident, but rather an indispensable part of the intellectual history of China which could be studied within its historical and ideological context. Hu Shi took "intellectual emancipation" as the "real mission of Chinese Chan," and Linji's crazy shouting, and so on, as a new "pedagogical method" of individual effort to find the truth of things. Hu Shi called this a "method of education by the hard way," and the teachings of Linji are interpreted as a rational "methodology" in his historicist account. Buddhists, however, would likely view Hu Shi's historicization of Zen/Chan as unsympathetic, and out of touch. I think it was this historicism which Suzuki was most disinclined to accept.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize that Hu Shi developed this own approach to the *Linji lu*. Although Hu Shi was citing Nakariya Kaiten on the point of the similarities between Linji Yixuan and Deshan Xuanjian, and for his explanation that Deshan Xuanjian may have directly influenced Linji, Nakariya details—in his intellectual history of Zen/Chan—six points of similarity between Linji and Deshan without describing the Zen/Chan of Linji as anything like the "methodology" of Hu Shi.²⁷ Hu Shi assertion about Linji's methods, as seen in the *Linji lu*, were undoubtedly unique to him.

II. The Freedom Cries of Linji in Yanagida Seizan's

Imagination

Yanagida Seizan was a groundbreaking Japanese historian of Zen/Chan. In his famous study of the historical works of early Chan, Yanagida opened the way for new studies which abandoned a traditional apologetic research perspective which emphasized personal experience for an objective and independent field of Zen/Chan historiography.²⁸ While Yanagida frequently expressed his sympathy for the experience centered Zen/Chan research which began with D. T. Suzuki, he did not accept this model as it was, and if anything he aspired to the modern historical approach to Zen/Chan which Hu Shi represented. Nevertheless, Yanagida trained as a Zen priest of the Rinzai school, and we find this sectarian bias in his writing. Yanagida focused his discerning historiographic perspective on the developmental stages of the Zen/Chan tradition with their vicissitudes and unique features, and by this he came to esteem the Zen/Chan of the Tang period, while disparaging that of the Song period as a degenerate form of Zen/Chan which had been made valueless by its institutionalization. Yanagida researched Zen/Chan with an overflowing freshness of self and individuality, as is reflected in his research on Linji. While Yanagida rejected the view of Linji Yixuan as the progenitor of a school or a faction—and claimed that we should liberate Linji from traditional sectarian notions so that he could be returned to his “original face” of being a historical figure—Yanagida idealized or even idolized Linji in his unbridled imagination.²⁹ In one of his introductions to the *Linji lu*, Yanagida describes his thoughts on the book as follows:

It is mainly that *Linji lu* has already become my irreplaceable deskside

book. I think it was this book which allowed me to finally pass a bleak desert of twenty or so postwar years. Linji is literally my refreshing refuge. If there is anything which could be called my ideology or outlook on life, it would be entirely indebted to this book. Although I now feel more lost in a jungle of ideas rather than a desert, I always return to this book for direction.³⁰

From this we can easily see the personal importance that the *Linji lu* had for Yanagida in shaping this outlook on life in ways which transcended, in his mind, such categories as academic interest or religious faith. Yanagida therefore emphasized that Linji was real historical figure, and that we should understand his “original ideology” from the history context of the era in which he lived. Yanagida worked to deconstruct the mythologization of what he perceived as the excessive idealization or even deification of Linji by successive generations and thought—as a macrohistorical examination of human affairs shows would find nothing could compare to the unique character and height of the boundless freedom Linji taught—we could understand Linji better and more valuably as real person rather than as progenitor of the Rinzai/Linji school. Thus, Yanagida stressed the necessity of unequivocally reading the *Linji lu* as the records of a religious person rather than as a religious scripture of the Linji school, for only then could we “clearly hear the shouts of a person who had freed himself while living through the chaos of the Late Tang.” Yanagida took these “shouts of a person who had freed himself,” so loudly praised in the *Linji lu*, as a something of “absolute human worth”; and maybe this is why he called the *Linji lu* the “king of all recorded sayings.”³¹ Yanagida summarized the teachings of Linji as follows:

The distinctive feature of Linji's Zen/Chan is that it is the Buddhism of a free person beyond the restraints of office, the thoroughly naked religion. That is to say, it concerns the most natural and ordinary of human affairs. What seems so eccentric at a first glance is actually an account of the *mui no shinnin* 無位の真人 (boundless true person), the *mue no dōnin* 無依の道人 (independent great person), and so on. After all, this is a free person. As D. T. Suzuki indicates, *mue* 無依 (unpositioned) is connected to *mue* 無衣 (unclothed) and really means naked. To be *mui* 無位 (boundless) means to be an ordinary person unaffiliated to any kind of office, authority, rank, or so on which one would be dependent upon...Such persons were often called *da zhang fu han* 大丈夫漢 (fellows who are men of great measure), meaning virile men of great capacity to fend for themselves.³²

Yanagida analyzed the frequency of characters used in the *Linji lu* to find that the negation characters such as *bu* 不 and *wu* 無, sometimes modified as *zongbu* 總不 or *jiewu* 皆無, were the most common; and he found the next most frequent was *ren* 人 (person), which was used about two hundred times.³³ Yanagida touched upon such issues as the general meaning of *ren* 人 and how its connotations had evolved to mean the sentient beings of Buddhism as well as the humanism of the west, but he said that the use of this character in the *Linji lu* presented unique problems. He gave three examples: *ci san zhong shen shi ni muqian ting fa de ren* 此三種身是你即今目前聽法底人 (the three kinds of [buddha] bodies are you, the now present hearing the dharma person), *jijin shiqu ting fa de ren* 即今識取聽法底人 (right now distinguish the person hearing the dharma), and *weiyou daoliu muqian xianjin ting fa de ren* 唯有道流目前現今聽法底人 (there is only the person hearing the dharma present right now following the way), and said that “hearing the dharma

person” in all of these actually refers to everyone present as buddhas, progenitors, and absolutely ideal personages.³⁴

Yanagida stated that Linji may have been both the first and the last to approach the issue of the core of Buddhism in terms of the concrete human being rather than by the pre-Linji Buddhist vocabulary of *faxing* 法性 (dharma nature), *zhenru* 真如 (true suchness), *foxing* 佛性 (Buddha-nature), *rulaizang* 如來藏 (tathagata womb), *xinxing* 心性 (mind nature), *zhenxing* 真性 (true nature), and so on.³⁵ As Yanagida reflected on the history of *ren* 人 (person) in the ideological discussion of Zen/Chan Buddhist history, he noted that the explanation *zhi zhi yi zi zhongmiao zhi men* 知之一字衆妙之門 (the one word “knowing” is the gate of the myriad mysteries), of such figures as Shenhui and Zongmi—who explained the intrinsic nature of persons by “knowing”—was overly abstract and philosophical, while Linji developed a use of *ren* 人 which was more substantial, richly independent, and most dynamic. According to Yanagida, that the phrase *jianxing* 見性 (seeing inherent nature) never occurs even once in the *Linji lu* is certainly an indication that Linji had inherited the ideology of the Mazu–Baizhang–Huangbo lineage, which never emphasized such terms as *jianxing* 見性 and *zhi* 知 (knowing).³⁶

Yanagida indicates that the uniqueness of Linji’s use of *ren* 人 (person) is also seen in his use of *zu fo* 祖佛 (progenitor buddha), saying that while terms such as *fo zu* 佛祖 (buddhas and progenitors), *fo* 佛 (buddha), *zu shi* 祖師 (progenitor teacher), and so on are common, *zu fo* 祖佛 (progenitor buddha) is rare and was likely coined by Linji to refer to each of his right now present hearing the dharma disciples as the only progenitor buddhas, who Linji also called the *huo zu* 活祖 (living progenitor).³⁷ Yanagida expresses this idea more clearly in his explanation of *chi rou tuan shang you yi wuwei zhenren* 赤肉團上有一無

位真人 (upon this red lump of flesh of is a boundless true person), where this “boundless true person” is none other than the listener of Linji’s dharma talks, the “you as right now present hearing the dharma person,” and is neither intrinsic principle (dharma nature), nor possible ideal (Buddha-nature).³⁸ Yanagida criticized the traditional Japanese reading of the *Linji lu* of Zen as explained in dharma talks and published works—such as the still authoritative Iwanami paperback edition by Asahina Sōgen—for such errors as the pervasive reading of the Chinese *zhi ni mianqian ting fa de shi* 祇你面前聽法底是 (it’s just you as present dharma hearer) in the Japanese *tada nanji ga menzen chōbō tei ze nari* 祇だあなたが面前聴法底是なり (it’s just the dharma hearer present to you), and thought such interpretations failed to grasp Linji’s true meaning.³⁹ Yanagida, dissatisfied with the commonly available edition of the *Linji lu* which he considered to be lacking in authenticity and not truly reflective of Linji’s ideology, wrote about his motivation to search for an edition of the *Linji lu* which better captured Linji’s ideology of the “person” as follows:

Thus far I have been hoping to connect with the spirit of the Linji Yixuan, who lived in the Late Tang, to hear what he had to say, for my greatest interest has been in Linji Yixuan as a historical figure. Now, I consider myself to have realized some of this hope. I have tried to understand the historical context of that time as much as possible by analyzing old records like the *Zutang ji* 祖堂集 (Progenitor Hall Collection), and the *Chuangdeng lu* 傳燈錄 (Lamp Transmission Records); and by making use of the *Nit-Tō guhō junrei kōki* 入唐求法巡禮行記 (Account of a Pilgrimage to Tang in Search of the Dharma) by our [Japanese compatriot] Ennin 圓仁 (794–864). Yet, how should we understand the

relationship of Linji as historical figure to the revised Song text which is the *Linji lu*?⁴⁰

In order to solve this problem, Yanagida thought it necessary to clarify the formation process of the various editions of the *Linji lu*.

The 1120 *Linji lu* edition reissued by Yuanjue Zongyan 圓覺宗演, who lived at the Gushan Temple in Fuzhou, is considered the base text of all other extant editions. Thus, the standard edition of the *Linji lu* only came into being at the end of the Northern Song period, more than two and a half centuries after the death of Linji Yixuan. What then was the situation of the circulation of this text over the course of these two and a half centuries? That Yuanjue Zongyan had “reissued” (*chongkai* 重開) the *Linji lu* implies that it had been previously published, but did it exist as its own edition in its own right, or only as a part of published collection? Yanagida surmised from his investigation that this 1120 edition had been edited to reflect Song period concerns in both its preface by Ma Fang 馬防 and in the rearrangement of the main text. Yanagida concluded, by comparing the 1120 reissued *Linji lu* to the recorded sayings of Linji in the *Sijia yulu* 四家語錄 (Discourse Records of the Four Houses), and to the recorded Sayings of Linji in the tenth and eleventh fascicles of the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu* 天聖廣燈錄 (Tiansheng-Era Expanded Lamp Records), that the source text of the *Linji lu* reissued by Zongyan was the content of the *Sijia yulu*—a text which was originally compiled in the early eleventh century—and that Zongyan used the main text of the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu*, and considered it in the context of the *Sijia yulu*, to write his “reissue” of the *Linji lu*.⁴¹ Fortunately, Yanagida was able to closely study the Song period version of the *Tiansheng guangdeng lu* included in the Kaiyuan

Temple edition of the Buddhist Canon in the collection of the Chion-in Temple in Kyoto. Thus, Yanagida said, by reading this text, he “was able to finally make progress in a longstanding desire to get closer to the voice of Linji.”⁴²

Yanagida compared the *Linji lu* reissued by Zongyan to the *Sijia yulu*, and made clear that this reissued edition included eight additional sections and differed in the arraignment. However, Yanagida found content between these two texts which was the same, with text of the *Shijia yulu* matching completely, in both content and arrangement, to the long middle section of the *Linji lu* which was divided under the subheading *shizhong* 示衆 (Instructing the Assembly). According to Yanagida, Zongyan used this text of the early Song *Sijia yulu*, and rearranged it and added eight sections to put his own ideas into the text in a way that truly “reflected the concerns of the Song period Linji school.”⁴³ Yanagida says of this as follows:

The Zongyan rearrangement of the *Linji lu* was its sheer formalization. It was the reinterpretation of the words of Linji, who lived the most extraordinarily free and easy life, into the institutional framework of Song period Chan. And it was this attempt to formalize the life of the person most disinclined to formalities which made it an impossible task.

Ideas, no matter how pure or lofty, are always lessened with formalization. *Jiyū* 自由 (liberty; liberation) itself is not the same as *jiyūshugi* 自由主義 (liberalism; liberation as a principle). When concrete daily activities are summed up with such terms as *daiki daiyū* 大機大用 (full functioning), or *zentai sayū* 全體作用 (complete essence functioning), the language of everything said and done is lifeless, dull, and meaningless.⁴⁴

It should be noted that people of the Song period continuously reshaped the image of Linji. For example, the famous Japanese portrait of Linji sitting cross-legged with angry eyes and agitated fists has its origins in this period...this of course occurred at the same time that Zongyan reissued the *Linji lu*.⁴⁵

According to Yanagida then, Zongyan had successfully reissued the *Linji lu*, but this reissuing was a reorganization, this reorganization was an institutionalization, and by this the text came to have the affectation of Song period Chan.⁴⁶ Moreover, Yanagida thought this process carried profound and lasting effects in characterizing, formalizing, and standardizing the text. For example, in the *Rentian yanmu* of Huiyan Zhizhao 晦巖智昭, and in the *Sijia yulu*, there is some phrasing which had been overlooked, such as the *sanxuan sanyao* 三玄三要 (three mysterious and three essentials), the *sanju* 三句 (three phrases), the *si he* 四喝 (four kinds of shouts), the *si binzhu* 四賓主 (four interactions between host and guest), the *si liaojian* 四料簡 (four classifications), and so on, which Yanagida took as revealing the characteristics of Linji's "house style." Also, in the *Biyuan lu* 碧巖錄 by Yuanwu Keqin, there is a great deal of prominent formalization in the parts which concern Linji. In the *Wumen guan* 無門關 (Gateless Gateway) of the late Southern Song period, there is no mention of Linji, but in Wumen's comments on the first case—"Zhaozhou's *wu* 無"—there is the line: "If you meet the Buddha, you will kill the Buddha. If you meet the progenitor, you will kill the progenitor," which Yanagida thought had become "quite abstract." Yanagida summed up his thinking on this as follows: "Although Zongyan made the *Linji lu* into a classic, he also began the trend where only a few set phrases of the text became popular."⁴⁷

I have provided here a general outline of Yanagida's views on the Zen/Chan style of Linji, as well as his thoughts on the published editions of the *Linji lu*. We can find these views in all of Yanagida's books mentioned above, as there is a great deal of overlap in his writing. However, we should note here that Yanagida discusses the "insanity" of Puhua together with Linji Yixuan and the *Linji lu*. Yanagida says that if Puhua was crazy, then we should call Linji a lunatic. Yanagida considered Linji the epitome of madness, and thought this aspect of Linji was much more important than his position as progenitor of the Linji school. For Yanagida, the charm of the *Linji lu* was not only its idea of the free, unconstrained, and liberated bare person, but also its accounts of Puhua's wildness, of which it owes the greater part of its unique charm. Yanagida viewed Puhua as none other than the concrete embodiment of the free person which Linji advocated, the archetype of Linji's Zen/Chan, and thought that just one of Puhua's lighthearted kicks were equivalent to a million words of Linji's sermons.⁴⁸

Thus, Yanagida believed that the narratives of Puhua and Linji in the *Linji lu* were, in effect, closely related, and that this was no mere coincidence. Despite inconsistencies in the records of Puhua across a variety of texts, they undoubtedly reflect a shared intent.

In short, Yanagida believed that both Linji's idea of the bare person and the crazy accounts of Puhua were representative archetypes of Zen/Chan thought, so he held a special fondness for Linji Yixuan, and placed the bizarre figure of Puhua on par with him. We can get the sense of Yanagida's understanding of this prototypical Zen/Chan from his book *Zen shisō: sono genkei o arau* (Zen Thought: An Inquiry into Its Prototypical Form). Although this book is short, we can easily see that this work contains the characteristics of Yanagida's unique understanding

from its chapter titles: “On Skulls,” “On Mirrors,” “On Reincarnation,” and “On Madness.” In “On Madness,” Yanagida focuses on the figures of “lunatic Linji,” and “crazy Puhua,” to describe how their idiosyncratic sayings and doings were the naked “prototype” of Zen.⁴⁹ Yanagida described the unconstrained and boldly free Linji and Puhua as the “deinstitutionalized” person, the *wuwei zhenren* 無位真人 (boundless true person), and the *wuyi daoren* 無依道人 (independent great person). Yanagida found his “prototypical” ideology of Zen by seeking the Linji of his dreams. Thus, we can say that the entire course of Yanagida’s research on Linji and the *Linji lu* was an ideological pilgrimage in search of the “prototypical” Zen. We can see that Yanagida had a distinct approach to Linji which differed from Hu Shi’s historical account of “shouting at the buddhas and curing the progenitors” as methodology, and we can see this as a newly created history of thought.

III. Conclusion

In this paper I have discussed the Linji, and *Linji lu*, research of Hu Shi and Yanagida Seizan from a methodological perspective. Moreover, I prefaced this discussion by introducing Tokiwa Daijō’s account of visiting the Linji Temple. Tokiwa Daijō’s fieldwork account of the Linji Temple; Hu Shi’s historical account of Linji Yixuan’s Zen as method; Yanagida Seizan’s visionary account of the “free ideal person” of Linji’s Zen, and his pursuit of this dream in the *Linji lu*—these differing approaches each deeply reflected their historical contexts.

For example, Chinese Buddhism was in a state of rapid decline when Tokiwa Daijō went to investigate the Buddhist monuments of China in the 1920s. The Buddhist temples of China were in ruin, abandoned, or

occupied by disreputable monks. Tokiwa, directly and indirectly, recorded this wretched state of a Chinese Buddhism damaged in every way. Yet, this wretched state of a Chinese Buddhism in rapid decline was an important impetus for Tokiwa to go to China and preserve Chinese Buddhism by transcribing texts, taking photographs, making rubbings of stone inscriptions, and so on. Tokiwa wrote, "I hear that China's ancient culture is now suddenly being destroyed, so I hope to right now lend a hand to our compatriots of the same race and writing by understanding, studying, and collecting as much of this ancient culture as possible...in just a year it will all be destroyed."⁵⁰ We can find that this idea—that the Japanese needed to rescue Chinese culture from decline and destruction because they were of the same race and writing—was extremely prevalent in Japanese society at that time. We must, therefore, say that Tokiwa's motivation to pursue fieldwork on the Buddhist monuments of China was multifaceted, and not entirely based on methodological considerations. So, we must consider and evaluate the methodological significance of this on the ground study of the Linji Temple within its historical context.

The 1920s were also when Hu Shi began to research Zen/Chan. China was in the midst of reforming its educational system in the 1920s and 1930s, with the revolution against the old learning and advocacy of the new learning. Hu Shi first participated in this educational reform from the perspective of literature in his famous essay *Wenxue gailiang chuyi* 文學改良芻議 (Some Modest Proposals for the Reform of Literature), in which he advocated against the eight-legged essays of literary Chinese and promoted the vernacular language movement. Hu Shi began, just in this era of Chinese educational reform, to more strongly tend to a modernizing narrative in his academic research. He researched Zen/

Chan in order to complete his book on the history of Chinese thought, and necessity made this research to be strongly goal oriented. This is what he needed at that time, it was an academic necessity, and never simply a matter of historical methodology. He introduced the methodology of Zen by describing Linji Yixuan's iconoclasm as a "method of education by the hard way," and this was not unrelated to the background of the Chinese academia in which Hu Shi was placed. I should also point out that Hu Shi makes clear that he organized his 1934 Beijing Normal University "Development of Zen Buddhism" lecture so that his discussion of seventh- to eleventh-century Zen/Chan methodology would be of some benefit for students of education.⁵¹ Of course, Hu Shi's methodological interests were not limited to Zen/Chan, and they certainly spanned a long period of time.⁵² We must understand and evaluate Hu Shi's interpretation of Linji's iconoclasm as a "method of education by the hard way" by considering his audience and the historical context in which he made these statements. Historical contextualization is also needed to understand, explain, and evaluate Hu Shi's historical interpretation of Zen methodology, his move to demythologize, and his critique of the unquestioning attitude of Japanese scholars.

Unlike Tokiwa and Hu Shi, Yanagida was a Cha/Zen scholar through-and-through. Yanagida greatly developed the field of Zen/Chan textual research, and his important contributions to the early Chan texts merit our close attention. Yanagida wrote, at the same time, an intellectual history of Zen/Chan which reflected his idiosyncratic perspective. His strenuous efforts to research the intellectual history of Zen/Chan reflect his pursuit of his dream of Linji and the *Linji lu*. Yanagida's research on Linji and the *Linji lu* reflected his historical context in much the same

way as the research of Tokiwa and Hu Shi reflected their historical context. Yanagida published most of his studies on Linji and the *Linji lu* in the 1960s and 1970s, yet it seems that he began this research much earlier in the 1950s. Yanagida reflected on his motivations for researching Linji as follows:

My personal resolve and methodology of reinterpreting the sermons of Linji Yixuan (d. 866) within the specific historical and geographic context of Hebei during the Late Tang and Five Dynasties came from my own regret of the way that Linji and his Zen were turned into war propaganda, along with of course everything else, during the Second World War. . . In 1949, the Chūō Kōronsha republished D. T. Suzuki's *Rinzai no kihon shisō* 臨済の基本思想 (The Fundamental Thought of Linji), which he had written for the *Philosophical Quarterly* at the end of the Second World War. In retrospect, D. T. Suzuki's interpretation of Linji was a first step towards postwar democracy, and it was not so much how he interpreted Linji's thought and so on, but how he so clearly broke with the traditional Japanese interpretation which has had such a lasting influence on how I researched Linji. Another study which greatly broke with the traditional Japanese interpretation of the *Linji lu* was Rikukawa Taiun's *Rinzai oyobi Rinzairoku no kenkyū* 臨済及び臨済録の研究 (A Study of Linji and the *Linji lu*). Kikuya Shoten of Okaya, Nagano Prefecture, published this book in 1949; Kikuya Shoten being a branch of the Nagano-style miso factory which employed and provided the livelihood of their author, the Buddhist layman Rikukawa Taiun. By reading this book again and again, we break free from the spell of the war. Linji, and the *Linji lu*, were mandates of human liberation.⁵³

This same kind of rhetoric can be found in Yanagida's other publications. Yanagida attempted to reimagine Linji Yixuan by linking him to the historical geography of Hebei, but this was based on his own reflection war propaganda wherein an understanding of the *Linji lu* could break the spell of the war, his understanding of this text as a mandate of human liberation, and so on. We can easily see that—Yanagida's discussion of Linji's "free person," his critique of the "institutionalization" of the Linji school of the Song period, his argument for emphasizing the Tang and deemphasizing the Song, his view of Linji Yixuan as a historical figure, and his insistence of interpreting Linji within the historical context of the late Tang period—all of this was in fact very deeply intertwined with the political and social context of Japan at that time. Linji Yixuan was, all things considered, neither champion of "liberty," nor an embodiment of the bare "individual." I think that Yanagida's conception of Linji was more or less just a figment of his imagination, similar to how he conceived of D. T. Suzuki's writings on Linji as a "first step towards postwar democracy," and so on.

I have here reviewed a century of research on Linji, and the *Linji lu*, to see the vestiges of the various efforts of past scholars. The research of Tokiwa Daijō, Hu Shi, and Yanagida Seizan are undoubtedly only a very small part of this history which includes the important contributions of other scholars like Iriya Yoshitaka. Although Iriya was a specialist of Chinese literature and philology, his enduring scholarly in the Zen/Chan records of China led to many influential studies. Iriya published many studies of the *Linji lu* which feature his extensive knowledge of vernacular Sinitic and linguistics, best represented by his annotated translation.⁵⁴ Iriya consistently opposed the longstanding Japanese practice of *kundoku* vernacular exegesis, emphasized reading

the text as vernacular Sinitic, and attended to the rhythm of the text. Iriya used his style of reading the *Linji lu* to correct many of the still common mistakes of the traditional Japanese vernacular exegesis. For example, the traditional *kundoku* reading of a well-known line—*tada nanji ga menzen chōbō tei ze nari* 祇だ你在面前聽法底是なり—is generally interpreted to mean “the thing hearing the dharma before your face.” With prosody being such an important characteristic of Sinitic, Iriya used his feeling of the rhythm of the language to interpret this phrase—*zhi ni mianqian ting fa de shi* 祇你面前聽法底是 (it’s just you as present dharma hearer)—and by doing so reinterpreted the terms *wuwei zhenren* 無位真人 (boundless true person), and *wuyi daoren* 無依道人 (independent great person), to mean the here-and-now just so “you.” According to Iriya, this radically different interpretation was not only consistent with the ideas in other parts of the *Linji lu*, but also with those of the Mazu lineage. For interpreting classical texts, Iriya repeatedly emphasized the necessity of asking: *what* is said, *how* is it said, and *why* is it said.⁵⁵ Thus, the concern of this way of reading was not only in how a text was read, but also whether its ideas could be completely understood. As it is said, “to miss by a hair is to be off by a mile.” In short, Iriya’s interpretation of the *Linji lu*—focused on intuiting the prosody of the Sinitic—marked a new era in the Zen/Chan scholarship of Japan. Yet, while this new interpretive method was taken seriously, this technique was premised on a knowledge of vernacular Sinitic so difficult to acquire that only a handful of scholars have inherited Iriya’s technique. Of these, Kinugawa Kenji of Hanazono University and Ogawa Takashi of Komazawa University have been the most active. Both of them participated in Iriya’s reading groups at an earlier stage of their careers, became familiar with his techniques of

reading Zen/Chan records, and now pass on this way in their own reading groups of Zen/Chan records in Kyoto and Tokyo respectively with a spirit of cooperation between them, and have published a great amount.⁵⁶ However, their research is beyond the scope of this essay, so I will not go into the specifics here. There are also other important methodologies which have their own unique characteristics, like that of Matsumoto Shirō who is a part of “Critical Buddhism,” and of the postmodern studies from Europe and America. In recent years there have also been several books on post-Mazu Zen/Chan published in Chinese. For example, Yang Zengwen, devotes a whole book chapter to Linji Yixuan and the *Linji lu* which is methodologically unique.⁵⁷ I regret that space limitations have precluded a discussion of these other methodologies, and I hope there will be an occasion for me to discuss them separately.

Notes

- 1 Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, *Shina Bukkyō shiseki tōsaki* 支那仏教史蹟踏査記 (Tokyo: Ryūginsha, 1938), p. 54.
- 2 Tokiwa, *Shina tōsaki*. p. 50.
- 3 Tokiwa, *Shina tōsaki*. p. 7.
- 4 Tokiwa Daijō 常盤大定, *Shina busseki tōsa: Ko ken no ato e* 支那佛蹟踏査 : 古賢の跡へ, (Tokyo : Kanao Bun'endō, 1921).
- 5 Tokiwa describes his motivation to survey the Buddhist monuments of China as twofold: “those things for society,” and “those things for myself alone.” On this latter motive Tokiwa wrote, “First there was the Chinese Buddhist history which I knew only from texts, yet by personally surveying the monuments of this history I wanted to feel that even a fraction of this history could become something of my own. I wanted the chance, by standing upon these monuments, to cherish in my own mind the spirits of the numerous eminent monks of old such as Tanluan, Linji,

- Tiantai (Zhiyi); or even Huirong, Farong, or Ju'ne." Tokiwa was discontent with textual research because he thought that pure bibliographic or philologic research could not make his investigation "something of his own," and he could not reach its true meaning.
- 6 "Religion and Philosophy in Chinese History," in Chih-P'ing Chou ed, *English Writings of Hu Shih: Chinese Philosophy and Intellectual History (Volume 2)*. (Berlin: Springer, 2013), pp. 98-99.—Trans.
 - 7 See, for example, Kenji Kinugawa 衣川賢次, "Rinzai roku sakki" 臨濟録札記, *Zen bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要 15, (1988); "Rinzai roku tekusuto no keifu" 臨濟録テキストの系譜, *Zen bunka kenkyūjo kiyō* 禪文化研究所紀要162 (2012); and Okimoto Kashimi 沖本克己, *Rinzai roku ni okeru kyokō to shinjitsu* 『臨濟録』における虚構と真実, *Zen gaku kenkyū* 禪学研究 73, 1995.
 - 8 See Hu Shi 胡適, *Zhongguo zhonggu sixiang shi chang bian* 中國中古思想史長編, in vol. 1 (上) of *Hu Shi zuopin ji* 胡適作品集, (Taipei: Yuandong chuban, 1986).
 - 9 A transcription of these lectures were published the following year, see: Wu Benxing 吳奔星 and He Yikun 何貽焜 trans., "Hu Shi zhi jiangyan: Zhongguo Chanxue de fazhan" 胡適之講演: 中國禪學之發展, *Shida xuekan* 師大學刊 18 (1935).
 - * Not exactly the Chinese as transcribed, but as Hu Shi wrote in 1932 and 1937, *English Writings of Hu Shi: Philosophy*, pp. 118-119; p. 157.—Trans.
 - 10 Yanagida Seizan ed., *Hu Shi Chanxue an* 胡適禪學案, (Kyoto: Chūbun Shuppansha, 1975), p. 511.
 - 11 In Hu Shi's 1932 lecture, "Chanxue de zuihou qi" 禪學的最後期, there are only three methods mentioned: *bu shuopo* 不說破 (don't tell), *chanji* 禪機 (enigmatic phrases and gestures), and *xingjiao* 行脚 (travelling on foot), yet in his "Development of Zen Buddhism" lecture adds *yi* 疑 (doubt) and *wu* 悟 (awakening) so that there are five methods. I appreciate my friend Professor Ogawa Takeshi for pointing out that Hu Shi later returns to a description of the above three methods, yet while the number of these methods differs, the content itself is unchanged. See Hu Shi, "Chan (Zen) Buddhism in China: Its History and Method," *Philosophy East and West*,

- Vol. 3, No. 1 (1953), pp. 3-24; Wade Giles romanization of Chinese has been changed to Pinyin for clarity.
- 12 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 20.
- 13 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 21.
- 14 Hao Wu ed., Hu Shi, *Outline of the History of Chinese Thought*, (Berlin Springer 2020), p. 116.—Trans.
- 15 See Hu Shi, *Zhongguo zhonggu sixiang xiao shi* 中國中古思想小史, in vol. 1 (上) of *Hu Shi zuopin ji* 胡適作品集, (Taipei: Yuandong chuban, 1986), pp. 513-519. Hu Shi, in the above "Chanxue de zuihouqi" 禪學的最後期, also mentions Linji's other methods such as the *si liaojian* 四料揀 (four measured selections), the *si zhaoyong* 四照用 (four ways of combining shining on ultimate reality and their concrete expressions), the *sanxuan sanyao* 三玄三要 (three mysterious and three essentials), *bang he* 棒喝 (hitting and shouting), and so on.
- 16 Hu Shi, *Hu Shi zuopin ji*, p. 506.
- 17 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 19.
- 18 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 19.
- 19 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," pp. 19-20.
- 20 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 20.
- 21 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," pp. 20-21.
- 22 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 20
- 23 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 20
- 24 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," p. 3.
- 25 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," pp. 2-3.
- 26 Hu Shi, "Chan Method," pp. 20-21.
- 27 See Nukariya Kaiten 忽滑谷快天, *Zengaku shisō shi* 禪學思想史, (Tokyo: Genkōsha, 1925, pp. 572-575.
- 28 See Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Shoki Zenshū shisho no kenkyū* 初期禪宗史書の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1967.
- 29 Yanagida's publications on Linji include: Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Rinzai nōto* 臨濟ノ一ト, (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1971); and for his annotated modern Japanese translations: Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Kunchū Rinzai roku* 訓註臨濟錄(Nagoya: Kichūdō, 1961); Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Rinzai roku*

- 臨濟録, (Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan 1986); Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山 and Takeshi Umehara 梅原猛, *Mu no tankyū: Chūgoku Zen 無の探究: 中国禪*, (Tokyo: Kadokawa shoten, 1969); and Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Rinzai roku 臨濟録*, (Tokyo: Chūō kōron shinsha, 2004).
- 30 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku* (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 9.
- 31 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), pp. 283–285.
- 32 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 301.
- 33 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 315.
- 34 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), pp. 317–318.
- 35 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 318.
- 36 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 319.
- 37 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 324.
- 38 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 327.
- 39 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 328.
- 40 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), pp. 10–11.
- 41 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 15.
- 42 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), pp. 14–15.
- 43 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 15.
- 44 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), pp. 15–16.
- 45 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 21.
- 46 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 21.
- 47 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Daizō Shuppan, 1986), p. 22.
- 48 See Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, *Zen shisō: sono genkei o arau 禪思想: その原型をあらう*, (Tokyo: Chūō kōron shinsha, 1999), p. 172; and Yanagida, *Rinzai nōto*, p. 143.
- 49 See Yanagida, *Zen shisō*, pp. 163–178.
- 50 Tokiwa, *Shina tōsaki*. p. 3.
- 51 *Hushi chanxue an*, p. 506.
- 52 See Ogawa Takashi 小川隆, He Yansheng 何燕生 trans., *Yulu de sixiangshi: jixi Zhongguo Chan 语录的思想史: 解析中国禪* (Shanghai: Fudan daxue chubanshe, 2015), pp. 240–246; for the Japanese version: Ogawa Takashi 小川隆, *Goroku no shisōshi: Chūgoku Zen no kenkyū 語録の思想史: 中国禪の研究* (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2011), pp. 366–373.

- 53 Yanagida, *Rinzai roku*, (Chūō kōron shinsha, 2004), p. 1; p. 7.
- 54 See the essays *Rinzairoku zakkan* 臨濟録雜感, and *Zengo tsurezure* 禪語つれづれ in, Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高, *Gudō to etsuraku: Chūgoku no Zen to shi* 求道と悦楽: 中国の禪と詩, rev. ed. (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2012).
- 55 Iriya wrote that these first two factors—finding not only *what* the text says, but *how* it says it—were often stressed by his mentor Yoshikawa Kōjirō; see Iriya Yoshitaka 入矢義高, *Jiko to chōetsu: Zen, hito, kotoba* 自己と超越: 禪・人・ことば (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2012). Iriya later added to these this latter point—finding out *why* the text says what it says in the way it says it—yet, although he was aware of its importance, he did not mention it very much in his writing.
- 56 For the latest work on *Linji lu* which reflects Iriya’s Zen/Chan techniques, see Ogawa Takashi 小川隆, “*Rinzai roku*”: *Zen no goroku no kotoba to shisō* 「臨濟録」: 禪の語録のことばと思想 (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 2008). Also worth noting are a series of field studies on the Linji Temple. Kinugawa Kenji has recently published, see for example, Kinugawa Kenji 衣川賢次 “Kahoku Seitei ni Rinzai Zen ji no iseki o tazuneru” 河北正定に臨濟禪師の遺跡を訪ねる(1), *Zen bunka* 禪文化 234 (2014): 61-66.
- 57 See, for example, Yang Zengwen 杨曾文, *Tang Wudai Chanzong shi* 唐五代禪宗史 (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe, 1995).