

Table of Contents

Preface.....	2
Note on the references:.....	3
Note on Catechisms:.....	3
Thank you, r/Zen!.....	4
The Four Statements of Zen.....	5
Translating the Four Statements.....	10
Translation Questions.....	12
Discussion of Translation.....	12
Transmission.....	13
Records, Scriptures, Words, Sentences.....	13
Straight pointing at mind.....	14
#1: Outside of Records.....	15
Refuting Sitting Meditation.....	20
#2: Transmitted Mind Seal.....	23
#3: Straight Pointing at Mind.....	30
#4a: See nature.....	35
#4b: Become a Buddha.....	41
Zen Masters: Buddhas All.....	41
Zen Master Buddha.....	43
Conclusion.....	46
Bibliography.....	48

Preface

For more than a decade I've been engaging people in discussions about what Zen Masters teach, how the records of the Zen tradition expound that teaching, and the ways in which various religions claiming to be "Zen" or "Zen-Buddhist" or "Buddhist" often fail to honestly connect to the teachings and traditions of Zen.

Many Westerners are complete unaware of the longstanding conflicts between Zen and Buddhism, dating back to around 600 CE when Buddhists lynched the Second Zen Patriarch. Buddhists who call themselves "Zen-Buddhists" have typically ignored the cataclysmic divide between Zen and Buddhism just as Western scholars have downplayed the role of colonialism in the oppression and misrepresentation of Asian culture.

Often conversations about Zen's textual history turn into one of two discussions, either:

Where could a beginner start learning about Zen?

or

How does Zen's 1,000 year written record refute Buddhist claims about Zen?

This short introduction to the Four Statements of Zen is one attempt to answer both questions because the Four Statements of Zen have traditionally been considered a summary of Zen's unique identity, as well as a rebuke of all the many flavors of Buddhism.

Christians have the Ten Commandments and Buddhists have the Eightfold Path, but the sense in which Zen *has* the Four Statements of Zen is not the same. Whereas the Ten Commandments make Christians Christian, and the Eightfold Path is the common doctrine of the various forms of Buddhism, the Four Statements of Zen do more to distance Zen from religions like Christianity and

Buddhism than they do to define Zen.

Zen Masters treat the Four Statements as the beginning of discussion, not a basis for agreement. It can be difficult for people new to Zen to grasp the magnitude of *the 1,000 year continuous written tradition of Zen in China*, or understand just how it is that discussion binds the Zen lineage together. Religions are bound together by doctrine, faith, and practice. Philosophy by first principle and reason. Zen has never been either of those, so let us acknowledge that and meet Zen on it's own terms.

Note on the references:

The bibliography of this discussion of the Four Statements of Zen is a bit unorthodox, and I blame everyone who came before me. When I first began studying Zen I was dealing with texts that romanized Zen Masters' names in different ways including the use of Japanese romanization (Mazu was Baso). Further, texts that were more than a thousand years old were "spruced up" for a modern largely lay audience of casual readers and thus given new titles, often of a wildly irrelevant nature. This was not my favorite part of studying the Zen tradition.

In order to rectify this, the bibliography lists the author's name as usual, unless the text deals with the teachings, writings, or record of a Zen Master, in which case the Bibliography will list the text under the Master's Name, Title of Translation, Translator's name. If you want to find the Mazu text, look under Mazu.

Note on Catechisms:

There is a great deal of controversy in the Buddhist community as to what "Buddhism" stands for, what the core beliefs and traditions are, in short, what the "catechism" of Buddhism boils down to. Book report style research on

“Mahayana” for instance reveals that the term being used as as a doctrinal umbrella is largely a modern invention. Similarly, the Japanese Buddhism from Japan invented by Dogen, “Dogenism”, is characterized by it’s devotion to Shikantaza “Zazen” prayer-meditation. Dogenism churches claim they are a “Soto Zen” lineage. This is doctrinally and historically untrue, but much like the Mormon’s claim that their religion is a branch of Christianity, many people have taken Dogenism’s claims at face value, without any sort of high school book report on the history, beliefs, and practices of the religion.

In short, the reader can expect to hear a fact-based approach to the topics of Zen, Buddhism, and Dogenism, which, while not pop-cultural, is driven by scholarship and real life experience rather than church doctrine.

Thank you, r/Zen!

As always, my thanks to the community of r/Zen on Reddit, which provided most of the suggestions for textual references that drove this project, gave advice on translation, and general criticism about more or less everything. It’s a rare sort of community and it has no parallel in modern Zen study and practice.

The Four Statements of Zen

謂之教外別傳。

單傳心印。

直指人心。

見性成佛。

(Yuanwu, 1100)

To speak of a teaching outside the historical
records

Zen Master transmitted Mind seal

Straight pointing at person's mind

See nature, become Buddha

-ewk trans.

"The special transmission outside the (written)
teachings,

the sole transmission of the mind seal,

directly pointing to the human mind for the

perception of nature

realization of Buddhahood."

(Yuanwu, 2005)

"A special transmission outside of Scriptures
No dependence on words and letters
Direct pointing to the soul of man
Seeing into one's nature and the attainment of
Buddhahood"
(Suzuki, 1961)

The origins of the Four Statements of Zen is lost in the fog of history. When D.T. Suzuki, the preeminent 20th Century Zen scholar, first translated the Four Statements in his writings, he didn't say what his textual source was. When D.T. Suzuki later speculated about the original author, he offered up Nanquan, but again, he didn't detail his thinking. D.T. Suzuki was unquestionably the foremost Zen academic of the 20th century, but we are still trying to trace the arcs of many of his lines of reasoning.

In *Chan Buddhism in Dunhuang and Beyond* there is a reference to the Four Statements in a stone marker for Faru dated 690:

"The transmission of India basically lacked letters; the entrance to this school was only a transmission of intent..." (Anderl, 2020)

Our tweet from an r/Zen friend provided:

天竺 — India['s]
相承 — Transmission [is]
本 — Originally
無文字 — w/o words
入 — Entering [through]
此 — this
門者 — gate (sect/school)
唯 — is the sole
意 — meaning
相傳 — passed on in the transmission

Searching through the Zen Masters' own historical record we have to be wary of ambiguity; the number four and the word statements isn't sufficiently descriptive. In fact, the most famous reference to the Four Statements in Yuanwu's Blue Cliff Record does not name them as such at all. We don't even know who called them "the Four Statements" originally; likely not the author of the Four Statements, given that they aren't universally referred to as such.

For example, from Case 83 of *Blue Cliff Record*:

僧請師直指某甲西來意

Please, I beseech you, Master, for me, *point directly* to the meaning of Bodhidharma's coming!

That translation of a Case from Mazu was by a Redditor interested in the early usages of the terminology of the Four Statements. Seeing the terms in other contexts may help us better date them.

Which brings us back to the question why would we even bother with the Four Statements at all? And therein lies the merit: No other language so elegantly defines the boundaries of Zen teaching, traditions, and culture. The Four Statements aren't so much a teaching as a declaration of the unique position of the Zen lineage. Anyone saying the name "Zen" can be immediately measured by Four Statements so comprehensively that the utility of the Four Statements is blindingly obvious. If you hear "Eightfold Path" instead of Four Statements, you know you are talking to a Buddhist.

Buddhism is itself a word so commonly abused, so inherently vague since it's creation by the colonial British in the 1800's, that it is difficult to find even a partial consensus on what "Buddhism" is doctrinally or historically. The term "Mahayana", as we increasingly see from historians, does not mean now what it meant historically. Harrison, in his *Searching for the Origins of Mahayana*, seems to force the

conclusion that Mahayana is better defined by what it opposes than by any common doctrine, culture, or textual collection. Yet with the Four Statements, which echo the most common themes in Zen teaching, we know exactly what Zen isn't, and what Zen demands to be.

By far the most essential primary sources for Zen study are those books of instruction written by Zen Masters themselves: Yuanwu's Blue Cliff Record and Measuring Tap, Wansong's Caodong Soto masterpiece Book of Serenity, and of course Women's Women's Checkpoint. I keep arguing for Xuedou's Empty Hall to be included, as well as Mingben's Illusory Man, but I've got to get people to read them first.

Blue Cliff Record (BCR) opens unambiguously with a reference to the Four Statements of Zen and couldn't be more auspicious as Yuanwu uses the Four Statements to establish Bodhidharma's purpose in coming from the West:

"From afar Bodhidharma saw that this country (China) had people capable of the Great Vehicle, so he came by sea, intent on his mission, purely to transmit the Mind Seal, to arouse and instruct those mired in delusion. Without establishing written words, he pointed directly to the human mind (for them) to see nature and fulfill Buddhahood."

(Yuanwu, 2005)

There can hardly be a more authoritative or historically ambiguous attribution than Bodhidharma! Arguably it is because of Yuanwu's reference here that some continue to attribute the Four Statements to Bodhidharma himself. It is unlikely that Bodhidharma is the author, however, since there are no written records of Bodhidharma's teachings recognized by Zen Masters.

Wansong's Book of Serenity (BoS) is far less direct in referencing the Four Statements of Zen.

"When we look at this monk, he too is a student of Buddhism; he uses the four propositions and hundred negations to make sure of the source essence of the special transmission outside the teachings." (Wansong, 2005)

This "special transmission" phrase is a reference to the Four Statements, to the most controversial statement of the Four Statements to many Buddhists, especially those around 900CE.

Albert Welter, in his essay *The Disputed Place of a 'Special Transmission' Outside the Scriptures in Ch'an*, is "begging the question" by assuming the conclusion he sets out to prove. Welter assumes that Buddhists who reject the transmission represent Zen, and then Welter "proves" that because of these Buddhists, Zen Masters don't universally support "a transmission outside the scriptures". Welter was the worst kind of religious apologist; a failure at critical thinking but famous for his reassuring audiences his religious claims as honest as historical facts.

Still, Welter reluctantly admits the facts are against him in *Patriarch's Hall*. The earliest record of the Four Statements of Zen was found in the *Patriarch's Hall*, which is dated to the 900's. This certainly proves that these Four Statements were around before Yuanwu put them into the *Blue Cliff Record*, which absolutely makes the Four Statements a Zen teaching that predates Welter's Dogenism (including Hakuin) with their misappropriation of the Zen name.

We could wiggle our fingers in all the holes of the swiss cheese that is Japanese Dogenism scholarship all day, but let's get to the good stuff; Zen Masters talking about the Four Statements!

Translating the Four Statements

The appetite for understanding translation is slowly but surely entering the Western consciousness, especially with regard to Zen study. More than ever technology is turning a herculean task for native speakers into a kind of literature subject to literary criticism. Translators are more and more including original languages in their translations, and feeling more and more obligated to discuss and explain their translation choices.

The four statements in this book are taken from the Blue Cliff Record, but the legendary Zen scholar R.H. Blyth offers a differently worded Four Statements in his *Zen and Zen Classics, Volume 1*:

- 1 不立文字
- 2 教外別伝
- 3 直指人 心
- 4 見性成仏

Which Blyth translates:

No dependance on words and letters
A special transmission outside of the
scriptures
Direct pointing to the mind of man
Seeing into one's nature and the
attainment of Buddhahood

It appears that D.T. Suzuki used this wording as well for his translation:

A special transmission outside the

Scriptures;
No dependence upon words and
letters;
Direct pointing to the soul of man;
Seeing into one's nature and the
attainment of Buddhahood.

We have another example of the Four Statements via
one of the alternate 49th Cases of *Wumenguan*:

Menggong's untitled epilogue

Damo came from the West, not
maintaining written words, but
pointing directly to the human
heart-mind to see one's own na-
ture to become Buddha.
Speakng, in particular, about
"pointing directly" is already a
twisted detour. Further, by sayng
"to become Buddha," the gentle-
man doesn't stop flunking. Be-
cause it is already gateless, is
there be a checkpoint? Like the
friendly feelings of an old woman,
he announces and spreads hateful
gossip. Wuan (Hermitage of Noth-
ing) wants to add one superfluous
talk to become the forty-ninth crite-
rion. In this space, there are some
imprudent errors, so scrape the
meat from the bones. Raise your

eyebrows (to open your eyes widely) and take hold of the offerings.

- (Wumen, 2007)

Damo is another name for Bodhidharma, the name most commonly used for him in much of Asia as I learned walking around saying "Bodhidharma", nobody understanding me, showing the characters, and being told, "Oh! *Damo*." Translation trouble.

Translation Questions

Discussion of Translation

Translation is a tricky business, made more complex by the fact that the Four Statements of Zen are written in a traditional format of four lines of four characters, which means that a bit of shorthand was used. What follows in this section is a paraphrasing of some of the discussion by various members of the Zen Reddit forum about how the characters are literally translated outside of the context of the Zen records themselves.

Transmission

單傳心印 has been translated as: "the sole transmission of the mind seal," but looking at the MDBG.net, "a master marks the heart" or "heart marked by a master" is more literal.

The first word seems to be one of those that's hard to translate well. It doesn't look at all like "teaching outside separate transmission" though, so where does "transmission" come from?

Records, Scriptures, Words, Sentences

"別傳" = "supplementary biography" zdic.net has it, "[supplementary biography] supplementary biography of someone's life anecdotes". "別傳" is more specific than "teachings" and relates to some (mis)understanding that was prevalent during the time regarding the records of "wise sages". Yuanwu's commentary starts with "謂之" and that, although "謂" can be "to speak", it can also be "meaning" and the next character, "之", I'm told by the dictionary is a possessive particle, so I think that's the part of Cleary's translation which says "This is called", and maybe it could also be "This is the meaning of ...".

"教" is "teaching" and also "religion" and this is very distinct from the next part, "別傳", so it could be more like, "This is the meaning of "the teaching outside of the chronicles (of the sages)" "Teaching" (教) "outside of" (外) the "the 別傳" (whatever they are).

Straight pointing at mind

"心", "xin" is an interesting concept. It is often translated as "heart-mind". though in English, it is "the mind." "人心" which is "person/human heart" but maybe even "people's hearts". This also be read as "Straightforward pointing to the human heart" or "Frankly pointing at human's intentions"

#1: Outside of Records

謂之教外別傳。

"To speak of the teaching that is
outside the historical records"

This term "historical records" is sometimes translated as "scriptures", as in, "outside of scriptures" and sometimes as "outside of words" which might lend itself to misinterpretation. Zen Masters argue that wisdom, prajna, is an expression of mind/self, dhyana, and thus rather than being immutable truth such as bibles and sutras might provide, Zen wisdom is only available, manifest, present, when an enlightened person is providing it to you. Which is why people quoting these words later is often referred to as "dead words", as opposed to the fresh, living words that emerge directly from a Master. Interestingly, a Master quoting another Master? The words are still alive.

The next logical question is if words do not convey or transmit truth in Zen as words do in religions with bibles or sutras, how is Zen transmitted? Mazu, a figure so large in Zen history that he was called the seventh Patriarch when there were only ever six, says this in a sermon found at the beginning of Sun Face Buddha:

The Patriarch said to the assembly, "All
of you should believe that your mind
is Buddha, that this mind is identical
with Buddha. The Great Master

Bodhidharma came from India to China, and transmitted the One Mind teaching of Mahāyāna so that it can lead you all to awakening. Fearing that you will be too confused and will not believe that this One Mind is inherent in all of you, he used the Lankavatāra Sutra to seal the sentient beings' mind-ground! Therefore, in the Lankavatāra Sutra, mind is the essence of all the Buddha's teachings, no gate is the Dharma-gate. (Mazu, 2001, p.62)

This "One Mind" teaching is transmitted by Bodhidharma, and the words of the Lanka, like all words in Zen, are used as a seal in wax, which making an inverse impression, is then put aside. What an odd metaphor!

The beginning of the Soto/Caodong lineage is Dongshan, who is controversial in so many ways, chiefly in this context because Dongshan wasn't enlightened by/under a Soto/Caodong Master but nevertheless "succeeded to" a Soto/Caodong. Succeeded being a term meaning "received the transmission of". Dongshan studied under Yunyen, but left to visit other Masters. Somewhere during his travels Dongshan "received the transmission" after visiting Nanquan, visiting Yunmen, or crossing a river. Later, receiving news that Yunyen had died, Dongshan returned to Yunyen's community and began preaching or teaching there:

Because the Master [Dongshan] was
conducting a memorial feast for

Yunyen, a monk asked, "What teaching did you receive while you were at Yunyen's place?"

The Master said, "Although was there, I didn't receive any teaching."

"Since you didn't actually receive any teaching, why are you conducting this memorial?" asked the monk.

"Why should I turn my back on him?" replied the Master.

"If you began by meeting Nanquan, why do you now conduct a memorial feast for Yunyen?" asked the monk. "It is not my former master's virtue or Buddha Dharma that I esteem, only that he did not make exhaustive explanations for me," replied the Master.

"Since you are conducting this memorial feast for the former master, do you agree with him or not?" asked the monk.

The Master said, "I agree with half and don't agree with half."

"Why don't you agree completely?" asked the monk.

The Master said, "If I agreed completely, then I would be ungrateful to my former master." (Dongshan, 1986)

Here we have the idea that the transmission is not based on agreement with the words (or at least half of 'em!) of the teacher, and, oddly, and not for the first time, a Soto/Caodong transmission occurs without the

Soto/Caodong Master's "approval".

Wumen, in his book of Zen instruction *Wumen's Checkpoint* (often mistranslated as *The Gateless Gate*, takes up the (still) controversial Case of Zen Master Buddha's first transmission:

Case 6: The World Honored One [Zen Master Buddha] Picks a Flower

The World Honored One a long time ago at a convocation on top of Spirit Mountain [Vulture Peak, where Buddha taught the Heart and Lotus Sutras] picked up a flower and showed it to the multitude. At that time all the multitude were thus silent. Only Kashyapa gave a broad smile and laughed a little.

The World Honored One said, "I possess the storehouse of the correct Dharma eye, the wonderful heart-mind of Nirvana, the formless true form, the subtle Dharma gate, not established by written words, transmitted separately outside the teaching. I hand it over and entrust these encouraging words to Kashyapa." (Wumen, 1999)

In this Case we see the transmission does not involve any sutras, or indeed any words at all. This Case is controversial not least because it first appears in writing in China around 900 CE, around more than 1,000 years after Zen Master Buddha taught on that peak in India in a different language. Ironically that

this core teaching of Buddha's appears only in China 1500 years after Buddha lived in India is one of the least controversial points in the long standing enmity between Zen and Buddhism.

The first and second of the Four Statements can get jumbled together in translations, and here we have Yuanwu in *Blue Cliff Record* eliminating the First Statement altogether, although "outside the written teachings" would imply "not having established and not depending" by default:

FOURTEENTH CASE:

Yunmen's Appropriate Statement

A monk asked Yunmen, "What are the teachings of a whole lifetime?"

Yunmen said, "An appropriate statement,"

YUANWU'S INSTRUCTION:

Members of the Ch'an family, if you want to know the meaning of Buddha-nature, you must observe times and seasons, causes and conditions. This is called the special transmission outside the (written) teachings, the sole transmission of the mind seal, directly pointing to the human mind for the perception of nature and realization of Buddhahood. (Yuanwu, 2005)

There is some discussion by Yuanwu where he interprets "teachings of a whole lifetime" to be everything that Zen Master Buddha ever said (or did). This means the monk is asking, "What is the sum total of all Buddha's words?" and Yunmen cuts the monk's question in half by saying "appropriate statement". Then of course Yuanwu references the transmission of the mind seal, which takes us directly into Chapter Two: Transmission.

Refuting Sitting Meditation

"Not based on written teachings" also has historically been used as a basis for rejecting sitting meditation. Not only has there never been a sitting meditation manual written by a Zen Master, modern scholarship has linked this specific phrasing as a reference to the explicit rejection of sitting meditation practice.

The history of this debate really begins in 1200 in Japan. Dogen, a messianic Buddhist, sought to create a religious movement by splintering from his Tiantai roots. Dogen attributed his new religion to "Buddha and Bodhidharma" originally, but then later attempted to link his church to Rujing, a Soto-Caodong Zen Master from China. Historians have since proven that there was no such link between Dogen and Rujing (Bielefeldt, 1990).

Dogen based his initial claim of a link between his new Shikantaza Zazen prayer-meditation and Chinese Zen on a reference to Bodhidharma's "wall gazing", before later claiming it came from Rujing. Modern scholarship is increasingly ruling out any

interpretation of this reference to Bodhidharma's "wall gazing" as a sitting meditation practice.

An excellent summary of the most recent development was provided by Redditor Spinozabenedicto, as follows:

Although the terms mianbi (面壁, wall-facing) and biguan (壁觀, wall-vipaśyanā/contemplation), associated with Bodhidharma are interpreted by a number of scholars as some sort of meditative practice involving physical wall gazing, it's descriptions in newly discovered texts and new translations seem to indicate otherwise. Texts as early as the Dunhuang Long Scroll datable to the early Tang or late texts like the Book of Serenity attribute this practice to Bodhidharma.

The oldest datable text, the Dunhuang mss, never describes the practice in detail, nor it is quoted by any historical Zen master. But the meaning of this term as used in the text might be preserved in a long-lost Tibetan translation, in the ninth-century Tibetan treatise Samten Migdrön as Tibetan translators were famous for translating meanings over transliterations.

The original reads 'If one.... abides in wall-examining (*biguan* 壁觀),..... no way following after the written teachings—this is mysteriously

tallying with principle.", while The Tibetan reads "If one reverts to the real.... and abides in brightness.....will not follow after the written teachings. This is the quiet of the principle of the real." So the Tibetan version translates it as 'brightness'/luminosity', the in the dzogchen context of this text, the word *gsal ba* used for biguan likely means original luminosity/enlightenment of mind, nothing sort of physical practice.

The next references are from the *Shaoshi liumen* 少室六門, the oldest text attributed to Bodhidharma that is quoted by a non-legendary Zen master like Dahui, in his *Treasury of the Correct Dharma Eye* and his [sayings record](#). Here it is referred to as *the mind like a wall*

You [should] merely, without(externally): desist from all objective supports; within(internally): have no panting in the mind. With a mind like a wall, you can enter the Way. (Spinozabenedicto, 2022)

This scholarship very much follows the trend started by D.T. Suzuki in his discussion of "wall gazing" as referece to a teaching rather than a hitherto unknown sitting meditation practice.

#2: Transmitted Mind Seal

單傳心印。

"Zen Master transmitted Mind seal"

Zen history is integrally tied to the recognition of enlightenment. Zen Masters are Masters because they are enlightened and thus are able to tell who is enlightened and who isn't. Enlightenment is demonstrated rather than claimed, which in turn accounts for and justifies Zen's continual and constant engagement with the public in question and answer.

How is this enlightenment obtained? The simple answer is it is transmitted from mind to mind, as it was from the beginning, which is outlined in Case 6 of Wumenguan, translated as Women's Checkpoint, from the previous chapter. As you would expect though, that's not the only teaching Women offers us on the transmission of Enlightenment:

Case 22. Kaśyapa's Temple Flagpole

Ananda asked Kasyapa, "Besides the golden robe [emblematic of successorship, what did the Buddha pass on to you?" Kasyapa called to him, "Ananda!" Ananda answered, "Yes?" Kaśyapa said, "Take down

the temple flagpole in front of the gate [you are ready to take my place]." (Wumen, 2006, p.87)

Whatever this "transmission of Enlightenment" is, it isn't an emblem, or a certificate, or permission from an authority. Also note that the temple flagpole was used to signal when dharma lectures and interviews were being given, so "take down the flagpole" is another way of saying "the teaching is done".

This next Zen historical record (Case/koan/gongan) comes from Huangbo – Blofeld's much beloved translation. It specifically address transmission, which in some religions has been reduced to simply a step in the ordination process. This exchange begins with Huangbo being asked about how transmission works if there is no doctrine, no information, no knowledge to be transmitted?

Q: If there is nothing on which to lay hold, how is the Dharma to be transmitted?

A: It is a transmission of Mind with Mind.

Q: If Mind is used for transmission, why do you say that Mind too does not exist?

A: Obtaining no Dharma whatever is called Mind transmission. The understanding of this Mind implies no Mind and no Dharma.

Q: If there is no Mind and no Dharma, what is meant by transmission?

A: You hear people speak of Mind transmission and then you talk of

something to be received. So
Bodhidharma said:
'The nature of the Mind when
understood,
No human speech can compass or
disclose.
Enlightenment is naught to be attained,
And he that gains it does not say he
knows.'
If I were to make this clear to you, I
doubt if you could stand up to it.
(Huangbo, 1994, p.59)

Several important questions are raised in this short dialogue, as there are in most Zen dialogues. First, note that Huangbo is attributing a teaching to Bodhidharma which is unusual, since Zen Masters attribute very little textually to Bodhidharma. All of the popular books available today that have "Bodhidharma" in the title are attributions made in the last few decades by Western academics, there is no corroboration by Zen Masters of these texts as Bodhidharma teachings.

Second, mind to mind transmission is discussed in such a way that it should be clear that it is *exclusively a connection between two people*. So people who don't have a particular teacher? Likely they aren't enlightened in the Zen tradition. People who had a teacher, but that teacher was discredited? All the students of that teacher are also discredited.

Third, Huangbo makes it clear that nothing is received. You can do what you like with that, but certainly this means that anyone "teaching" a practice, doctrine, or particular "truth" is not a Zen Master.

The nature of this transmission of

Enlightenment is further explored in another of Wumen's famous Cases, Wumen's Checkpoint Case 28, which is an account of a famous Buddhist lecturer (Deshan) who traveled to the South of China to argue with Zen Masters and ended up converting to Zen:

Case 28. Long Have We Heard of
Longtan (aka Deshan's Candle)

Once when Deshan was getting instruction from Longtan, he stayed on into the night. Longtan said, "It's late-why don't you go?" Deshan said goodbye and lifted up the curtain [to go]. He saw it was dark out, so he turned back [to Longtan] and said, "It's dark outside."

Longtan then lit a candle and handed it to Deshan. As Deshan was about to take it, Longtan blew the candle out. At this Deshan suddenly had an insight. Then he bowed to Longtan. Longtan said, "What truth have you seen?"

Deshan said, "From this day forward I shall no longer doubt the tongues of all the world's enlightened teachers."

The next morning Longtan went up to the teaching hall and said, "There's a guy here with teeth like a forest of swords and a mouth like a bowl of blood. Hit him a blow and he doesn't turn back. Someday in the future he will go to the summit of a solitary

peak and establish our Path there."
Deshan then took [the sutras and] the commentaries he had written and brought them, along with a torch, to the area in front of the teaching hall. He held up the commentaries and said, "To plumb the depths of all the abstruse mystic theories is like placing a single hair in the void of space. To investigate to the end the workings of the world is like throwing a drop of water into a great abyss." Then he took [the sutras and] his commentaries and burned them. After that he paid homage to Longtan and said farewell.
(Wumen, 2006, p. 92)

Again there are many implications from this historical record, but the most relevant to the Four Statements is the question What did this Master and Student see in each other in that moment of the candle being blown out? Especially given that Deshan says, "I shall no longer doubt"? and Longtan says "teeth like swords, mouth like a bowl of blood"? Clearly each understood something about the other, but it was not something doctrinal or textual or ideological... how could it be?

Deshan's burning of the sutras is also very controversial. You'll note I put that in myself (the are mine) because so many translators want to shy away from the fact that commentaries are written into the sacred books. It's one thing to burn all your lecture notes, it's another to burn the bible you wrote your lecture notes in. Clearly though the commentaries aren't the problem... the sutras are being described as

"mystic theories". Which isn't that bad compared to Yangshan calling the sutras "devil words".

Finally, there is an interesting passage in the Soto/Caodong Zen Masterpiece Book of Serenity, which I refer to as the "Modern Soto Zen Bible". Soto Zen Master Wansong is recounting a criticism of Nanquan before launching into a review of Nanquan's resume:

In Dharma Master Feishan's Preceptual Jewels, he discussed the teaching of the special transmission of mind and criticized Nanquan, saying,
"Someone like Nanquan never devoted himself to study, and didn't know the fundamental--he is not worthy to speak of the teachings of the Buddha."

Notice though that whoever this "Feishan" person is, the criticism of Nanquan is contextualized in... wait for it... *the special transmission of mind*. Even to their critics of the time Zen Masters were understood to be "teaching" this special transmission of mind described in the second of the Four Statements.

Finally, let's turn to Yunmen. What could go wrong?

Someone asked Master Yunmen, "Since antiquity, the old worthies have transmitted mind by mind. Today I ask you, Master: What device do you use?"

The Master said, "When there's a

question, there's an answer."
The questioner went on, "In this case it
isn't a useless device!" The Master
replied, "No question, no answer."
(Yunmen, 2018 p.89)

Well, now you know: mind to mind transmission is by
means of a device: question and answer.

#3: Straight Pointing at Mind

直指人心。

"Straight pointing at person's
mind"

Now we get to what is involved in this "outside of records" and how exactly this "mind seal" could be "transmitted", all of which are central concepts in Zen but not so much in religious or philosophical Buddhisms. The first two of the Four Statements are about the what of Zen, now, in the Third Statement, we are talking about the how.

The textual beginning of the idea of straight pointing is firmly established in Bodhidharma's arrival in China. The fact that we have no written records from this period obscures the point that all the later generations of Zen Masters emphasized this idea of Bodhidharma as "point to mind" to the exclusion and eventual abandonment of the other thing Bodhidharma is known for in Zen texts: The Lankavatara Sutra. Here is a chapter from D.T. Suzuki's *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*, notice how Suzuki finds in the Lanka these two key teachings of Zen:

- (I) THE DOCTRINE OF MIND-ONLY
 - (II) THE CONCEPTION OF NO-BIRTH
- (Suzuki, 1930)

While the Lankavatara Sutra rarely comes up in the Zen textual tradition as it developed beginning two generations after Huineng, the 6th and last Patriarch, Zen clearly is interested in the themes that D.T. Suzuki saw in the Lanka, since those first two sections are central themes in Zen teaching.

So how does this "pointing" at "mind" come up in Zen texts? In Dahui's Shobogenzo, which is by the way the original Shobogenzo which would later be plagiarized in Japan by Dogen, the messianic Buddhist cult leader who would so successfully mislead people into thinking his new religion was Soto Zen, we have this Case:

Master Wuzu Yan said,

Yaoshan asked Shitou, "I have a rough knowledge of the twelve-part teachings of the three vehicles. I hear that in the South you point directly to people's minds to show them their nature so they become enlightened. I do not understand this; please be so kind and compassionate as to instruct me."

Shitou said, "This way will not do, not this way will not do; this way and not this way will not do at all."

When I was a student, I heard brothers discussing this, saying, "Even 'mind itself is Buddha' will not do; denial of 'mind itself is buddha' won't do

either." If you talk like this, how dare
you call yourselves [Zennists]?
(Dahui, 2022, #152)

To put this in the proper context, Yaoshan was in the
Soto Zen (aka Caodong) lineage from waaay back,
this way:

Huineng → Quingyuan → Shitou →
Yaoshan⁽⁷⁴⁵⁻⁸²⁸⁾ → Yunyan → *Dongshan*

with Wuzu Fayuan(1024-1104) turning up in the Rinzai
(Linji) lineage a long time later. Contrary to the claims
of Zazen Dogenism, Zen Masters do not consider
there to be any difference of doctrine, practice, or
teachings between the lineages, but it being much
more a matter of attitude, or style. So it is not unusual
at all to see a Soto (Caodong) Master quoted by a
Rinzai (Linji) Master on the topic of the core doctrine
attributed by Zen Masters to Bodhidharma: Pointing at
Mind.

The teaching of Pointing at Mind comes up in
some of the more commonly read texts in the West,
beginning with a lesser known translation of Huangbo:

祖師西來直指一切人全體是佛
Bodhidharma came from the west
directly point out to all people that
their whole substance is Buddha.

祖師直指一切眾生本心。
Bodhidharma directly pointed out to all
their original mind.

直指一切眾生本來是佛

directly pointing out to all that their
original nature is Buddha.
(Huangbo, 2013)

Again this "pointing at mind" is attributed to Bodhidharma, but whether that is an attempt to emphasize its importance, its history, or its origin in the Lanka is a mystery of history. Huangbo also contrasts the teaching of pointing to mind with "orthodox teachings", emphasizing its superiority over the sutras, this time in Blofeld's much beloved translation:

Essential substance partakes neither of identity nor difference. If you accept the orthodox teachings of the Three Vehicles of Buddhism, discriminating between the Buddha-Nature and the nature of sentient beings, you will create for yourself Three Vehicle karma, and identities and differences will result. But if you accept the Buddha-Vehicle, which is the doctrine transmitted by Bodhidharma, you will not speak of such things; you will merely point to the One Mind which is without identity or difference, without cause or effect. (Huangbo, 1958, p.73)

Huangbo's text is famously anti-Buddhist orthodoxy, and much of it boils down to this question of the how, via point to mind. For Huangbo it is not a doctrinal position, since the doctrine of pointing to mind is not

itself the immediate experience of one person pointing and another person turning the light around toward mind.

As a final note on the amazing adventure that is translation, I was fumbling around this "直指", "direct pointing", and it was pointed out that in 指 appears in this shortened version to match the four character structure of each line, whereas in texts it also appears as 指明. A search of that turned up the phrase "佛道指明" which literally translates as "Buddha Way Pointing", and guess how Google (and others) have (mis)translated that? "Buddhist teachings". How amusing is that? The unorthodox teaching of direct pointing which supersedes the sutras is nevertheless translated as "Buddhist teaching". It's a wonder anybody isn't confused.

#4a: See nature

見性

"See nature..."

Now we arrive at the central element of the Four Statements, the single ingredient in Zen enlightenment: Seeing the nature, or perhaps more elaborately, seeing the Buddha essence. Huineng uses the term "self nature", but either way, seeing and nature are the core teaching of Zen .

Hakamaya, a Dogenism scholar at the center of the Critical Buddhism movement in Japan, argued that Buddhism generally and Dogen explicitly reject this central thesis of Zen. *"The second that Buddhism came to be understood as a "religion of self-awareness," it ceased to be Buddhist... when it changed to a "religion centered on nature" at that moment it ceased to be Buddhist"* and *"Dogen developed a very pointed critique of "religion centered on nature," the false Buddhism that asserts that "mountains, rivers, grasses, and trees all attain Buddhahood"* (Hubbard, 1997, p. 121)

That Zen is incompatible with the many varieties of Japanese Dogenism, especially those marketing themselves as "Zen-Buddhism" tends to be surprising to people who don't have prior exposure to either Zen or Buddhism's catechism regarding the rejection of Ātman, or "self", while Zen argues aggressively that awareness of this non-predictable

self is all that made Buddha enlightened.

This next dialogue is attributed to Chih of Yun-chu of the eighth century, who may be Guizong Zhichang. It appears in D.T. Suzuki's essay *Zen and the Unconscious* which can be found in *Zen Buddhism: Selected Writings of D.T. Suzuki* p.206, and again in Suzuki's *Zen Doctrine of No-Mind*, p.78:

"A monk asked Chih of Yun-chu of the eighth century, 'What is meant by seeing into one's Self-nature and becoming a Buddha?'

Chih: 'This Nature is from the first pure and undefiled, serene and undisturbed. It belongs to no categories of duality such as being and non-being, pure and defiled, long and short, taking-in and giving-up; the Body remains in its suchness. To have a clear insight into this is to see into one's Self-nature. Self-nature is the Buddha, and the Buddha is Self-nature. Therefore, seeing into one's Self-nature is becoming the Buddha.'

Monk: 'If Self-nature is pure, and belongs to no categories of duality such as being and non-being, etc., where does this seeing take place ? '

Chih: 'There is a seeing, but nothing seen.'

Monk: 'If there is nothing seen, how can we say that there is any seeing at all?'

Chih: 'In fact there is no trace of seeing.'

Monk: 'In such a seeing, whose seeing is it?'

Chih: 'There is no seer, either.'

Monk: 'Where do we ultimately come to?'

Chih: 'Do you know that it is because of erroneous discrimination that one conceives of a being, and hence the separation of subject and object. This is known as a confused view. For in accordance with this view one is involved in complexities and falls into the path of birth and death. Those with a clearer insight are not like this one. Seeing may go on all day, and yet there is nothing seen by them. You may seek for traces of seeing in them, but nothing, either of the Body or of the Use, is discoverable here. The duality of subject and object is gone—which is called the seeing into Self-nature.'"

That might seem like the long way

around to "seeing the self nature"
given that we end up with no seer,
nothing seen, and no seeing.
Haven't you heard "outside the
records"? Well now you know why.
The records aren't all that helpful, are
they? Even as "self" is at the core of
the Zen perspective, clearly
predication is entirely useless.

Zhaozhou is famous for saying that dogs don't
have a self nature (the Buddhist equivalent of denying
that dogs a soul), which forms the basis of the first
Case of Wumenguan, aka Women's Checkpoint.
Zhaozhou also famously said dogs do have the
Buddha nature, going on to argue why the dog ended
up a dog in the lottery of rebirth. Zhaozhou's record
has strong things to say about Buddha/self nature
beyond that though:

Whoever it is who questions me, I
teach him by means of my own
nature." (Zhaozhou, 1998, p.35)

and

187.

A monk asked, "What is the unmistakable
path?"

[Zhaozhou] said, "Awakening to your
mind, seeing your nature; these are
the unmistakable path."

That's as clear a support of the Four Statements of
Zen as you'll find anywhere.

Hundreds of years later this nature comes up again in Mingben's Illusory Man:

An illusory man went into his illusory house one day, sat down on his illusory seat and picked up his illusory fly-whisk, and then all his illusory disciples gathered around in a cloud. They began to speak to him, asking, why are pines straight? and why are brambles tangled? and why are swans white? and why are crows black? ...This illusion is a blindness invisible to the eyes, it gives birth to the illusion of sight, it submerges you in your own concepts where illusory distinctions first begin. You see 'straight' as 'not crooked,' and 'white' depends on not being 'black.' With all your stratagems and methods, you grasp perversely at your own nature and you are born (Mingben, 2022)

Now, prepare yourself for The Big Reveal, because this is how shockingly consistent Zen Masters are: The name Zen comes from the word dhyana, which I would translate as "Reigning Awareness"; but dhyana is also known in Huineng's text as the lamp of the light of wisdom (prajna), aka... self nature. Huineng's much maligned student Shenhui took up this theme in his own teaching, as D.T. Suzuki establishes by quoting from Huineng and then providing this translation of Shenhui's record:

"Where this (mystery) takes place, we say that Dhyana, taken up by itself, is the Body of Prajna, and is not distinct from Prajna, and is Prajna itself; and further, that Prajna, taken up by itself, is the Use of Dhyana. and is not distinct from Dhyana, and is Dhyana itself. (Indeed) when Dhyana is taken up by itself, there is no Dhyana; when Prajna is to be up by itself, here is no Prajna. Why? Became (Self-)nature is suchness [being itself], and this is what is meant by the oneness of Dhyana and Prajna." (Suzuki, 1991, p.47)

Dhyana, Zen, is the very being of the self nature. The name Zen is thus a direct reference to what is "seen" in the Zen school.

#4b: Become a Buddha

成佛。

...become Buddha.

Zen Masters: Buddhas All

What does it mean to see your Buddha nature or self nature? What does "enlightenment" amount to? It amounts to Buddhahood, Zen teachings are very explicit on this point:

One day [the Buddhist layman and superintendent of Henan-fu] Wang Jingchu paid a visit to Linji. He was with Linji observing things in front of the monks' hall, when he asked, "Do the monks in this hall read the sutras?"

Linji said, "They don't read the sutras."

Wang asked, "Do they study Zen?"

Linji said, "They don't study Zen."

Wang said, "If they don't read the sutras and don't study Zen, ultimately what are they doing?"

Linji said, "We're making them all into buddhas and patriarchs." (Linji,

1999, p50)

It must seem odd to people new to Zen that all the shouting and slapping and silly answers are in reality no less than the living manifestations of Buddhahood, but there you are; that's Zen for you.

The most famous writing of all Soto (Caodong) Zen Masters is by Zen Master Wansong, who literally wrote the bible on Soto Zen instruction. Here he quotes the Record of Linji about the how a Buddha is born:

In the extensive record of Linji it says,
"There is only the independent
Wayfarer listening to the Dharma;
this is the mother of the Buddhas.
Therefore the Buddha is born of
independence; if you realize
independence, buddhahood too has
no attainment. If one can see in this
way, this is truly correct insight and
understanding." (Wansong, 2005)

"Born of independence" is of course all you can hope for since you can't be born as a result of records or teachings or practices and must instead see what the pointing finger that points at mind is pointing at.

Wansong also recounts this famous teaching by Zhongyi, who receives the newly enlightened Yangshan as Yangshan goes around calling on his Zen Masters uncles and aunts and cousins:

Yangshan asked Zhongyi, "What is the meaning of buddha nature?"

Zhongyi said, "I'll tell you a simile: it's like putting a monkey in a room with six windows --when someone outside calls it, 'Simian!Simian!' the monkey then responds. In this way, called through all six windows it responds."

Yangshan said, "What about when the monkey is asleep?"

Zhongyi got right down from his seat, grabbed and held Yangshan and said,

"Simian, Simian, you and I see each other." (Wansong, 2005)

The six windows are the six senses, the five you've heard of and the sixth being reasoning or cognition. The monkey is you and me and Yangshan. If you call out through a window, of course the monkey will answer. Give someone you know a pinch and see what happens. Among Wansong's comments on this Case are, "Will the monkey agree to rest quietly?" and "Don't talk in your sleep."

Zen Master Buddha

Of the many controversies between Zen and all the forms of Buddhism, one of the greatest controversies is the view that Zen Master Buddha was just a Zen Master, and the corollary that all Zen

Masters are Buddhas themselves. This is a particularly difficult doctrinal position for Japanese Dogenism given the religion's history of alcoholic and sexually predatory meditation "masters" (sexpredators, 2008). The revered Zazen "masters" of the 20th Century were all tied to scandals that were as "not Buddhas" as you can get; all of whom are still called "masters" by their church a generation later, all of whom are still seen as dharma vessels and transmitters of the dharma, which only Buddhas, Patriarchs, and Masters are capable of being and doing.

Those who can't keep the precepts, let alone avoid addiction and sexually predatory relationships with their students, are certainly not enlightened. People who study Zen have a very different set of expectations for "master" than Japanese Dogenism brought to the West:

"In the 1960s, four major [Japanese Buddhist] teachers came to the United States from Japan: Shunryu Suzuki, Taizan Maezumi, Joshu Sasaki, and Eido Shimano. Andy Aftab, one of Shimano's former head monks, called these four the "major missionaries" of [Japanese Buddhism], as they had all received "transmission" from leading Japanese teachers... And three of the four... have caused major public sex scandals... The only one of the four whose reputation was unblemished, Shunryu Suzuki of the San Francisco Zen Center, gave his

sangha over to a man named Richard Baker, who was later embroiled in a sex scandal of his own, resigned from his abbacy." (Oppenheimer, 2013)

These scandals illustrate what happens when communities are led by people who are deeply troubled on both the personal and spiritual level rather than by Buddhas or patriarchs or Zen Masters.

When Zen Masters talk about becoming Buddha, they don't mean a person of authority in a religious organization. When Deshan was enlightened, his teacher described Deshan as having "fangs are like the sword tree" and a mouth "like a blood bowl". If nothing else, this imagery suggests a very different version of Buddha than Buddhist religions extol and we can call this different version of Buddha "Zen Master Buddha". (Wumen, 1966, p.163)

Whatever else we can learn from the textual history of Zen, spanning as it does almost one thousand years of unbroken tradition, we can certainly for a picture of the kinds of people who were called "Zen Masters" and how they led communities. Their compassion was not directed toward exhorting people to practice seated meditation, their conversations were not directed toward simplifying a message that could be intellectually digested, and their conduct was not morally comprised any more than it was conformist.

Conclusion

These Four Statements put Zen in a very different context than Buddhism. Firstly because while Buddhists are learning the Eightfold Path, Zen students are learning the Four Statements. The basis of the conversation for the new student isn't even remotely similar, and that will result in these students coming at their textual history, traditions, and teachings from very very different directions.

Secondly, the doctrinal implications of the Four Statements are directly at odds with many, if not all, interpretations of Buddhism. Next time we sit down together, we might talk about how the Buddhist doctrines of non-self and dependent origination are at odds with Zen's descriptions of a universal Buddha nature and Original yet Sudden enlightenment, not to mention "outside of records", which not only invalidates all the Zen teachings as the authority of the tradition, but all the Buddhist sutras as well. It is not for nothing that Deshan burned the sutras in the lecture hall. Speaking of sutras there can be no clear exposition of the Four Statements than this:

Guishan said to Yangshan, "The
Nirvana Sutra has about forty
chapters of the Buddha's teaching;
how many of these are devil
teachings?"

Yangshan said, "All of them."

Guishan said, "From now on, nobody
will be able to do what he likes with
you."

Yangshan asked, "From now on what should be my mode of life?"
Guishan said, "I admire your just eye; I am not concerned about the practical side of the matter." (Blyth, 1970, p. 102)

This "just eye" is also called the Eye of the Dharma, that which Zen Master Buddha transmitted on Vulture Peak when he held up the flower. Not having a mode of life means living as you will, subject to no one.
Buddhas all the Way down.

Bibliography

- Bielefeldt, C. (1990). *Dogen's Manuals of Zen Meditation* (First Edition). University of California Press.
- Blyth, R. H. (1970). *Zen and Zen Classics, Volume Three: History of Zen (Nangaku Branch)* (First Printing ed.). The Hokuseido Press.
- Dahui, D. (2022). *Shobogenzo, published as Treasury of the Eye of True Teaching* (T. Cleary, Trans.). Shambhala.
- Dongshan, (1986). *The Record of Tung-Shan (Classics in East Asian Buddhism)* (Powell, Trans.; 0 ed.). Univ of Hawaii Pr.
- Foyan. (1994). *Instant Zen: Waking Up in the Present* (T. Cleary, Trans.). North Atlantic Books.
- Huangbo, (1958). *The Zen Teaching of Huang Po: On the Transmission of Mind* (J. Blofeld, Trans.). Grove Press.
- Huangbo. (2013). *CHAN MASTER HUANGBO DUANJI: A HISTORY AND TRANSLATION OF A TANG DYNASTY TEXT* (J. Leahy, Trans.; Thesis). Dpt of Religious Studies, California State University, Long Beach.
- Hubbard, J., & Swanson, P. L. (1997). *Pruning the Bodhi Tree*. Amsterdam University Press
- Jorgenson. (2020). *Chán Buddhism in Dnhuáng and Beyond A Study of Manuscripts, Texts, and Contexts in Memory of John R. McRae (Numen Book)* (C. Anderl, Ed.). BRILL. *Early Chán Revisited: A Critical Reading of Dàoxuān's Hagiographies of Bodhidharma, Huìkě and Their Associates*
- Linji, (1999). *Three Chan Classics* (Anthropological

- Field Studies) (Cleary, Trans.). BDK America.
- Mazu, (2001). *Sun-Face Buddha: The Teachings of Ma-Tsu and the Hung-Chou School of Ch'an*. (Poceski, Trans.). Jain Pub Co.
- Mingben, Z., & E. (2022). *The Illusory Man* (W. Dufficy, Trans.). Independently published.
- Oppenheimer, M. (2013, November 16). *The Zen Buddhist Who Preyed on His Upper East Side Students*. The New Republic.
<https://newrepublic.com/article/115613/zen-buddhist-sex-controversies-america-excerpt>
- Spinozabenedicto. (2022, June 14). *Biguan and the practice of no-practice*. Reddit.
https://www.reddit.com/r/zen/comments/vbpf3v/biguan_and_the_practice_of_nopractice/
- Sengcan, (2022). *On Faith In Mind - Hsin-Hsin Ming - Seng-ts'an*. (Trans. Dusan Pajin, University Of Arts In Belgrade, Yugoslavia.)
 Selfdefinition.Org/. Retrieved May 16, 2022, from <https://selfdefinition.org/zen/hsin-hsin-ming/faith-in-mind-dusan-pajin-translation.htm>
- sexpredators (2008, March 23). *R/Zen*. Retrieved June 16, 2022, from <https://www.reddit.com/r/zen/wiki/sexpredators>
- Suzuki, D. T. (1930). *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*. Munshirm Manoharlal Pub Pvt Ltd.
- Suzuki, D. T. (1961). *Essays in Zen Buddhism* (Evergreen ed.). Grove Press.
- Suzuki, D. T., & Humphreys, C. (1991). *The Zen Doctrine of No Mind* (Reprint ed.). Weiser Books.
- Wansong, (2005). *The Book of Serenity: One Hundred Zen Dialogues*. (Cleary, Trans.). Shambhala.
- Wumen. (1966). *Zen and Zen Classics, Volume Four: Mumonkan* (R. H. Blyth, Trans.; First Edition).

- Hokuseido Press.
- Wumen, (1999). *Three Chan Classics* (Anthropological Field Studies) (Cleary, Trans.). BDK America.
- Wumen, (2007). *The Gateless Checkpoint of the Zen Lineage*. (Wonderwheel, Trans.)
[Http://Home.Pon.Net/](http://Home.Pon.Net/). Retrieved May 16, 2022, from
<http://home.pon.net/wildrose/gateless.htm>
- Yuanwu, (1100). *Blue Cliff Record*. NTI Reader.
http://ntireader.org/taisho/t2003_02.html
- Yuanwu, (2005). *The Blue Cliff Record*. (Cleary, Trans.) (First Edition (US) First Printing ed.). Shambhala.
- Yunmen. (2018). *Zen Master Yunmen: His Life and Essential Sayings* (U. App, Trans.). Shambhala.
- Zhaozhou, (1998). *The Recorded Sayings of Zen Master Joshu: Chao-Chou Chan-Shih Yu-Lu* (Sacred Literature Series) (Green, Trans.). Altamira Pr.