



1955

## Svabhava in the Philosophy of Zen Buddhism

Frances Wesely Miller

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)



Part of the [East Asian Languages and Societies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Miller, Frances Wesely. (1955). *Svabhava in the Philosophy of Zen Buddhism*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3968](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3968)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgibney@pacific.edu).

---

S V A B H Ā V A

IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF ZEN BUDDHISM

Frances Wesely Miller

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of  
The American Academy of Asian Studies,  
A School of the College of the Pacific,  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for  
the degree of Master of Arts

San Francisco, California

June 1955

---

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	3
II. ORIGINAL NATURE .....	15
1. All Things are Empty .....	19
2. All Things are Unborn .....	28
3. All Things are Non-dual .....	34
4. All Things are Without Self-substance .	43
III. SEEING INTO ONE'S SELF-NATURE .....	57
1. Meditation, Will, and Faith .....	57
2. Zen Discipline and Practice .....	70
a. The Bodhisattva .....	77
b. Seeing Without Seeing .....	94
IV. ART IN ZEN .....	112
1. War, Swordsmanship, Archery .....	127
2. Brush and Ink .....	133
3. Haiku .....	139
4. The Tea Ceremony and Nō Plays .....	146

I. INTRODUCTION

When the Zen master asks, "Who are you?" a reply as to your name, age, and place of residence would be out of order. The proper answer might be silence. But if silence were consciously resorted to in contrast to sound, this would still be no answer. In fact, the only acceptable answer would lie in your merely being what you are at that very moment, without a second, or reflective, thought. And this amounts to being what you have always been and always will be.

The question has to do with your "original nature," that which you were before you were born or even conceived. This nature is of the nature of voidness.

To Western ears such statements may sound absurd. To us "self" is for the most part identified with what we call "I," the subject; selfhood is that particular individuality which the body encloses and defines, or perhaps

mechanistically gives rise to. But from the fact that we can say "my body" and "my self" a deeper sense of selfhood arises--the sense that something "other" than the body and even "other" than the self-conscious mind resides within the body. Here, strangely enough, we do not usually press the point, because it becomes inaccessible to the examining intellect and we can't "make sense" of it. Therefore the mystery of this double nature remains unsolved, for our way of solving things lies in the direction of logical intelligibility. We want "facts." Lacking them, we may either "believe" that this haunting companion, which we identify with the "ego," will one day be shucked out of the body as a pea is shucked out of its pod, or believe that it is a phenomenon arising from a temporary physical assemblage and that it will perish with the body.

In broader respects Western thought has dealt at great length with Nature. The universe has been conceived of as being composed of God, Nature, and Man--"Nature" in this case meaning the examinable world outside, which powerful telescopes and microscopes presumably will make more intelligible and more controllable as time goes by. Now that the physical sciences have blasted Nature's solidity into mere "events" and "relations," attention turns once more to man.

In the popular mind God is still where He has been for a long time: not here but "up there," to be believed in, as if He were possibly not true, and to be called upon for occasional practical intervention. If one were to say to a Christian, "Thou art God," or "Look within thine own mind; God is there," one would be accounted a heretic--or, now that we are more tolerant, a madman.

"Human nature" is the latest of the triad to be subjected to scrutiny. Although at the moment it is being identified with one of its aspects, namely, the instinct of self-preservation, the fact that such examination is almost always linked with the view of nature-as-process is a hopeful sign. Nevertheless, process is still seen objectively. When L. L. Whyte criticizes Descartes' Cogito as isolating the existent entity "I" and thus establishing the dualism of mind and matter, he proposes in its stead, "I am aware of the intermittent processes of thought in myself, born of the changing relations to the environment which make up my transient life."<sup>1</sup> This "I am aware of" perfectly expresses the Western malady. No one who is thus looking at his mental processes or at anything else as an object has yet, according to Eastern thought, discovered his true or original nature.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Next Development in Man (New York: Holt, 1948), p. 215.

As for self-preservation, the first requirement of one who is seeking his true nature is that he experience "the moment of the great death" in which self is found to be no separate phenomenon.

That the Western world is obsessed with acute metaphysical anxiety is evident in a frenzy of historical research in which our present situation is sought to be defined. But no amount of searching will find out what is central; it is to be found only by the cessation of searching. In Europe a more profound search goes on--in eschatological movements, ontological speculations, and extra-ecclesiastical religious groups.<sup>2</sup> In the midst of all this effort, that which requires no effort at all abides eternally, always accessible beneath the layers of ignorance, no matter how learned that ignorance may be.

More and more scholars are turning to the non-dual metaphysic of the Middle East and the Far East. Some, like René Guénon, for example, see it as capable of providing us with the same principle of unity which for many centuries has bound the East together in fundamental outlook. But M. Guénon takes a dim view of the possibility that many Westerners can overcome their dualistic habits of thinking--or, at least, that they can do so in time to

---

<sup>2</sup>A valuable discussion is to be found in Paul Tillich, The Religious Situation (New York: Holt, 1932).

prevent imminent catastrophe or rampant barbarism. The utmost that he dares hope for is an "intellectual elect" to act as a leavening agent.<sup>3</sup> By "intellectual" he does not necessarily mean "erudite," but rather intellectually clear. And perhaps this is all that can be hoped for.

But I should like to be more optimistic than this. Non-dual wisdom has always been directed against dualistic ways of thinking, and these ways are by no means confined to the West. Moreover, the "inscrutable" Orientals have no secrets from us. Everything is revealed, nothing is "esoteric." Knowledge lies so near at hand that only a tenth of an inch's distance separates us from it. But in that tenth of an inch "heaven and earth are set apart."<sup>4</sup>

The teaching is very simple--so simple, says Nyogen Senzaki, that people hesitate to practice it.<sup>5</sup> It is so simple that all one needs to say on a logical level is, "Heaven and earth are not apart." But realization does not occur on a logical level. What actually happens in realization is that the logical level un-occurs, and original

---

<sup>3</sup>Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Doctrine, tr. by Marco Pallis (London: Luzac, 1945), pp. 338ff.

<sup>4</sup>Seng t'san, Shinjin-no-mei, tr. by D. T. Suzuki in A Manual of Zen Buddhism (London: Rider, 1950), p. 77.

<sup>5</sup>Buddhism and Zen (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), p. 72.



nature is allowed to shine out without any such impediments as "heaven" and "earth" and the subject who has set them apart. Realization, as the Japanese fencing master Takuan says, is like the melting of ice into its original flowing state. This being so, it is not different from ignorance, except that from the standpoint of ignorance itself there is a certain painful tentativeness in being an ice-cube.

Certain schools of Eastern thought have stated that it is not necessary to study scriptures or to be profoundly learned in the prolific terminology used in their exposition. They state further that asceticism and elaborate ritual observances are unnecessary. I have selected one of these schools, the Zen school of Japan, not only because it concerns itself primarily with the central point of the metaphysic but also because it offers a "direct" or "easy" way to enlightenment. This does not mean that a few minutes of instruction on How to Become a Buddha will unravel the complications of many lifetimes, although perhaps there is always that hope. Zen texts say that enlightenment is as sudden as a lightning-flash rather than a smooth, gradual synthesis such as is indicated by Hegel. It might take ten or twenty years to reach it, or one might have to suffer through thousands of further births before being able to move over just that one-tenth of an inch to a point where enlightenment means nothing.

Zen is often called "Zen Buddhism." Zen does not have to be Buddhistic; it can be Christian, Mohammedan, or almost anything whose central teaching is "the bliss of the Innate." But Mahāyāna Buddhism as interpreted by the Hua-yen school of China most nearly accords with Zen views when they are philosophically expressed.

The name "Zen" is the Japanese version, after the Chinese ch'an, of the Sanskrit word dhyāna, meaning "meditation." Zen tradition is said to have begun with the transmission of the doctrine from the Buddha to Mahākāśyapa about the beginning of the fifth century B.C. Legend has it that the Buddha, upon being asked to deliver a sermon, silently held out a flower instead. Only one disciple, Mahākāśyapa, understood and smiled. The secret thus transmitted is called "an open secret." Everything you see is this secret. Words can only indicate it; nothing can contain it.

The history of Zen as a school begins about a thousand years later with the coming of one Bodhidharma to China. He is thought to have come from India, but old texts also refer to him as a Persian. The name "Persian," however, was used at the time to designate any foreigner. According to Zen tradition, he was the twenty-eighth of a line of Indian patriarchs including such illustrious figures as Aśvaghōṣa, Nagārjuna, and Vasubandhu. After

his death he was reported seen leaving China carrying one shoe in his hand. When his grave was opened, only one shoe was found. It is peculiarly fitting that the founder of the school should have appeared and disappeared so mysteriously. The fact is, as Zen would say, that he came from nowhere and went nowhere; he was never born. This may be called the essence of his teaching. When the Chinese Emperor asked him who he was, he replied, "I don't know."

After Bodhidharma there were five other patriarchs in China, of whom Hui-neng, the sixth and last patriarch, was undoubtedly the greatest. Hui-neng (also called Wei Lang) represents the Southern or "abrupt" school as against the Northern or "gradual" school of his erstwhile rival Shin-shau. According to the Southern school, which is now known in Japan as Rinzai (after its introducer Lin-chi), you cannot eliminate darkness from a room by bailing it out in bucketfuls; if you merely introduce a light into the room, darkness will vanish instantly. Hui-neng's great contribution to Zen thought was the phrase "seeing into one's self-nature" and its exposition. "You will find what is esoteric within you," he said.<sup>6</sup>

Today there are three Zen sects in Japan: the Rinzai, Soto, and Obaku, the last (the school of Hsi-yun

---

<sup>6</sup>The Sutra of Wei Lang, tr. by Wong Mou-Lam (London: Luzac, 1947), p. 23.

or Huang Po) having contributed to the teaching of the Rinzai. Soto Zen does not approve of the Koan exercise (a meditation "problem" which I shall explain later), and very often considers enlightenment itself unnecessary. Its emphasis is on meditation in the usual sense of that word. In this paper when I say "Zen," I shall be referring to Zen as practiced by the Rinzai sect.

The fundamentals of Zen as transmitted through Hui-neng and kept alive by such great masters as Ummon, Hakuin, and Basō, have been given to the West in recent years by one of the great scholars of our time, Dr. Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki. Little can be said about Zen that has not already been said or at least indicated by Dr. Suzuki. But there is a growing body of literature on Zen and Mahayana Buddhism in general.

Zen aims at a sudden dispersion of the contents of the conscious mind into the unconscious (to put it in understandable terms), in which conscious elements appear "empty" but are in fact far from negated. It is as if one suddenly saw the sameness of a pond and the sheet of ice which covered it. The ice would still be there, but its conditional aspect would be known. One could skate on it and still know that it was water under a certain set of conditions. In satori (enlightenment) Zen gains detachment from, without exclusion of, mental constructions, which are simply allowed to go on "happening" without being assigned final validity. Not being given

finality, they lose their power of chaining one by their apparent self-substantial reality.

It will be seen at once that this school is not of the "ivory tower" variety. It neither plunges into forgetful phenomenal activity nor withdraws from ordinary life. It aims at an ultimate affirmation of life, insisting that it be total and not bound by the accidents which normally limit it and spell the death of its immediacy and fluency.

Zen's goal of "action without attachment to the fruits thereof" is also the great theme of the Bhagavad Gita, which has justly been called the cream of the milk of all the Upanishads drawn from the udders of the Vedas. In the course of the development of this paper reference will be made to the Upanishads and the Gita, as well as to the works of Lao-tse and Chuang-tse, and to certain Tibetan texts, all of which develop the same central non-dual theme. It is chiefly because of its clarity and its practical methods that I have selected Zen as a starting-point.

The West has few exponents of the non-dual metaphysic, which sees all nature as "original." Among those whose statements seem to coincide most closely with Eastern thought are Plotinus (whose views, I believe, are too often misinterpreted), John Scotus Erigena, "Dionysius the Areopagite," Meister Eckhart, and a handful

of other so-called "negative theologians." These little-known men might be studied with profit, since they offer freshness after long neglect. But in general, although a thorough grounding in Christian doctrine and Western philosophy is desirable, I would say that the more familiar elements of our background should be temporarily left out. For too many centuries there has been a tendency toward intellectual moralism and "thinking religion," so much so that we can speak of religion as becoming "secular" when there is no distinction at all between "secular" and "holy." We are great believers in the "Holy Religion." But this is in itself an intellectual distinction. The two words could well stand reevaluation in light of the Middle Way.

Western mystics as a group do not escape the stigma of dualism. The East stresses so strongly the principle of "not otherness" that one can see by contrast the danger of setting up an object of contemplation, such as God, as an entity in itself. In mystical union with God as an entity, this union must remain a consciousness of identity with something totaliter aliter, "completely other." Such consciousness is far from the thoughts of Zen. If this is what "mysticism" means, then Zen is not mystical,

since it makes no juncture with any object whatsoever. It merely removes the false assumption that either subject or object exists.

In spite of the informality of its teachings, any exposition of Zen's aims short of actual practice must take the form of conceptual presentation. Therefore I shall attempt to explain it first by setting forth its fundamental presuppositions, which, however, are mere expedients toward freedom from all suppositions. After that I shall try to define the path toward that freedom and the character of the man who exemplifies it; and, last of all, a tangible evidence of the value of Zen teachings as shown in the arts. This is not to say that the value of these teachings lies in their "use." It lies in their very absence of purpose and calculated effort. Only "I" can have purpose, but if "I" am not there to crowd the power into falsely assumed outlines, anything might happen.

As my point of departure I have selected the concept of self-nature (svabhāva). In logical mode it may be so considered, however inadequately. It is itself what provides the means for talking about it. It is the only point of departure, as well as the point of all returning.

## II. ORIGINAL NATURE

Eastern metaphysic is basically inexpressible, referring as it does to the very life of expression. Words, therefore, as the Sutras are always saying, constitute a formidable barrier to knowledge. Because knowledge, in the sense of enlightened or direct knowledge, or Prajñā, is no specialized or limited matter which resides only in so utilitarian a function as the logical, discriminating mind. Words involve the separating-out of certain aspects of experience and the suppression of others. But Prajñā is a matter of one's entire being, and makes no discriminations because it has no use. Its very essence is non-doing, and the logical mind is only one of the restricted avenues through which it flows.

Since Vedic times the East has sought an adequate expression for that which is beyond speech. "Ultimate Reality" or "The Absolute," impersonal though they are,



still imply "unreality" and "the relative." "That" implies "this." "The One" implies "the many." Whatever expression is used, the implication of otherness is present. The very use of a word imposes a boundary. But the central fact of non-dual metaphysic is "not otherness," or in one sense a total absence of boundaries.

The Upanishads attempted to bridge the apparent gap between the individual and "That" by means of the well-known Tat tvam asi (That art thou). This formula has the danger of seeming to indicate a subject, an object, and an identification. What it intends to indicate, however, is a primary condition of inseparateness in which neither subject nor object exists. For subject and object are themselves products of a falsely imagined viewpoint. We cannot even say, as Conzé says of Buddhism, that the viewpoint here is God's. There is no viewpoint at all. Nothing whatever can be said that is not ipso facto false. For this reason Vimalakirti of Vaisali, when asked to give his view on entering the gate of non-dualism, "remained silent without word." And for this same reason the Buddha transmitted the doctrine to Mahākāśyapa by holding out a flower.

It is especially difficult for the Western mind to comprehend non-duality. The idea of God as "a being" is of very long standing, and the idea of "a being" is in itself separative. No Hindu or Buddhist would deny the

personality of God when we use the term "God" as expressing universal reality, because totality excludes nothing. But God as a personality would constitute for him only a symbol with no final validity.

There is a further difficulty in the Western notion of time. To us time is linear, static. Time was created and it will end. Whatever happens within it is dynamic. It is possible that when our metaphysic catches up with our scientific findings this linear view will disappear. But obviously no other view is possible under our theology, which declares that the Christian revelation is the only revelation of its kind. In the Eastern metaphysic time itself is dynamic; it is cosmic energy. "I am time," says Krishna in the Gita.<sup>7</sup> This explains why there is no once-and-for-all story of creation in the East, but only symbolic myths which indicate continuing manifestation. The world is being created now. Secondly, this is why the Oriental mind can admit reincarnation and a succession of Christlike figures, whereas the Western mind cannot. Ours is the only savior. We are allowed only one life, or at most two--one here and one elsewhere. In Eastern thought there is no "elsewhere" and no difference between life and death. Thirdly, this is why the Eastern conception of "self" is beyond time, or timeless. Your

---

<sup>7</sup>See discussion in Swami Siddheswarananda, "A Hindu View of Christian Theology," in Vedanta for Modern Man, ed. by Christopher Isherwood (New York: Harper, 1951).

"original nature" is what you were before you were born, what you are now, and what you will always be.

"That" or "The Brahman" as words expressing final reality do not refer to "something" as the word "God" usually does. Neither do they refer to "nothing," since "nothing" so considered becomes "something," a deprivation or a lack of whatever is in contrast to it. But neither can it be said that they do not so refer. Therefore the Brahman is said to be "without and with qualities" (nirguna-sagunasca). "Being in the Brahman" means that you are not ignorantly assuming reality to reside in lumps such as, for example, concepts. But it also means that you are not even excluding it from ignorant concepts, since there is no twoness at all. Neither is there oneness in any conceivable sense of the word, since "one" argues a bounded integer, and the Brahman is at once bounded (relatively) and boundless (absolutely).

No word can quite escape the implication that it refers to an "it." At most it can be, as Zen texts say, like a finger pointing at the moon. Those who treat it as an object of speculation are looking at the finger, not the moon.

The Buddha sought to overcome this danger by substituting for the apparent objectivity of "That" or "The Brahman" the term Thusness or Suchness (tathatā). For the

doctrine of the ātman (self) he substituted the negative-sounding anātman (or, in Pali, anattā, not-self). These terms have at least the virtue of not seeming specific. There is little temptation to project them and study them as theories.

Mahayana Buddhism bristles with such negative terms. The foundation of its theory of nature is Śūnyatā, emptiness. According to Dr. Suzuki, the four distinguishing marks of Mahayana ontology, "which constitute its very kernel," are: "(1) that all things are empty (śūnya), (2) unborn (anutpanna), (3) not dual (advaita), and (4) without self-substance (niḥsvabhāva)."<sup>8</sup>

Since these four terms provide a key to everything that follows, I shall discuss them in order. Whatever other terms may occur in the course of the discussion will be dealt with as they arise.

### 1. All Things are Empty.

Śūnyatā (emptiness) is usually explained by the statement that all things are empty because they are compounded, conditioned, and dependent upon causal factors, and can be said to be neither cause nor effect but only part of an endlessly related chain. Maṅgārjuna, for example, said, "The fact of dependent origination is called

---

<sup>8</sup>Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra (London: Routledge, 1930), p. 166.

by us Śūnyatā."<sup>9</sup>

Dr. Suzuki, with right on his side as always, objects to this equation.<sup>10</sup> "From Emptiness we can pass to relativity, but not conversely," he says--the reason being that as long as we stay with relativity we stay with a world of particulars. No amount of logic can ever rid us of the dualism involved in conceptualizing. Logic is confined to the four categories, namely: It is A; it is not-A; it is both A and not-A; it is neither A nor not-A. Emptiness, however, means among other things "unattainability."

This means that we are not to conceive of emptiness as vacuity. In fact, we are not to conceive of it at all. It is exactly the inconceivability of the true nature of things in any ordinary sense which makes them "empty" to the senses, the feelings, and the logical mind. Emptiness is synonymous with Suchness (tathatā) and is unthinkable (acintya). No characterization is possible; no predicates can be assigned.

To see things yathābhūtam is to see them "as they really are," and this means not merely seeing them from

---

<sup>9</sup> Quoted by Chatterjee and Datta in An Introduction to Indian Philosophy, Fourth Edition (University of Calcutta, 1950), p. 147.

<sup>10</sup> Essays in Zen Buddhism, Third Series (London: Rider, 1953), pp. 241ff.

the outside or being intellectually convinced of their voidness, but seeing them from the inside, or knowing them by being empty. One of the most insistent points about this kind of knowledge--one that cannot be repeated too often--is that knowledge is being.

This does not mean exactly that you project yourself into an apple, for instance, and see that greenness and roundness are not part of its essential nature but have only been assigned as qualities by you. Whatever it is that you call "you" must disappear completely into the hollow hub of the universe upon which the wheel of existence revolves.<sup>11</sup> From this position only is it possible to know that "Things of this world are relative because of their being empty by nature," rather than the other way around.<sup>12</sup>

The philosophers of the Prajnaparamita, in attempting to explain emptiness, use the analogy of Māyā (illusion), and Māyā is often illustrated by the idea of magic creation. The illustration is of course not to be taken literally. It is intended only to overcome the attitude of naive realism which takes what it sees at face value and wants to hold what is in fact ungraspable.

---

<sup>11</sup>Lao-tse, Tao Te Ching, tr. by Ch'u Ta-kao (London: Buddhist Society, 1945), XI. "Thirty spokes unite in one nave, and because of the part where nothing exists we have the use of a carriage wheel."

<sup>12</sup>Suzuki, ibid., p. 251.

It is a well-known fact that in watching a magician we often follow the repeated movements of his hand until a certain element of expectation arises. It is then that he pulls the rabbit out of the hat. For while we are mentally completing a motion which he has accustomed us to seeing, he himself is not completing it at all but is doing some grossly obvious things which would be clear to us if we were not anticipating. If we could wrest our attention away from the fascinating things that his right hand is doing, we would see that his left hand is bringing things out of pockets with no great attempt at concealment. Otherwise we would swear that we see what we see. And this is true: we do see what we see, but we see with a great deal of imagination and under the influence of habit.

Something like this happens when we look at what we call "objective reality." It is magic or dream that we are beholding. The wise are those who, although they see the same things as the ignorant, know that they are witnessing illusion and therefore do not insist on it as if it were real. The wise cannot help the illusion, but know it as such. The ignorant do not know, and attach themselves to it as fact.

Dr. Suzuki cite another example:

"According to Nāgārjuna, the child sees the moon in the water, the desire is stirred in him to scoop it

out, he extends his arm into the water. Not, however, being able to take hold of it, he is very much grieved. A wise man now tells him that what he sees there in the water is not to be handled. In the same way, a world of appearance is not denied, only its seizability or attainability is denied."<sup>13</sup>

Seeing things under their illusory aspect is not the mere result of wrong perception built up in the course of a few years. In Buddhism we do not begin with a Lockean tabula rasa. Rather, false discrimination has existed "from time immemorial" (that is to say, in the Eternal Now) and is based upon memory (vāsanā) accumulated from a beginningless past and upon the habit-energy produced by karma (action). The power of illusion over us is made possible only by our desire (tṛṣṇā) to possess objects. But desiring objects is like trying to hold images in a mirror. The illusion itself is flawless, but our ignorance lies in trying to cling to it as finally real. Our true nature is mirrorlike and clear. When the dust is removed from it, Shin-shau said, it will reflect anything that comes before it, without partiality or prejudice, and without trying to hold anything.

"If this world is an error as is taught by thee," Mahamati asks in the Lankāvatara Sūtra, "is it to be

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 246, citing Nagārjuna's commentary on the Prajñāparamita, Fas. XXXII.



regarded as existent or non-existent?"

The Buddha replies, "It exists as māyā [illusion], and no aspects of it are worth clinging to."

"If this erroneous world is like māyā," Mahāmati asks again, "does this not lead to the creation of another error?"

"No," the Buddha says, "it does not, because māyā is not the cause of the error, because it does not produce faults and fallacies. Māyā, indeed, does not produce faults and fallacies. ... Whatever faults there are in connection with this erroneous world come from the clinging of the ignorant to that which is nothing but a delusion of their own minds. The wise, however, are free from all this."<sup>14</sup>

The pertinent question here is whether one wants to be a wise man merely in the sense of "knowing about," or whether one wants to know. The wise man knows that what he calls reality is illusion. But what is he himself? What is the subject? This question must be answered in the section on niravabhāva. But in a way it is already answered: He is nobody in particular. As Hui-neng said, "There is no mirror. Since all is void, where could the dust alight?"<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>Tr. by Suzuki in Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra, p. 121.

<sup>15</sup>Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 18.

Another designation of Śūnyatā is "Mind" or "Universal Mind." This, I think, is a rather unfortunate term, since it seems to create a distinction between ordinary mind and divine mind, and those who employ it are always being put to the necessity of distinguishing between "mind and Mind" or "mind and mentation." The term could just as well be "Sight" or "Hearing," because Emptiness or "That" is really unspecifiable, having reference to anything at all without being dependent upon anything. Concerning its immanence the Brhad-Āraṇyaka Upanishad says: "He entered in here, even to the finger-nail-tips ... Him they see not, for [as seen] he is incomplete. When breathing, he becomes breath (prāṇa) by name; when speaking, voice; when seeing, the eye; when hearing, the ear; when thinking, the mind ..."<sup>16</sup> The Bhagavad Gita says: "Everywhere THAT bath hands and feet, everywhere eyes, heads, and mouths; all hearing, He dwelleth in the world, enveloping all; shining with all sense-faculties, without any senses, unattached, supporting everything, free from qualities, and enjoying qualities."<sup>17</sup> And Lin-chi says: "... Mind [i.e., Universal Mind] has

<sup>16</sup> Brhad-Āraṇyaka Upanishad I.4.7, in The Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. by R. E. Hume (Madras, 1949, from plates of Cumberledge, Oxford, 1921).

<sup>17</sup> XIII.13, 14. Tr. by Annie Besant and Bhagavan Das (Madras: Theosophical Publishing Co., 1950).

no form and penetrates every corner of the universe. In the eye it sees, in the ear it hears, in the nose it smells, in the leg it runs."<sup>18</sup>

Concerning transcendence, the Kena Upanishad says: "There sight attains not, nor speech attains, nor the mind. We know not nor can we discern how one should teach of That; for it is other than the known, and it is above beyond the unknown ... That which remains unexpressed by the word, that by which the word is expressed ... That which thinks not by the mind, that by which the mind is thought ..."<sup>19</sup>

Transcendence, then, means ungraspability. Immanence means the same. What "sees with the eye" cannot be seen, any more than a finger can grasp itself. So that if the mind grasps an illusion, it is in a very real way being "grasped through." One has only to know this to be free of the clinging that leads to sorrow. "Your ordinary mind IS the Buddha."

At this point the problem of "self-power" and "grace" becomes important, but I shall defer discussion of this subject until a later time. At the moment I am concerned only with "it".

The Void is the pleroma. The Rig-Veda and the Bṛhad

---

<sup>18</sup>Quoted by Suzuki in Essays III, p. 52.

<sup>19</sup>Kena Upanishad I.3-5, in Eight Upanishads, tr. by Sri Aurobindo (Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram, 1953).

have given us a picture of the universe as a sacrificial horse. "Om! Verily, the dawn is the head of the sacrificial horse; the sun, his eye; the wind, his breath; universal fire, his open mouth," and so on.<sup>20</sup> The meaning of this is, "He divided himself" (II.3). That which sees, that which hears, and that which thinks are only minute portions of the great horse. But they are nothing else than this horse. Just as the liver is a distinguishable part of one's own body yet nothing in itself, so is man in the body of the horse. He uses and is used, eats and is eaten. There is no real distinction, only an apparent one. But this appearance, as the Lankāvatara Sutra says, is also real. It is real as illusion. Dr. Samuel Johnson, kicking a stone and exclaiming, "Ouch!" would never defeat this philosophy. The first thing it would ask is, "Who is 'Dr. Johnson'?" Both Dr. Johnson and the stone are empty, but both are relatively real. The stone could bruise his toe very badly.

Yet emptiness remains the same, and independent of all division. "[Universal] Mind is like the void, in which there is no confusion or evil, as when the sun wheels through it, shining upon the four corners of the world. For, when the sun rises and illuminates the whole earth, it is not the void which is bright and, when the

---

<sup>20</sup>Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka Upaniṣad, I.1, loc. cit.

sun has set and it is dark everywhere, it is not the void which is dark."<sup>21</sup> The Void has been likened to a Great Round Mirror in which all things are reflected impartially, without distinction, preference or rejection. Wriggling things are in it, as well as men, toads, flowers, and Buddhas. It participates fully without becoming confounded.

One final word about "the Void" or "Mind," or whatever term is used of the Absolute. One version of the Mahaprajnaparamita lists eighteen forms of emptiness.<sup>22</sup> Among them is śūnyatā-śūnyatā, "the emptiness of emptiness." Not even the idea should be clung to. Emptiness is not a "thing," nor is the idea of it a "thing." All such words are mere expedients, as Huang Po says, "for the purpose of influencing men. It [is] like using yellow leaves for gold to stop the crying of a child ..."<sup>23</sup>

But while we cannot say in any words what "That" is, we can definitely say, "This is That."

## 2. All Things are Unborn.

Existing things, from a relative point of view, do

<sup>21</sup>The Huang Po Doctrine of Universal Mind, tr. by Chu Ch'an (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), p. 18.

<sup>22</sup>These are discussed at p. 236 of Suzuki's Essays III.

<sup>23</sup>Op cit., p. 50.

actually exist. If you see them, they cannot, in one sense, be said not to be there.

If we think about it at all, we might dread the idea of being deranged and having hallucinations. To a person who is so deranged, however, there is nothing dreadful about it. He might actually see his grandmother sitting in her favorite rocking chair and hear her talking to him very pleasantly. We who are "normal" regard this as insanity but admit that for the moment it can't be helped. We humor the patient and keep working with him until some kind of therapy may restore him to his former averageness. He is then brought back to the usual outlook on things and to dreams and daydreams which even he now recognizes as insubstantial.

In the same way the man who has discovered his original nature regards the man who has not. Whatever the patient says, he assents to, knowing that the patient can't help it. And in his own mind he accepts his own dreams and daydreams of what others call "reality" as something insubstantial. He has what several Mahāyana Sūtras call "not-born-object-patience" (anutpattika-dharma-ksānti).

Anyone who dreams will freely admit that he does so. But he will not for one moment think, in his life when awake, that the two-headed monster he saw last night has any solid reality. It was in this way, I think, that the

Buddha was "awake" to the dreams of everyday "aware" life. They passed through his mind as through the mind of an inert spectator, as dreams usually do, yet he participated in them fully, to such an extent that nothing in the dream could take place without his being there.

In dream, who creates the images? In waking life you know that they were part of you. You did not actually "cause" them, since they were unintentional, not deliberate. In the dream they were simply there. Similarly, from the standpoint of the Buddha's awakeness, he might say that what he formerly thought real (before his enlightenment) had only been within himself, that it had appeared real, and that he now saw its complete insubstantiality. Such an admission, however, would not in itself be enough to eliminate dreams. They go on happening; one's intention has nothing to do with them. One has to accept them with patience as unborn objects which, in the dream itself, appear to have been "born." This is why the Sutras keep saying, "It is like seeing various objects created by a magician or in a dream."<sup>24</sup> We do not ascribe reality to these objects, yet we cannot deny them. This is the way things are; it is all of a piece with the skill of Suchness.

---

<sup>24</sup>Lankāvatara Sutra, tr. by Suzuki in Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra, p. 124.

Can we say that these dream-images exist, or must we say that they do not? Neither statement would be correct. We cannot affirm, saying, "Yes, they are real," or deny, saying, "No, they are not." We actually see them. We cannot say, "They are real and they are not real," because the two statements nullify one another; and for the same reason we cannot say, "They neither are nor are not." The answer here is beyond the two opposites of being and non-being. "Things are unborn simply because no categories admitting contradiction or alternation or antithesis are applicable here."<sup>25</sup>

This is the question, then: What did cause these images while we were asleep? Psychology believes that it has an answer, but I am speaking on another level. Psychology, after all, is "wide awake." From the standpoint of the dreamer himself where did they come from? Suppose that the dreamer had the same power of analysis that we have when we are awake. In his dream he could examine every lineament, every quality, and every aspect of behavior of his dream-monster. This would still not tell him anything about its origin. He might end by "believing" that some unknown power created it. In the morning he would know that it arose or "gave birth to itself" within him.

---

<sup>25</sup>Suzuki, Studies, p. 122.



Chuang-tse says: "Those who dream of the banquet [may] wake to lamentation and sorrow. Those who dream of lamentation and sorrow [may] wake to join the hunt. While they dream, they do not know that they dream. Some will even interpret the very dream that they are dreaming; and only when they awake do they know it was a dream. By and by comes the Great Awakening, and then we find out that this life is really a great dream. Fools think they are awake now, and flatter themselves they know if they are really princes or peasants. Confucius and you are both dreams; and I who say you are dreams,--I am but a dream myself. This is a paradox. Tomorrow a sage may arise to explain it; but that to-morrow will not be until ten thousand generations have gone by."<sup>26</sup>

There is one more aspect to this question of bornness (utpādatā). If the dream-monster arose within you, what is his life-span? It might seem to be a single night, or it might seem to be only an hour or so. But since he was never really "born," he still resides within you as a possibility. It was, in fact, only his actuality that proved him so. Perhaps he will appear again in the same form, perhaps in another. He can never be called "created" for the simple reason that what is essential to him and not accidental is always there.

---

<sup>26</sup>Chuang Tzu, Mystic, Moralist, and Social Reformer, tr. by Herbert A. Giles (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1889), Bk. II, Pt. 1, Sec. 2. Following Legge, I have added the word "may" in square brackets.

"Why is existence regarded as unborn or unoriginated?" the Lankavatara Sutra asks. "Because there is neither creating nor created, and, therefore, there is no causer."<sup>27</sup>

To put all this another way: You might be somebody's dream--the dream of an eternally abiding person. You were never "born" because you live only in Him, and you live as long as He does, which is for time without end. But this "person" is not actually a person. "He" is that inexpressible, uncreated principle called the Void. It might be possible to conceive of it tentatively as a symbolical person. But the Void does not come and go as things of the imagination do. You conceive of a person only because you are one (or fondly think you are). To an imaginative stone, its creator might appear to be a stone; to a cow, a cow. I quote from memory, and possibly inaccurately, from some verses by Roy Campbell the exact location of which I have long since forgotten--

This is the wisdom of the ape  
 Who yelps beneath the moon:  
 'Twas God who made me in this shape.  
 He is the Great Baboon.

.....

He swings with tail divinely bent  
 Among those azure bars,  
 And munches to his heart's content  
 The kernels of the stars.

---

<sup>27</sup>Tr. by Suzuki in Studies, p. 122.

And when I die, his loving care  
 Will lift me from the sod  
 To know the perfect wisdom there,  
 The nimbleness of God.

### 3. All Things are Non-dual.

I have said that Eastern metaphysic exists because of an attempt to elucidate "not-otherness." Whatever terms it uses must necessarily imply "otherness" and so be only temporary. "One and speech are two; two and one are three."<sup>28</sup> This creates what Saraha calls "the three-fold falsification," that of perceiver, thing perceived, and act of perceiving.<sup>29</sup>

"In Buddhism," Dr. Suzuki says, "no distinction is made between knowledge and the knower. Supreme Wisdom (arya-jñāna) is at once the inner perception and the mental power that brings about this perception. This is quite in accordance with the general mode of thinking in Buddhism; for if there is something at the back of the knowledge, or if there is the function of a certain higher faculty of mind, there will be the dualism which is so strongly combatted by the Mahayanists."<sup>30</sup> This is to say

---

<sup>28</sup>Chuang-tse, loc. cit., Book II, Part 1, Sec. 2.

<sup>29</sup>Saraha's Treasury of Songs, tr. by David Snellgrove, in Buddhist Texts, ed. by Edward Conze et al. (Oxford, Cassirer, 1954), p. 229.

<sup>30</sup>Studies, p. 127.

once more that "Your ordinary mind is the Buddha." However mistaken you may be, it is not "you" who are mistaken. Ignorance is "an unknown knower behind knowing."<sup>31</sup>

It is precisely at this point that the idea of Sin arises. Are we responsible or not? Western theology says that we are; Eastern metaphysic says that we are not. Dr. Suzuki says that "The will as it is in itself is pure act, and no taint of egoism is there ..."<sup>32</sup>

It is through the power of self-reflection (manas), which is a primary principle "erroneously self-created"<sup>33</sup> by being individualized through discrimination (vikalpa) and memory (vāsanā) falsely interpreted and adhered to by desire (trṣṇa) that consciousness (the observer) arises. It is this consciousness which establishes the initial dualistic split.

Here follows a passage from Dr. Suzuki which Sir Charles Eliot calls a passage full of "dark sayings."<sup>34</sup> To me it seems extraordinarily lucid.

"In the beginning, which is really no beginning and

---

<sup>31</sup>Suzuki, Essays I, p. 127.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

<sup>33</sup>Suzuki, Studies, p. 97.

<sup>34</sup>Japanese Buddhism (London: Arnold, 1935), p. 402. To give due credit to Sir Charles, whose book is both fascinating and indispensable, he confesses that he is out of sympathy with Zen and does not pretend to understand it.

which has no spiritual meaning except in our finite life, the will wants to know itself, and consciousness is awakened, and with the awakening of consciousness the will is split in two. The one will, whole and complete in itself, is now at once actor and observer. Conflict is inevitable; for the actor now wants to be free from the limitations under which he has been obliged to put himself in his desire for consciousness. He has in one sense been enabled to see, but at the same time there is something which he, as observer, cannot see. In the trail of knowledge, Ignorance follows with the inevitability of fate, the one accompanies the other as shadow accompanies object, no separation can be effected between the two companions. But the will as actor is bent on going back to his own original abode where there was yet no dualism, and therefore peace prevailed. This longing for the home, however, cannot be satisfied without a long, hard, trying experience. For the thing once divided in two cannot be restored to its former unity until some struggle is gone through with. And the restoration is more than a mere going back, the original content is enriched by the division, struggle, and resettlement.

"When first the division takes place in the will, consciousness is so enamoured of its novelty and its apparent efficiency in solving the practical problems of life that it forgets its own mission, which is to enlighten

the will. Instead of turning its illuminating rays within itself--that is, towards the will from which it has its principle of existence--consciousness is kept busy with the objective world of realities and ideas; and when it tries to look into itself, there is a world of absolute unity where the object of which it wishes to know is the subject itself. The sword cannot cut itself. The darkness of Ignorance cannot be dispelled because it is its own self."<sup>35</sup>

It is to be noted that Dr. Suzuki does not advocate or even think possible the destruction of consciousness. But it is this factor, when driven by desire, which is responsible for dualism and ignorance. Desire attaches it to what it remembers seeing and causes it to add up what it has seen into "stopped" segments of total reality which it then calls "objects." This stoppage extends even (or perhaps I should say especially) to itself. It becomes an "I"; it is "born." But the ego is the purest of fabrications. It is constructed 100 percent from memory (vāsanā). In other words, it is what we have seen rather than what we are seeing now. What we are seeing now is unthinkable (acintya) and therefore "empty." All forms rise from this emptiness and are not different from it. They only appear to be, when viewed from the angle of this

---

<sup>35</sup>Essays I, pp. 129-130.

"stopping" consciousness. Having constructed objects, we next construct an observer (an observed observer, that is), or subject, and, having constructed these, we go on to construct a relationship. This is Saraha's "threefold falsification."

It is also to be noted that "consciousness" is equated with "self-reflection." It is self-reflection which eternally initiates creation. But from the absolute standpoint this self-reflection does not reflect an "I." That is, God does not behold an "I"; he reflects what you call an "I", a concretion of airy nothings which, by means of that same self-reflection, takes on its limitations, its measure or māyā, and makes the inevitable "error" of assuming itself to be an "I", for the very reason that it can be measured. "God set a compass upon the face of the deep." It is by reason of this error of assumption that something "other" exists or "is born." So that in a very deep sense there is original sin. That which is called "sinful" or "ignorant" is that which is measured, or less than God. It is not complete. "Sin" certainly does not refer to one's "baser instincts" socially judged or to the things that social judgment has made of people's freedom. Social judgment has, for instance, identified the very natural sexual function with "sin," with the result that that function is glorified and exoriated out of all reason. To the body it is no more

important than digestion--not so important, in fact, because the body can continue without the use of its sexual apparatus (though posterity cannot), but it cannot do without food. In some blind way the desire connected with this function has been identified with its sinfulness, but "desire" has been sadly misconstrued.

Conceding desire in its deeper sense to be mistakenly attached to so-called "objects," what can be said of it? Is it reprehensible? When directed toward objects, it results in evil (or "suffering"), and the energy so spent is never lost. It has a direct influence on a continuing chain of causation known as Samsāra, or flux. Misdirected desire is like a stone thrown into endless waters. The first ripple creates another, this creates another, and so on.

This means, then, that evil is primary, and our own evil is only part of a vast chain which continues endlessly by repetition--in time, as it seems to us. Evil is attachment, or love improperly directed toward the discriminated product of self-reflection.

A Christian might exclaim, "What! Are you saying that God Himself is both good and evil?"<sup>36</sup> What I am saying is what the East says: The Void is beyond good and

---

<sup>36</sup>An illuminating discussion of the problem of good and evil in Christianity is to be found in Alan W. Watts, Myth and Ritual in Christianity (New York: Vanguard, n.d. [1953]), Ch. II.



evil because it is utterly uncharacterizable; but potentially both good and evil reside within it, just as long and short, thick and thin, front and back, and up and down, reside within it. These are characterized, discriminated aspects which are present only to one who so sees them. Who, then, was (or is) this original One? Brahmanism symbolizes it by the figure of Brahmā (not to be confused with the Brahman), the father-creator. Buddhism, which is fond of precise intellectual language, calls it Vishaya, pure act or "work" or "function." For the Void is the only thing (I am compelled to use the word) of which it may be said that it has self-nature (svabhāva)--or, rather that it is self-nature. The pure, clear, motionless Void is, and being is pure act. By analogy one might say that the sun shines because shining is its nature. If things grow in its light and warmth, it is not because it intends to make them grow. It merely shines, because that is what the sun is: it is shining. Its self-nature and its functioning are inseparable; they are one and the same. If it warms the earth, it is not because it is intentionally "good." If it scorches it, it is not because it is intentionally "bad." It is unintentionally either good or bad, or both. It shines; this is its Suchness. A bat doesn't care for this functioning at all; a grasshopper does. Who can characterize it? Characterization is possible only from a relative point of view.

This is what Chuang-tse meant when he said: "How can it be known that what I call knowing is not really not knowing, and that what I call not knowing is not really knowing? Now I would ask you this. If a man sleeps in a damp place, he gets lumbago and dies. But how about an eel? And living up in a tree is precarious and trying to the nerves;--but how about monkeys? Of the man, the eel, and the monkey, whose habitat is the right one, absolutely? Human beings feed on flesh, deer on grass, centipedes on snakes, owls and crows on mice. Of these four, whose is the right taste, absolutely? Monkey mates with monkey, the buck with the doe; eels consort with fishes, while men admire Mao Ch'iang and Li Chi, at the sight of whom fishes plunge deep down in the water, birds soar high in the air, and deer hurry away."<sup>37</sup>

And again: " ... from the standpoint of TAO [ultimate Reality], a beam and a pillar are identical. So are ugliness and beauty, greatness, wickedness, perverseness, and strangeness. Separation is the same as construction; construction is the same as destruction. Nothing is subject either to construction or to destruction, for these conditions are brought together into ONE."<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Op. cit., Book II, Pt. 1, Sec. 2, par. 8.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., Book II, Pt. 1, Sec. 2, par. 4.

Suchness, then, is unintentionally both good and evil (relatively) and beyond good and evil (absolutely).

Here I must sound a note of warning about the use of the word "being." We have no better word, unless we employ Aristotle's "being of being," which requires a good deal of explanation, or "Pure Being." "Being" is here used not in opposition to non-being, but rather in the sense of non-intension or absence of attributes, a state (if one can call it that) beyond being and non-being and beyond any and all conceivable opposites. By the word "is" I do not mean "exists" in the ordinary sense. In relation to the inadequacy of this word, I have several times heard Dr. Frederic Spiegelberg, of the American Academy of Asian Studies, suggest the word "be-s". This strikes me as a useful substitute.

According to the non-dual metaphysic, then, there is nothing but this svabhāva, or unceasing pure act, and all "selves" within it are figments arising spontaneously through self-reflection carried on by discrimination, memory, and desire, and therefore are "not other" than Original Nature itself, or Suchness.

Now we might possibly say that this desire itself is evil. But it is love, misdirected or reflected back upon itself, which gives rise to grasping. In human love of the sensual kind we seek to hold the object because of

its value to ourselves. Divine love is unintentional love; it merely "happens" in the complete abandonment of the avabhāva to the pure act which is in fact its nature. It holds nothing. In the most complete selflessness it gives itself away in its function. So that the Void must be without qualities or characteristics, since these are forever streaming forth in its giving. Again we can definitely say, "This is That."

#### 4. All Things are Without Self-substance.

Like the doctrine of Emptiness, the doctrine of asvabhāva (no self-substance), or abhāvasvabhāva, or, more familiarly, anātman (no self), cannot be discussed on the relative plane without utter confusion. Dealing with things relatively is already our primary confusion. We look, as it seems to us, outward toward objects, and relate these objects both to one another and to ourselves. Buddhism's contention is that so-called objects do not exist fundamentally in a state of relation, but rather in a state of sameness with apparent relation, and that the assumed subject "I" and the assumed object "other" are self-identical.

This seems a difficult, almost incomprehensible statement. Actually it is a very simple assertion, so obvious that no one thinks of taking it at face value. It states what everyone already knows. If it were not

for certain obstacles, it could be accepted in the barest of terms, such as: "All things are of one Nature."

There are several reasons why even the simplest verbal formula fails to convey certainty. It may carry conviction or it may arouse belief; but conviction and belief are not knowledge. They are information to which a person relates himself on the basis of attraction or repulsion.

We imagine that words correspond to definitely measured segments of reality. Actually, Buddhism says, this measure does not lie outside us but within us--or, rather, the inner rhythm of life that is expressed grossly in heartbeats and life-breaths, and more subtly in the tension and vibration of all sentient matter, itself represents the power of measurement or creation. It is what makes it possible for us to think thoughts and frame words, and to desire, imagine, and remember. So that if I want to know what "things" are and what "I" really am, I shall have to go back, as Zen advises, to who is asking the question.

No mere collection of psychic faculties (if we must call them that) can float out into space and turn to look back at what produced it. The self can never be seen in this objective way, for it is always what is doing the looking. If it could detach itself completely, it would have found something else, not itself. "It is

like fire's asking, 'What am I?' 'Whence do I come?' 'Whither do I go?' 'Why do I burn?' As long as fire is fire and keeps on burning, these questions are unanswerable, because fire is to burn, just to burn, and not to reflect on itself; because to know itself is to cease to be itself."<sup>39</sup>

Nor can one know himself subjectively, if he imagines that this means experiencing something. True self-knowledge is neither an experience nor a state of mind. There is no doubleness in it, no discovery. This is because there is no one to discover anything. Externally or internally, we intrude the subjective-objective assumption and seek to enter into what we already are. You are both what you are looking for and what you are looking with. It is a case of "using the Buddha to find the Buddha," or expecting the ear to hear itself. So that if you are to know at all, these two apparent dwellers in the body, the subjective "I" and the objective "me," must coalesce in a unity. Moreover, you will have to realize that the "objects" outside you are you.

This means that if consciousness is ever to find out its own source, or the unconscious reservoir of its being, it will have to abandon the delusion that it operates independently, and simply rest in this source as its

---

<sup>39</sup>Suzuki, Essays III, 149.

instrument, for that is what it actually is. The doctrine of anātman means simply that there is nothing with an independent and separate self. Finding oneself is not a matter of "something" turning face-about to dive into "nothing," for it is that very "nothing" which has spiraled itself up busily through the whole of creation (if one looks at it evolutionwise), fashioning antennae and gaping mouths, tentacles, eyes, ears, noses, hands,--and brains.

Both Hinduism and Buddhism have devoted much time to the complexities of the logical process itself. There are thousands of analyses and thousands of terms. Our own meager vocabulary relating to the mind's workings does not begin to compare with that of the East. But for true knowledge, self-knowledge, the East has used the language of knowledge: symbol.

The curious doubleness of nature (which is also man's nature) is expressed throughout all sacred literature. The earliest example is the Vedic image of two birds sitting on a bough, one eating at the other's breast, the other watching. In Vedic ritual there is the silent figure of the priest (the Witness) who stands immovable watching the activity of the sacrifice, from time to time uttering the single syllable Om--the Word. In China the symbol is Yang-Yin, a circular device consisting of two teardrop-shaped figures which partake of each other's nature. In Confucius there are further the two ideograms

chung and yung, showing activity around an immovable center, or "circulation about the invariable." The Gita says, "There are two Energies (or puruṣas, persons) in this world, the changeful and the changeless; the changeful is all beings, the unchanging is called Kūṭastha (rock-seated)."<sup>40</sup> In Christianity we have the Father and Son, or God and the Word (logos).

Tantric Hinduism and Tantric Buddhism represent this dual nature by means of a sexual symbol. Since the symbols vary somewhat, I shall confine myself to Buddhism.

The two figures Prajñā (Wisdom) and Karunā (Compassion) or Upāya (means) are shown in sexual union. Prajña is female and passive; Karuna, male, active.<sup>41</sup> In Tibet they are called Wisdom and Method.

The pair is at the height of ecstasy, fused in a sameness of emotion (sama-rasa) in which "each is both," both completely given over in bliss. In Tibet they are shown touching at all possible points of contact, encircled by flames, the fire of Supreme Wisdom, which devours all obstacles.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup>Bhagavad Gita, XV, 16.

<sup>41</sup>For fuller information see S. B. Dasgupta, An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism (University of Calcutta, 1950), and Obscure Religious Cults (University of Calcutta, 1946).

<sup>42</sup>See Marco Pallis, Peaks and Lamas (New York: Knopf, 1949), pp. 218ff.



Wherever this double figure appears, it represents passivity-activity, procession-recession, negative-positive, nonbeing-being, and so on. The passive or negative is Essence, and the active is executive Nature, or Pure Act, the manifesting means.

The third element is at once their affirmation as man and woman, for the terms are meaningless apart, and their negation, for they are canceled in one another. It is the third element, the androgynous offspring, Bliss or Suchness, which is the true condition of things. In Christianity the third is the Holy Ghost, or the Holy Spirit of Love which eternally passes between the Father and the Son.

Neither Hinduism nor Buddhism conceives of a beginning in time. But if in our timebound way we were to look upon the Bliss as a resultant, we should also have to say that it pre-existed as that which brought the parents together, and as that by lack of which both were incomplete and mutually dependent. To be potential, St. Thomas says, a thing must have been actual in the beginning. Or, as Meister Eckhart says, if something is born, it must have first been an unborn actuality. The Holy Ghost is "uncreated but proceeding."

This figure is neither a duality nor a triplicity, but a three-in-one symbol. Karunā is said to be "later" than Prajñā, not in point of time but in point of Prajñā's

sovereignty. He is in and of Prajñā, inherent Act, through which she is perpetually becoming a self. But lover, beloved, and the bliss that enfolds them are all one and inseparable except in our attempt to understand. All together they are beyond non-being and being. Reality is uncompounded.

Besides being a universal symbol, this is a symbol of enlightenment. It indicates the interfused double nature of the phenomenal world, its systole and diastole, and between the two the ungraspable continuity called life, which at the same time is the dead, unmoving center of all rhythm. It is in that neutral point between any two opposites, where they are neither themselves individually nor not themselves, where they clash and pivot --the point of both separation and integration--that the hindrance between the two is eternally removed, just as the fire of Supreme Wisdom burns away all obstacles between the lovers.

This point of coincidence and cleavage, or of beginning and end, is a moment without duration, an eternal moment. It has been called a flash of lightning, the thunderbolt (vajra), the hub (kha), the shining seed (bīja), and the instantaneous quickening of the ovum fertilized by the seminal drop (bindu). Thus, the Lankavatara Sutra says, "From one seed, O Lord of Lanka, are produced, ... in one continuity, stems, shoots, knots,

leaves, petals, flowers, fruit, branches, all individualised. As it is with every external object ... so also with internal objects."<sup>43</sup>

The seed is the one all-inclusive source of the Tree of Life. Within itself, "rolled up," there is the entire history of the tree when "spread out."<sup>44</sup> The tree is completely "taken up" in the seed, and the seed is taken up in the tree. If you look at the tree as merely what it appears to be, you see a spectacle of interworking factors, an organic unity sustained by many contributing energies. These do not ultimately "cause" it. It is exactly as it was prior to the laws of cause-effect. It is an unborn tree appearing in consciousness as born, and all these factors are merely the "skilful means" of its making. This tree is only a memorial (stupa) of what in the seed is anticipation, or Idea. It is "in the image of" that idea, which is self-reflective.

The true source of this tree is in the hollow center of the seed, the point where the "quickenings" lies, where there is space filled with movement, or where, as Ananda Coomaraswamy says, the sun's brilliance has entered.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup> In Suzuki, Studies, p. 72.

<sup>44</sup> These terms are from Fa-tsang's Essay on the Gold Lion, in Fung Yu-lan, A History of Chinese Philosophy (Princeton University Press, 1953), II, 349.

<sup>45</sup> "'Spiritual Paternity' and the 'Puppet Complex'", in Am I My Brother's Keeper? (New York: John Day, 1947), Ch. VI.

The seed is the tree and the tree is the seed, and yet they are not the same. One is an appearance of the other. The formless appears as form; and this appearance, although illusory, is genuine. as illusion, is a part of Nature, and is not to be rejected.

There is one further thing about this tree. It appears as extremely varied, differentiated into many leaves, stems, blossoms, and fruits, all growing from the same trunk. It is impossible to tell where one variation begins and another ends, or at exactly what moment a new form arises. It is an unbroken continuity, with no hindrance to its transitions, and with a dimensionless time lapse between transitions. The whole tree is a serial and functional totality, with all parts statically interrelated and interdependent, with no hindrance anywhere to the development of individual parts or their passing into one another. Between seed and blossom there is an unbroken flow, and the blossom is on its way toward the end once more. In anticipation it is already there, known. The individual appearance does not know where it came from or how it got there or what it does; it simply moves on. It grows with none of its own doing, and cannot add a "cubit" to its stature.

The cherry trees bloom each year  
in the Yoshino Mountains,  
But split the tree and tell me  
where the flowers are!<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup>Quoted by Suzuki in The Essence of Buddhism  
(London: Buddhist Society, 1947), p. 13.

Nor could the seed tell anything. Although it "knows," it does not "know how," but knows what it does only as it does it. It is "taken up" in a dream of its possibilities, and is all these things at once, past and future, yet individually they are always new. To live, they must be.

You may wish to ask where the flow-  
ers come from,  
But even Tokun [the god of spring]  
does not know.<sup>47</sup>

It may clarify things a little to think of this third term as Now. The parents, Past and Future, are both identified and lost in this Now.<sup>48</sup>

Suppose, for example, that you try to follow the smoothly flowing movement of a clock's pendulum. At what exact point does it leave one moment and enter into the next? It is always leaving and entering at exactly the same time. There is no perceivable place where it begins and ends. It may leave a ghostly shadow of its passing, but there is no time in which it lingers. There is only some point at which, like the Holy Ghost, it "proceeds" and keeps proceeding without interval, with all past and future flowing around it. If your mind were acute enough to needle itself into that spaceless space, you

---

<sup>47</sup>Zenrinkushu, tr. by R. H. Blyth in Haiku (Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1952), p. 19.

<sup>48</sup>See Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Time and Eternity (Ascona, Switzerland: Artibus Asiae, 1947).

would step like Alice beyond the looking-glass and be outside time as time is ordinarily conceived. You would be at the turning point of all things, where the moments fly out centrifugally. But if you were to step through, you would not find anything different. You would only drop the delusion that you live primarily in the created time-moments. Because it is from you that these moments whirl out while you sit immovable and watch them.

Through habitual ignorance we have come to imagine ourselves bound in time. It is because the subtle knife, the point, of discrimination (which is also self-reflection) is at the center of experience that positive and negative whirl away from it momentarily in separated aspect. We take only the individualized parts of the truth, forgetting that the unmoving point of oneness from which we "go abroad" is where we are actually standing.

As experience is cleft timewise, we love what self-reflection reveals, and try to hold the reflection. What happens in time we project and hold out in space, imagining "objects" and therefore a "subject," who is also only a form in space. Because we can reflect and remember (energy leaves an "unlosable" trace in emptiness) and because we can name the "memorials" of our thought, we cling to the name as substance. But all these apparently outward things are only forms of ourselves. They are actually the "I" we make.

As to the center where long-short and large-small fly away as if they were separated, this has only one name; but it is so full of possible others that it cannot be named at all. It is what we name with. Then we hoard our names, as if they were more than symbols of their source, and refer them to one another in a grammar of objective relationships which seeks to say, "These are not events but entities; they are solid."

Two other things are said of the glowing moment, and these are very significant. Tantric Buddhism says that the moment of "quickening" is the Bodhicitta (enlightenment-mind), and again that it is "I-ness."

The moment of satori is a continuing moment, one in which unconscious and conscious are at a perpetually neutral juncture-point (as I shall explain later). Enlightenment is our constant condition and the constant condition of the universe. There is no "I" who has the use of a consciousness and its control. Consciousness is one of the parents (Act), unconsciousness the other (Essence, or Substance), and both are joined in the mutual giving that constitutes enlightenment. Actually and properly consciousness is submitted to the service of the Unconscious, as the Unconscious lies passive in its own submission. "I" do not have the use of "myself." I am Self-use, the hollow channel of its Self-being and Self-spending.

When Tantra says that the pair creates "I-ness," it means that Supreme Wisdom by virtue of its inherent Act mirrors itself against itself in unconscious self-reflection, in a willing and loving, if illusory, state of division. Mahāprajña is both lover and beloved, and does not know it. She unconsciously sees herself in a vision of "that" when there is only "this"--one totality. Because this is a living and limitless image, it goes forth endlessly and renews itself continually in a dream of I-ness that extends beyond any galaxies our telescopes can see and down beyond the electrons.

Plotinus says:

"... we utterly must not speak of Him as made, but sheerly as maker; the making must be absolved from all else; no new existence is here established; the Act here is not directed to an achievement but is God Himself unalloyed; here is no duality but pure unity. ...

"By having acted, He is what He is and there is no question of 'existing before bringing Himself into existence'; when He acted He was not in some state that could be described as 'before existing.' He was already existent entirely.

"Now assuredly an Activity not subjected to essence is utterly free; God's selfhood, then, is of His own Act. ...



"If there had been a moment from which He began to be, it would be possible to assert His self-making in the literal sense; but since what He is He is from before all time, His self-making is to be understood as simultaneous with Himself; the being is one and the same with the making and eternal 'coming into existence.'<sup>49</sup>

So that there is only one Svabhāva. It has no particular nature because it is all natures, and yet is the same everywhere.

Before a man can see who "he" is, however, he must divest himself of the troublesome, suffering "I." This is not easy to do. He could simply let Nature work through him, as it does whether he knows it or not, but this is not man's way. He is so accustomed to regarding himself as an isolated entity which "does" things, that it requires an effort to purge himself of his false notions of solidity. Zen has a particularly effective way of helping him to arrive at this knowledge.

---

<sup>49</sup>Enneads VI.8.19, tr. by Stephen Mackenna and B. S. Page, in *The One and Good*, being Volume V of five volumes variously titled consisting of the Enneads (London: Medici Society, 1930).

### III. SEEING INTO ONE'S SELF-NATURE

#### 1. Meditation, Will, and Faith.

The terms "meditation" and "enlightenment" can almost be depended upon to evoke images of hollow-cheeked hermits sitting cross-legged and practicing breath-control until they ascend to the top rung of the ladder of consciousness and enter a state of blissful trance.

The Soto school of Zen is inclined to stress this type of meditation (dhyāna), but the Rinzai school, with which I am concerned here, makes no distinction between Dhyāna and Prajñā (supreme wisdom, direct seeing). Hui-neng said, "Dhyāna is the body of Prajñā, and Prajñā is the function of Dhyāna."<sup>50</sup> That is to say, supreme enlightenment is immanent within us and is working at all times to make itself known in and through the consciousness. Consciousness, however, has become enamoured of itself and with the objective termini of its operation.

---

<sup>50</sup>Tr. by Suzuki in Essays III, 33.

A great deal of light, I think, can be shed on Prajñā as meditation by bringing together some of Dr. Suzuki's statements about will. Prajñā is only one name among many which are roughly equivalent. Others are will, meditation, enlightenment (sambodhi or bodhi), all-knowledge (sarvajñāta), Buddhahood (Buddhata), Suchness (tathatā), mind (citta), the Unattainable (anupalabdha), and so on. "Will" refers to both the activity of seeing and the seeing itself.

When Dr. Suzuki says that "Zen is a religion of will-power,"<sup>51</sup> he does not refer to the ego-bound, ignorant grasping which is subject to memory and habit and involves a choice made more or less under bondage. This kind of choice is an affective clinging to the objects of defilement. As for any differentiation between individual and divine will, or any such problem as that of free will and predestination, the East has never considered them problems. Dr. S. N. Dasgupta says: "... the question of the opposition of freedom and karma did not rise at all as an important point of discussion. When we however approach it with our minds steeped in western philosophy to meet the discussion of free will and determinism we find it difficult to reconcile them."<sup>52</sup> Divine will

---

<sup>51</sup>Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture (Kyoto: East Buddhist Society, 1938), p. 37.

<sup>52</sup>Yoga Philosophy (University of Calcutta, 1930), p. 318.

as expressed in man is considered as pure as any of his other functions--sensation, perception, conceptualization, and the rest--provided that it is not directed toward the individual's own objects but that it functions in harmony with the whole. In this respect man is responsible for his choices. Dr. Suzuki says, "All the doings and happenings, including thoughts and feelings, which I have or which come to me are of the divine will as long as there are on my part no clingings, no hankerings ..."<sup>53</sup>

Referring again to the passage quoted at length in Chapter II, we find Dr. Suzuki's statements substantially echoed in some of our own religious writings, as for instance in Theologia Germanica: "... Perception and Reason are created and bestowed along with Will, to the intent that they may instruct the will and also themselves, that neither perception or will is of itself, nor is nor ought to be unto itself, nor ought to seek or obey itself. Neither shall they turn to their own advantage, nor make use of themselves to their own ends and purposes; for His they are from Whom they do proceed and unto Him shall they submit, and flow back into Him, and become nought in themselves, that is, in their selfishness." And further: "... the will in the creature, which we call a created will, is as truly God's as the Eternal

---

<sup>53</sup>The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind (London: Rider, 1949), p. 69.

Will, and is not of the creature."<sup>54</sup>

Dr. Suzuki's statement, to repeat a little, was to the effect that "the will wants to know itself, and consciousness is awakened," and that conflict ensues from the split. He continues: "Ignorance prevails as long as the will remains cheated by its own offspring ... , consciousness ... The cheating, however, cannot last, the will wishes to be enlightened ... Ignorance always presupposes the existence of something outside. This unknown outsider is generally termed ego."<sup>55</sup>

By "will," then, is meant Divine Will, which is always working through consciousness to try to "see itself." It struggles against its offspring, but its offspring has been enticed by the Serpent to taste of the dualistic tree. Consciousness in itself is not the villain of the piece. It is both the Old Adam and the New Adam; it is the "only-begotten Son." "Knowledge--that is Ignorance--," says Dr. Suzuki, "drove Adam from the garden of Eden ... , but it was not knowledge [i.e., rational knowledge] that would reconcile him to his father, it was Will dispelling Ignorance and ushering enlightenment."<sup>56</sup>

"Creation," he says again, "is the awakening of

---

<sup>54</sup>Ed. by Thomas S. Kepler (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1952), LI.

<sup>55</sup>Essays I, 129-30.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 156.

consciousness, or the 'awakening of a thought'; the Fall is consciousness going astray from the original path. God's idea in sending his son among us is the desire to see himself through its own offspring, consciousness; Crucifixion is transcending the dualism of acting and knowing ... Resurrection means the will's triumph over the intellect--in other words, the will seeing itself in and through consciousness."<sup>57</sup>

"The will, back from his excursion through time-consciousness, is God himself."<sup>58</sup>

"When the will is illumined, and thereby when the intellect is properly directed to follow its original course, we are liberated ... and purified of all the defilements which ooze from the will not being correctly interpreted."<sup>59</sup>

"The truth of Zen opens by itself, and has nothing to do with the practice of dhyana" [i.e., as usually conceived].<sup>60</sup>

These passages should give a fairly clear idea of what is meant by will, or Prajñā. The will is pure act, uncreated and free in its essence, which operates more or

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 152-3.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 152.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 211.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

less strongly in all beings, according to how deeply it is buried under "defilements" (kleśa). These defilements ("bankerings") arise freely within the causal chain, binding all conscious life together in the desire for greater individuality. The will, however, must work through this bondage, which is its own, in order to reach the final point of seeing itself. In man there is almost a complete split between separate individuation and the will, which can ultimately see itself only because of this individuation. In one way this represents the extreme of bondage to the will; in another way, the extreme of freedom to consciousness.

To us the question as to the degree of man's freedom is an important one. We bring it up quite naturally here in view of the fact that the doctrine of Karma seems to allow no freedom whatever. Why are there such inequalities among men, and how can one make a choice at all if he is a slave to the chain of causation? How can the will make itself felt if it has reached the limits of bondage?

To these questions Dr. Suzuki replies: "... human beings are the only beings which have their Karma. All others move in accordance with the laws of their being, but it is human beings alone that can design and calculate and are conscious of themselves and their doings. We humans are the sole self-conscious animals, or, as Pascal says, 'thinking reeds.' From thinking ... consciously we

develop the faculty of seeing, designing, and planning beforehand, which demonstrates that we are free, and not always bound by the 'inevitable laws' of Nature. ...

"Not only are we wrapped up in our Karma but we know the fact that we are so wrapped up. It may be better to say that we are Karma, Karma is ourself; moreover we are all conscious of this fact, and yet this very fact of our being aware of the Karma-bondage is the spiritual privilege of humanity. For this privilege, implying freedom, means our being able to transcend Karma."<sup>61</sup>

With the consciousness of bondage comes suffering, which is an essential pre-condition of spiritual experience and must be accepted willingly. But "Just to be conscious of Karma," says Dr. Suzuki, "means no more than throwing ourselves into hell-fire."<sup>62</sup> If life itself is Karma, then there must be no escape from it except by self-destruction. It is here that no-Karma becomes apparent to the dualistic mind of intellection, and the frightening thought arises that, in order to escape, the individualizing intellect must die. The thought is at once frightening and fascinating. Its truth strikes into consciousness like a sword of fire--and Prajña now begins to operate strongly, leading desire toward itself and leading the intellect toward submission. History is full of

---

<sup>61</sup>Essence of Buddhism, p. 26-7.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., p. 27.



instances showing that once this process of "finding oneself" begins, it is a driving force not to be resisted. In Santa Teresa, for example, we find the story of a struggle between the real and the superficial self which lasted for many years.

The force of will stripping away the trappings of egoity is called "meditation." Once it begins, individuals may take various paths according to their tenacity in holding on to the contrived self. Very often "meditation" takes the form of a life-and-death struggle in which it seems that the intellect itself is to die. But only its illusions are to die, particularly the illusion of separate selfhood. Consciousness, Zen insists, is not to be suspended or left behind in the process of enlightenment, for if it were not present at all times, enlightenment would not be enlightenment but annihilation.

Zen approaches the struggle in a most direct manner. What it tries to do is to cut the individual off immediately from any possibility of clinging to objects of thought. Meditation is a process which is going on inside, and it is the business of the Zen master to guide his disciple in getting rid of anything that might impede it.

Zen has seen a certain danger in adopting any object of meditation, even one so inclusive as God, because this may result in one's setting up a new discriminated object

--something "other." But the emphasis on "will-power" or "self-power" is, I think, less by way of distinction than by way of precaution. Since enlightenment takes place within the individual, and since Prajña is immanent within him, having brought itself up to this stage of meditation, it can hardly be said that the source of enlightenment is "other." "Self-power" does not mean "self-effort" in the superficial psychological sense. All individual effort must stop, but what takes place happens only in the individual. Dr. Suzuki says, "... with the God of mysticism there is the grasping of a definite object; when you have God, what is no-God is excluded. This is self-limiting. Zen wants absolute freedom, even from God."<sup>63</sup>

This does not mean that Zen denies transcendence. But it does insist that Buddhata and Dharmata, or Suchness, "which is not the self and yet which is in the self,"<sup>64</sup> can be realized only in and through its immanent aspect. "The cleansing of sin is ... intellectually seeing into the truth that there is something more in what is taken for the self, and conatively in willing and doing the will of that something which transcends the self and yet which works through the self."<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>An Introduction to Zen Buddhism (London: Rider, n.d.), p. 97.

<sup>64</sup>Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series) (London: Rider, 1950), p. 264.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid.

The key to Dr. Suzuki's thinking on the subject lies, I believe, in the statement that "when you have God, what is no-God [i.e., the individual] is excluded." For Zen strongly emphasizes the fact that "There are two, yet there is One; there is One, yet there are two." It is for this reason that Dr. Suzuki states--and this is the extent of his statement--that "the exclusive 'other-power' theory is not tenable."<sup>66</sup> It is not tenable because it could not bring about enlightenment, which is a conscious (or supra-conscious) realization of the Unconscious. Only the conceptual consciousness must die, along with its accumulation of memories; but the field of consciousness must remain, otherwise one would perish. "Other power" suggests, on the one hand, an identification which Zen does not like. "Identity is ... a static condition and decidedly associated with death."<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, if conceptual consciousness remained, no enlightenment would be possible, because the sense of "otherness" would effect a permanent separation.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p. 268.

<sup>67</sup>Zen Buddhism and Its Influence, p. 235.

<sup>68</sup>On the question of the Shin sect of Buddhism, which is an "other-power" (tariki) school, as against Zen, which is "self-power" (jiriki), Dr. Suzuki has in the past made some apparently unclear statements. In Living by Zen, pp. 127ff., he speaks of Shin texts as expressing "an absolute other-power doctrine, rejecting even the desire to hear--as issuing from self-power--the desire which is ordinarily legitimate enough on the part of the devotee ... " But many

The only thing (but a very difficult thing) to be given up in meditation is "contriving" or "clinging."

This means that any mental object which floats into the view of the meditator is permissible--God, Amida, the Buddha, or anything--provided that it is allowed to float freely and is not held on to. Hui-neng says, "When our mind works freely without any hindrance, and is at liberty to 'come' and go', we attain Samadhi of Prajna, or

Shin devotees, he notes, are given to dialectical subtlety and to genuine seeking. Their emphasis on hearing rather than seeing is in itself more passive than it is intellectual. Yet even passivity, he says in Essays II, p. 268, "is made possible only when there is something intensely active within ourselves. Let this active background be all blank ... and there is not even a shade of passivity there. The very fact that it is felt to be passive proves that there is a power on our side that prepares itself to be in a state of receptiveness." "There is a power which receives."

In a recent article, "Enlightenment," in The Review of Religion, March 1954, at p. 143, he says that Shin is "apparently" against the self-power doctrine, but that "the enlightenment idea nevertheless forms its basis"; that its teaching is based upon Amida's enlightenment as Zen's teaching is based upon the Buddha's enlightenment. Shin followers have the additional assurance that if they do not attain enlightenment here and now, they will get it in their next life--but this is not inconsistent with general Buddhist teaching. So it seems that practice runs somewhat contrary to Shin texts, which stress salvation by grace.

In a meeting with a small group at the American Academy of Asian Studies, San Francisco, on January 22, 1955, Dr. Suzuki replied to two similar questions along this line that Zen and Shin are not fundamentally different--"Zen is not jiriki, and Shin is not tarik." Zen's jiriki, he stated, "is on the absolute plane--beyond jiriki and tarik." A distinction, he said, can be made between the two sects only on the basis of individual psychological predispositions and historical and traditional differences. The self-power referred to, he stated, comes from within, "from a supra-psychological plane."

liberation. But to refrain from thinking of anything, so that all thoughts are suppressed, is to be Dharma-ridden, and this is an erroneous view."<sup>69</sup>

To a certain extent, of course, there is "contriving" in order to get rid of the clinging, but in the end it is Prajña itself that finishes the process. Alan Watts says, "... freedom is known when we give up 'contriving' ... but it does not seem to me that the experience can be effective unless there has first been a state of contriving and struggle."<sup>70</sup> It is only infrequently that the experience does come without a struggle, and it is also seldom, as Zen itself found before adopting the koan, that it comes without a method of some sort. This is probably why there have been so few mystics in the Western world; we have never thought of helping the process of enlightenment along with a method. Perfect passivity, as Dr. Suzuki notes, involves some activity, and apparently there are many who must be started toward this activity. Passivity is more than mere indifference, more than the attitude of "Let Jesus do it while I go my way."

Whatever Zen offers by way of "contriving" is admittedly a method adopted only after it was seen that very few adherents could manage without some sort of discipline.

---

<sup>69</sup>Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 35.

<sup>70</sup>"Faith and Works in Buddhism," in the Review of Religion, May 1941, p. 397.

"Self-power" in its usual shallow sense, says Dr. Suzuki, "is not strong enough to cope with cosmological Karma."<sup>71</sup> If advocates of the "other-power" school can accuse the self-power group of spiritual pride in pulling itself up by its own bootstraps, the self-power school can reply that it does so only in order to bring about true submission.

Zen does require faith, but it does not adopt a "faith" which somehow implies that a thing may or may not be true but is only "believed in." Zen wants to know, and there is humility in its assertion that God makes man in order to know through him. So that there can be no finger leveled, I think, at "self-power." It involves a willing and active submission to a power in which it has faith in the sense of confidence. What is often called "faith" may be only a subtle kind of resistance, after all, a reservation of oneself to oneself until another force takes over, if it can. And it seldom can.

Faith has a definite role in Zen, but this faith, as I say, always implies trust. It is characterized by the clear-eyed knowledge that the ego must die, and the ego itself assists in the murder. Dr. Suzuki says, " ... the Zen student is called upon to have a most definite faith in the efficiency of the koan [which I shall explain later] ... and also in the Zen tradition ...

---

<sup>71</sup>Essays II, 262.

Those who lack this faith ... cannot hope to progress in the mastery of the koan. Such a one will go back to the old method, natural, self-dependent, and painstaking, of reaching a final solution."<sup>72</sup> Again: "In my view faith comes first, and a most determined mind is awakened through the working of faith, but the latter generally lies hidden in the depths of unconsciousness, and for that reason its presence in the mind is not recognized ... Faith is then more fundamental than the determined will ..."<sup>73</sup> "This faith ... is not the one to which we ordinarily refer, because it has no object to which it applies itself, nor has it any subject from which it goes out to something other than itself."<sup>74</sup>

With this kind of faith, the Zen monk can "let go with both hands" and plunge into the abyss.

## 2. Zen Discipline and Practice.

It is necessary at the outset, I believe, to understand what Zen is aiming at in its discipline. This may be expressed in part by stating what it does not aim at. It does not aim at the liberation of the individual so that "he" may dwell in bliss. This kind of liberation,

---

<sup>72</sup>Living by Zen (London: Rider, 1950), p. 159.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p. 161.

claimed by the earlier Śravakas and Pratyekabuddhas, is in fact not liberation at all. It requires unceasing effort, still by a subject ego, to hold his mind presumably in a state of cessation. To do this he must wall himself off from the world of forms and engage in years of "formless meditation." What he reaches is at best an unstable equilibrium, and what he espouses is only the inactive and unmanifest side of reality. He is still a someone holding onto a "somewhat," or a "name-form."

Zen's discipline, on the other hand, aims at an eventual absence of discipline in the sense that this word implies one thing holding another thing under control, as, for instance, the "inner man" controlling the "outer man." Self-mastery implies duality, and as long as there is this sense of duality, discipline will undoubtedly have to go on. It may take many years to undo the habits established by the whole of evolution from the first seed on up.

It is liberation from the individual as an isolated entity that Zen strives for. "Twofold is the knowledge that must be known,"<sup>75</sup> the knowledge that form and the formless are but two mental aspects of a whole that cannot be separated except mentally, and that mentality itself with its cleaving habits is not all of That but only its agency.

---

<sup>75</sup>Mundaka Upanishad, I.1.4, tr. by Sri Aurobindo in Eight Upanishads (Pondicherry, 1953).



Enlightenment, Zen says, is not something to be attained, but something to be revealed in consciousness as already existing, primary to and including consciousness. Although there is an event called satori and something is definitely achieved in it, this achievement is not actually the "gaining" of enlightenment but the loss of an obstruction which has hindered the will from operating freely in the consciousness. Eliminating this obstruction is not the easiest thing in the world, for it is tenaciously held in the delusion of "my own free will" as against another will which would take away all freedom. This holding on is unconscious, and is a matter not merely of the individual's mental habits but of a disposition developed throughout long ages, or "from time immemorial." So that even when an individual submits himself freely, as he believes himself to be doing, the task is not too easy.

Although the statement that "Everybody is a Buddha" is metaphysically true, we ordinarily think of a Buddha as one who has gone beyond the usual fears of mortality and beyond the suffering of conscious limitation. In this sense many men, unfortunately, are bound to such an extent that in their present state of mind it would be impossible for them to reach the knowledge of their Buddhahood. It is true that whether they are in complete ignorance or the direst of sin, they are only

mistaken Buddhas. But the suffering soul is looking for a certain kind of knowledge.

This knowledge cannot be demonstrated, for it is not knowledge "about," but a consciousness without objects --an unconscious consciousness. It is "being-consciousness" in the sense that the East uses this term. Nature, the East says, is "of the nature of consciousness" (chit). This does not mean consciousness of anything, but the sentience underlying all the forms that follow upon it, or "being-consciousness" (sat-chit). This consciousness is "self-revealing."

In order to rest freely in being-consciousness one must, as the Chinese say, "go back to the root." This consciousness is already there, and all the leaves and branches are merely its manifestations. If we can subside briefly, we will know in an inexpressible and "unknowing" way that our own inner self is identical with the nature of its source.

I have been somewhat puzzled by a statement of M. Chaning-Pearce concerning the Oriental identification of self with Self.

"If the [Oriental] 'inner self of self' is a thing flawless, universal, indestructible, and, when released, omnipotent, it is also identical with God and there are no limits to the self-culture and humanism which can be built upon the basis of such a belief. ... For such a

'wisdom' the inference is that, in the first place, this occult self and God are identical and, in the second, that this divine Self abides intact in every man, only awaiting the discovery of illumination.

"A 'self' which is no more than, in Kierkegaard's words, 'the abstractest possibility of self,' the mere soil for self awaiting the divine seed, and a 'Self' equatable with God Himself, which 'shines by its own light,' are two wholly different conclusions. The one leads direct to a secular humanism, the other to Christianity."<sup>76</sup>

There appear to be several misconceptions in these statements. One is that "the Oriental inner self" is a "belief," rather than an inner self. Another is that the human self is equatable with God. Here I think he means "identical". But there is a difference between "identical" and "self-identical," for the first does not allow for difference or for transcendence. Daiju answered this rather nicely when he said that "The confused take the green bamboo for Dharmakaya itself, the yellow blooming tree for Prajna itself. ... If the bamboo were Dharmakaya, Dharmakaya would be identical with a plant. But Dharmakaya exists, Prajna exists, even when there is no blooming tree, no green bamboo. Otherwise, when one eats a bamboo-shoot, this would be eating up Dharmakaya itself."<sup>77</sup>

If the idea that the "soil of self" awaits the divine

---

<sup>76</sup>The Terrible Crystal (London: Kegan Paul, 1940), p. 41.

<sup>77</sup>In Suzuki, Introduction, p. 80.

seed involves the idea that the soil is completely different and not merely a "distinction within non-distinction," it offers far more opportunity for the development of a "secular humanism," it seems to me, for it still sees itself as quite disjointed. A "secular humanism" could hardly be built at all, although a very ignorantly constituted personal code or a whole society might be, for there is no difference between divine and secular. As R. H. Blyth says, "The things of Caesar are things of God."<sup>78</sup> Ego-culture (I believe this is what Mr. Chaning-Pearce means) is even less liked in the East than it is in the West, but even so, the more enlightened men of the East would have the charity not to look down upon it. The idea of "ignorance" is far more kind than our usual conceptions of "sin."

Knowing that you can come as you are, ignorant and "sinful" though you may be, is called "entering the frontier gate of Zen." And, just as you are already received because you have never been cast out except as you thought yourself to be, so you are to receive the "sentient beings" inhabiting your mind. This is the secret of Zen meditation. It involves not following after and not holding the "creatures" of the mind on the basis of pleasure or pain, but merely letting them be as they are and staying

---

<sup>78</sup>Zen in English Literature (Tokyo: Hokuseido, 1942), p. 52.

as you are. In meditation it is necessary that you should not continue under the delusion that you can take any action with regard to your thoughts. To run after them is to seem to become dispersed in all directions, and to be passive toward what actually springs forth from the spontaneous activity of mind. You are simply to let them be, with a mind so pure that it accepts everything just as it is, and so makes no choices. "Enlightenment" being such a thought, even that should be allowed to go its own way.

A disciple asked Huang Po, "Then we should not seek for anything at all?"

"By conceding this you would save yourself a lot of mental effort."

"But in this way everything would be eliminated. There cannot be just nothing."

"Who teaches that there is nothing? What is this nothing?"<sup>79</sup>

Zen meditation is not meditation on something. It is meditation with forms without attachment to forms. I believe that if we understand what the perfect man in Zen is like, we will understand why this discipline may be said to be directed purposively toward no purpose and strenuously directed toward no effort.

---

<sup>79</sup>Huang Po Doctrine, p. 40.

a. The Bodhisattva.

Every day in Zen monasteries the monks chant the following four vows:

"All beings, however limitless, I vow to carry across;

"My evil passions, however inexhaustible, I vow to destroy;

"The Dharma teachings, however innumerable, I vow to study;

"The Buddha-way, however peerless, I vow to attain."

The aim and end of Zen is not merely enlightenment (bodhi) but supreme enlightenment (sambodhi). To this end the prospective Bodhisattva (bodhi, enlightenment; sattva, being) approaches his discipline with a firm resolve to relinquish everything, even his enlightenment, for the salvation of "all sentient beings."

We are accustomed to use the term "sentient beings" with reference only to organisms with a rather well-defined nervous system and the capacity to be self-conscious. But "sentient" and "conscious" have broader connotations, which Judge Woodroffe suggests might be more closely described by the word "feeling."<sup>80</sup> Anything with form, no matter how rudimentary and no matter how insentient it may appear, is a form of consciousness. "We must here include chemical sentiency and memory; that is the atom's and molecule's remembrance of its own identity and behaviour therewith.

<sup>80</sup>Shakti and Shākta (Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1951), p. 256.

... The consciousness of plants is only trance-like (what the Hindu books call 'Comatose') though some of the higher aspects of sentiency (and we may here use the word 'consciousness') of the vegetable world are highly interesting; such as the turning of flowers to the sun," and so on.<sup>81</sup>

"Sentient beings" also refers to one's thoughts. For one does not look at a thing without entering into it formally, imposing one's own impression upon it. It is not that there is not something to give a mental reaction, but that there is no distinction between our reactions and our actions. The normal state of our minds is actively passive, so that what we see is at least as much subject as it is object; in fact, no differentiation can be made. Because we are possessed of formal activity (that is, life), our thoughts themselves have forms, and are to be "saved"--or "let be." Many thoughts do not refer to so-called "outer" objects, and these also are formal. They are as much "sentient beings" as anything else.

Anything that we see as having form, if we react to it with pleasure or pain, is being judged by us as limited, or "in sin." But if we make no judgment and see sameness in difference, we "liberate" all beings.

A person who feels himself to have a special consciousness and to be limited to his own body is restricted and "in sin." A sense of sin, being the individual

---

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 259.

consciousness of finitude as against a sensed infinitude, is equated with suffering. The more sensitive and psychically specialized the organism, the greater its capacity for suffering, or, as the Existentialists call it, "anxiety." Dr. Tillich says: "... anxiety is the state in which a being is aware of its possible non-being ... anxiety is the existential awareness of nonbeing. 'Existential' ... means that it is not the abstract knowledge of nonbeing which produces anxiety but the awareness that nonbeing is a part of one's own being. ... Anxiety is finitude, experienced as one's own finitude. This is the natural anxiety of man. ... "82

The prospective Bodhisattva is possessed of a deep sense of suffering. He sees the whole world plunged in sin and his fellow-men suffering, and he sees himself as the center of all this; for his actions, words, and thoughts in the pattern of cosmological Karma have modified the whole structure from time immemorial by defiling it. He has grasped his thoughts by desire and held them in temporal and spatial bondage, thus strengthening the power of cause-effect. "Samsāra is just one's own thought," says the Maitri Upanishad; "with effort he should cleanse it, then."<sup>83</sup> This cleansing must include body, speech, and

---

<sup>82</sup>Paul Tillich, The Courage to Be (New Haven, 1952), p. 35, quoted by John Margolis, "Contributions of Religion to Ethics," in The Review of Religion, March 1954, p. 164.

<sup>83</sup>Maitri Upanishad 6.34 (Hume translation).



mind, the constituents which he has called a "self," which hereafter are to be the obedient instrument of Self toward the deliverance of all of mind's inhabitants (not "his" mind's, but Mind's).

It is for the universal cessation of suffering (limitation, measure, or "sin") that the Bodhisattva-to-be offers himself as a way for all sentient beings to pass beyond limitation to Sacchidananda (sat-chit-ānanda, or Being-consciousness-bliss--again, not bliss of or in anything other, but the bliss that Being-consciousness is). This means that as a symbol to guide them he offers to keep his limited form throughout as many births as necessary, in any form necessary. He offers to keep it until men, animals, devils, plants, stones, and all other beings held by ignorance of māyā in a discriminated and isolated form have reached enlightenment. These bodily transformations (nirvana) he will accomplish by his skilful means (upāya) to assume any form and to bestow his merits upon anything, no matter how mean or lowly, to the extent that it can receive these merits, and without judgment as to its ability to do so. These vows he makes out of a great loving heart (mahākarunācitta), a great compassionate heart (mahāmaitracitta), a sympathetic heart (dayacitta), an unimpeded heart (asaṅgacitta) which wants to remove all limitations, an endless heart (anantacitta), and a wisdom-heart (jñānacitta) by which he enters into all-knowledge (sarvajñāta). The

word "heart" here means something like "disposition," "tendency," "nature."

The strength of his vow at the beginning of his search for satori will determine its strength and effectiveness. There are degrees of satori, Dr. Suzuki says, of which the highest is sometimes called "the transcending of sagehood," or passage into the unconscious innocence of the saint. All scriptures--I can think of no exception--compare this innocence with that of a baby, which, unconscious of itself, looks upon all things equally. The innocence of a Bodhisattva is more than the innocence of a mere lack of learning. Once established it cannot be shaken. It corresponds to the fourth of Blake's four stages of knowledge: innocence, experience, silence, innocence. "Zen ... says we are to act self-lessly, thought-lessly, taking no thought, not only for the morrow, but for today, for the present as well. ... What Zen wishes to do is to take us back to the most primitive condition of all, to lead us to become, not only children, but fetuses, amoebae."<sup>84</sup> Even this is not as far as Zen wishes to take us. It wants us to go back to where it is clear that nothing is ever born.

This choice of the Bodhisattva as to his sacrifice is very important. Before the idea of the Bodhisattva

---

<sup>84</sup> R. H. Blyth, Zen in English Literature, p. 175.

swept through Mahayana, Buddhism stated, as did Hinduism, that after enlightenment a person released from the bondage of Karma need live out only the consequences of the Karma created in his present lifetime (some Hinayana texts say that he may commit suicide forthwith) and never appear again unless he so chooses. Some Indian schools say this choice is itself determined by Karma; others say that the Divine Will, or Supreme Enlightenment, is forever working to sustain its inhabitants (i.e., itself). The distinction between the two viewpoints is a rather fine one, I think, for Karma seen as cosmological law is not different from the Divine Will. Aspectually it may perhaps be called Justice as distinct from Mercy--but actually it is both.

The Bodhisattva's choice insures him true enlightenment, in that the Divine Will itself shows no predilection either for formless<sup>-ness</sup> or forms; it simply does not come within these categories. So that in offering to give away his enlightenment he is giving himself over completely, as the Void itself does, to whatever may happen and to whatever any "creatures" may want to take from his nature. Like the Divine Will (I say "like," but, as I pointed out before, divine and human will are the same), he is all willingness, and his unfathomed activity in merely being (while at the same time he is beyond both being and non-being) is a refuge, a light, and a path. One does not, in Zen, seek to escape his "natural" condition by fleeing

to divinity as an alternative. Divinity is beyond alternatives--with and without--so that it makes no difference to the Bodhisattva what happens to him in the way of form. He is completely obedient and submitted, willing to return again and again in any form that will further enlightenment, and willing to inhabit any form now without partiality. He is not indifferent--just non-different. His "natural condition" is no particular condition. It lies in the Middle Way in an infinitesimally small neutral moment called Now where all opposites are reconciled.

"... his heart has become free from timidity," Āśvaghoṣa says, "inasmuch as he would not shudder even at the thought of falling down to the stage of Āravakahood or Pratyekabuddhahood, any more than to the evil creation."<sup>85</sup> He does not care who or what he is as mere appearance.

When a Bodhisattva assumes a human form, it is God himself incarnate. In man he is "fleshing." It is He who extends hands, sees with eyes, and hears with ears "as if" He were indeed a man. One cannot call him an impersonal God, because He is intensely personal--life of the life and breath of the breath. Yet one cannot call Him personal either. If so, which person is He? For all men are incarnations. "... so many absolutes," says Dr. Suzuki, "and yet all one in the Absolute."<sup>86</sup> The difference

---

<sup>85</sup>The Awakening of Faith, tr. by D. T. Suzuki (Chicago, Open Court, 1900), p. 121.

<sup>86</sup>Essence of Buddhism, p. 18.

between the Bodhisattva and other men is that they are consciously something else than an incarnation. All sentient beings are enstonelements, aquations, vegetations, and incarnations--and this not in a static sense. They might rather be called "stoning," and so on, for the continuity of life is without identity from one moment to the next. Lack of identity is what makes it continuous.

Lest this view be considered animistic, I will add Fa-tsang's statement that in the gold lion " ... the various organs of the lion [phenomenon], down to each and every hair, all include the whole lion, in so far as they are all the gold [noumenon]. The eyes are the ears, the ears are the nose, the nose is the tongue, and the tongue is the body. They each are freely established and do not impede one another."<sup>87</sup> This is true not only with respect to the parts of the lion, but with respect to things in relation to one another. Relatively considered they are individuals and not at all the same; absolutely considered they are the same. Such considerations, however, should not be made separately.

The farther down the scale of consciousness we go in the relative world, the deeper is the bondage and the smaller the possibility of overcoming this bondage. The Bodhisattva, however, never pauses in his work of enlightenment. He holds himself away from nothing and extends his

---

<sup>87</sup>Loc. cit., p. 350.

merits everywhere, to be received as best they can be. He works to bring everything up to a higher level of consciousness. So do the gods for us, and all the Bodhisattvas and Buddhas in all the infinite number of Buddha-lands (these Buddha-lands being all around us, in lions, lions' eyes, and so on.)

To take all this back to the recesses of One Mind (and the Bodhisattva is that), I should say that, without holding himself so in a dualistic way, the Bodhisattva must be as pure-minded as possible, for his life is in a sphere where he is everything he knows, and at the same time is not of it. In other words, The Bodhisattva does not know what he is in himself, or even that he is in himself. He is not consciously self-contained, but has his life in his environment. This is his "being-consciousness."

To have the conscious and the Unconscious running together freely as one stream, to have consciousness submitted to the will (by which, of course, I do not mean the desiring will), is to negate both elements and affirm them in a third term called Suchness. This, rather than trying to bury oneself as a finite ego in the "infinite," is true naturalness--or I should say Nature. It is this inner harmony that the Bodhisattva wishes to help establish throughout the universe. It is fear as well as desire which leads beings to cling to objects as if they could rest in them. The Bodhisattva seeks no harbor anywhere;

he is fearless and abodeless. "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head."

Sacrifice, then, is the keynote of the Buddhist life. It is not sacrifice performed with any idea of sacrifice. The concept of sacrifice itself is to be sacrificed. The highest of all pride is the subtle pride of conscious humility--so subtle that it deserves to be called Satanic. Marco Pallis says: "... the Bodhisattva's vow must never be taken to imply that the saving of mankind, or even of all creation, should become an end in itself for the apprentice in spirituality. Nothing short of the naked Truth, shorn of all contingencies and restrictions, merits to be called Desirable, its pursuit alone can be called Activity unqualified; only one who has been stripped of his attachments to everything except the truth without a rival or associate can hope to attain it. Having attained it, he does, in fact, become qualified to save the world, but should he at any stage yield to the supremely diabolical temptation (the one offered by Satan to Christ upon the high mountain) of making the world's salvation into his first aim, then he must pay the price of his altruistic idolatry and remain irremediably chained to the world and its otherness. A hair separates the two positions ..."<sup>88</sup> The Bodhisattva's deeds must remain purposeless (or, rather, it is not that they "must" but that they do) and be performed toward no conscious end.

<sup>88</sup>Peaks and Lamas, p. 320.

This matter of intention makes all the difference between an intellectual morality with an eye to material results such as goodness, happiness, evolutionary progress, social harmony or a reward in Heaven, and the amoral purity of the Bodhisattva. Some thinkers have misconstrued his position as being that of one who may do anything--kill, plunder, and destroy--in the interest of his ideal. Adolf Hitler also thought that he had come to save the world. This sort of attachment to an ideal can degenerate too quickly into the view that the end justifies the means. The Bodhisattva has no end, but is all means. He is not attached to anything--certainly not to a philosophical ideal. It is his entire body that knows its direction and pursues it. There is in fact no direction, no pursuit. There is merely movement in non-movement, and it is in the heart of this paradox that he lives. If things seem, in an oversimplified linear view of them, to be tending forward, they are also tending backward at exactly the same rate of speed, and Goethe's "anticipation" and Plato's "recollection" are both true, but not separately. "Now" includes them both. Far more vital than the linear view is the rich contextual view in which the universe as a whole changes constantly in an unbroken continuity of movement that is going nowhere; it is just going. The Chinese, as Dr. Jung notes in his introduction to the I Ching, were always more aware of the concrete,



complex present than of the abstract linearity of past and future. This is why Zen appealed to them and why in turn they did much to keep it down to earth. Life is not linear; it holds intellectual paradox firmly in one embrace.

How, then, does the Bodhisattva go about saving the world? He does not "go about it." And it is not "he" who can deliver anything; each being must deliver itself through him. He may teach, if that happens to be his vocation, or he may be an artist, or a farmer or a shoemaker or anything else. The essential thing is that he himself is universal law, which means that he does not strive against the world.

When a man is to take the world over  
and shape it,  
I see that he must be obliged to do it.  
For the world is a divine vessel;  
It cannot be shaped;  
Nor can it be insisted upon.  
He who shapes it damages it;  
He who insists upon it loses it.  
Therefore the Sage does not shape  
it, so he does not damage it;  
He does not insist upon it, so he  
does not lose it.<sup>89</sup>

He does not say "Come" or "Go" to anyone or anything, but is present as "the light of the world" if one has sufficient understanding to follow it.

Even if men be bad, why should they  
be rejected?  
Therefore the Sage is always a good  
saviour of men,  
And no man is rejected;

---

<sup>89</sup>Tao Te Ching, XXIX.

This is called double enlightenment.  
 Therefore good men are bad men's in-  
 structors,  
 And bad men are good men's materials.  
 Those who do not esteem their in-  
 structors,  
 And those who do not love their mate-  
 rials,  
 Though expedient, are in fact greatly  
 confused.<sup>90</sup>

With the crucifixion of the ego comes resurrec-  
 tion to the Self. With the extinction of his own de-  
 sires the Bodhisattva reaches the fulfillment of all de-  
 sires. He is supremely content--or he is content. He  
 lives and breathes in everything he sees--everything but  
 himself--, sorrows in others and rejoices in them, with  
 his essential self unsorrowing and unrejoicing, with no  
 ego to know whether it is "happy" or not. The universe real-  
 izes itself in him, and he in it. He might be said to play  
 in his thought at being all things, as a child might play  
 at being a cow or a horse without being one. In all this  
 there is no pretense, no divided consciousness watching  
 itself at play. The untouched identity, unconscious  
 either of self or of Self, is both hidden and revealed  
 in the acting, for it is what sustains every movement of  
 it without being changed or defiled by its characteristics.  
 Not that it would be so defiled unless that defilement  
 were its own. Thus a Bodhisattva can associate with  
 thieves and murderers without being at all affected.  
 In so far as he is in them, they are pure; in so far as

---

<sup>90</sup>Ibid., XXVII.

he rests in himself, he is pure; but this is all himself.

He is like "a lotus leaf unwetted by the water."

He by whom the world is not perturbed and who is not perturbed by the world, freed from the anxieties of joy, anger, and fear, he is dear to Me.

He who wants nothing, is pure, expert, passionless, untroubled, renouncing every undertaking, he, my devotee, is dear to Me.

Alike to foe and friend, and also in fame and ignominy, alike in cold and heat, pleasure and pains, destitute of attachment,

Taking equally praise and reproach, silent, wholly content with what cometh, homeless, firm in mind, full of devotion, that man is dear to Me.<sup>91</sup>

The Bodhisattva does not look upon things as void, but he sees differently; he sees them as void, not considers them. His eyes are void; he sees "as if not seeing." His patience is the acceptance of all things as unborn. He does no violence to them or to their way of thinking, but receives them as they are. He confers unity and accepts unity. All this he does with no effort at all, just the colorlessly blissful activity of being fully alive. Chuang-tse says: "The sage comprehends the connexions between himself and others, and how they all go to constitute him of one body with them, and he does not know how it is so;--he naturally does so. In fulfilling his constitution, as acted on and acting,

---

<sup>91</sup>Bhagavad Gita, XII, 15-19.

he simply follows the direction of Heaven; and it is in consequence of this that men style him (a sage). If he were troubled about (the insufficiency of) his knowledge, what he did would always be small, and sometimes would be arrested altogether; ... When (the sage) is born with all his excellence, it is other men who see it for him. If they did not tell him, he would not know that he was more excellent than others. And when he knows it, he is as if he did not know it; when he hears it, he is as if he did not hear it. His source of joy in it has no end, and men's admiration of him has no end;--all this takes place naturally. The love of the sage for others receives its name from them. If they did not tell him of it, he would not know that he loved them; and when he knows it, he is as if he knew it not. His love of others never has an end, and their rest in him has also no end;--all this takes place naturally."<sup>92</sup>

And now, to eliminate any remaining possibility that the Bodhisattva might be imagined as a glorious, effulgent being who can instantly be distinguished from other men, I must add that it would be impossible to tell him from an ordinary kindhearted man. His charity far exceeds the ordinary, for his whole mind is a form of charity. It is in fact not "his" mind, as I have said before; he lays no claim to anything. "It is said,"

---

<sup>92</sup>Works, Book 25, Pt. 3, Sec. 3, par.2, in Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXXIX and XL, ed. by F. Max Muller (Oxford, 1927). Translation by James Legge.

says the author of Theologia Germanica, "it was because Adam ate the apple that he was lost, or fell. I say, it was because of his claiming something for his own, and because of his I, Mine, Me, and the like. Had he eaten seven apples, and yet never claimed anything for his own, he would not have fallen; but as soon as he called something his own, he fell, and would have fallen if he had never touched an apple."<sup>93</sup> The Bodhisattva makes no assertions. He is neither a nobody nor a somebody.

A magnificent, soaring vision of his heavenly abode is presented in the Gandavyuha Sutra. But in contact with the Chinese the earlier Indian idea of the Bodhisattva was modified on the side of health. The morality involved, as I have indicated, is natural--and by this I do not mean that it is based on "self-preservation"; it is based first of all on self-destruction. True Self does not have to be preserved. All necessity is absent from it; it is free. The morality of the complete and essentially free man implies the free acceptance of all things--his environment, his lot in life, his duty and proper vocation (svadharma), and the limitations of a human form and a rational mind as instruments of the Buddha. There have been outstanding Bodhisattvas, but there are many more whose quiet deeds have never been recorded in writing.

In China the Buddha has ceased contemplating his navel. His samādhi reaches to all aspects of life, and

---

<sup>93</sup>p. 40.

life itself is the terminus a quo and the terminus ad quem --not this form of life, but this life. Dr. Suzuki says: " ... Zen followers in China ... have induced even the Buddha himself to take an active part in the common life of the masses. He no more sits on a high seat decorated with seven kinds of jewels, discoursing on such abstract subjects as Non-ego, Emptiness, or Mind-only. On the contrary, he takes up a spade in his hands, tills the ground, sows seeds, and garners the harvest. In outward appearances he cannot be distinguished from a commoner whom we meet on the farm, in the street, or in the office. He is just as hard-working a person as we are. The Buddha in his Chinese Zen life does not carry his Gandavyuha atmosphere ostentatiously about him but quietly within him. A Buddha alone discovers him."<sup>94</sup>

A commentary on The Secret of the Golden Flower says: "When a man lives in contact with the world, and yet still in harmony with the Light, then the round is round and the angular has angles; then he lives among men concealed, yet visible, different, and yet the same, and none can compass it; then no one takes note of our secret life and being. The living manner of the circulation of the Light has just this meaning: To live in contact with the world and yet in harmony with the Light."<sup>95</sup>

One clue to the Bodhisattva's secret is the unfaill-

---

<sup>94</sup>Essays III, 79.

<sup>95</sup>The Secret of the Golden Flower, tr. into English by Cary F. Baynes (London: Routledge, 1950), p. 58.

ingly close attention which he pays to his thoughts and actions, as if they were ritual--and so they are: a ritual of sacrifice, and sacrifice is the same thing as acceptance. While he is giving everything away, he is also receiving everything.

b. Seeing Without Seeing.

A primer of Zen might have as its first lesson something like this: Enlightenment is not enlightenment; enlightenment is the essential condition of everything just as it is; meditation is enlightenment; everybody is a Buddha; there is nothing to seek; your everyday thought is the Tao.

Statements like this are very frequent. Yet Zen says that its central point and raison d'être is the Buddha's enlightenment. As an historical fact, realization did come to Siddhartha Gautama under the Bodhi-tree near Gaya. But even the Buddha is reported as saying, "I acquired not the least thing," and "if anyone says that the Tathagata sets forth a Teaching he really slanders [the] Buddha ... "96

It would seem, then, that there is no particular reason for entering a monastery, sitting in meditation

---

<sup>96</sup>The Jewel of Transcendental Wisdom (Diamond Sutra), tr. from the Chinese by A. F. Price (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), XXII, XXI.

(za-zen) and "facing" koans until an experience called satori happens. But more is needed than the mere knowledge that it is useless to seek. One must seek with all the vigor of his will, desire, and discriminating intellect until he actually gives up. He will then know existentially that what he sought was there all the time. Such knowledge is immanent and non-objective. Therefore it was not, and could not be, taught in words by the Buddha. Every person must uncover this knowledge for himself and know it, as Zen says, "as a water-drinker knows how hot or how cold the water is."<sup>97</sup>

"To seek God without already having him," St. Julian of Norwich says, "is of all things the most impossible."<sup>98</sup> For the person doing the seeking is already, without knowing it, a perfect union of samādhi and dhyāna. The formless, unmanifest, unworking aspect of his nature is there as the necessary ground upon which activity arises, as sound can arise only in silence. This side of him is pure, unmoving, unattached to forms, and in perfect equilibrium--a solidly full emptiness. Within it, in the inner vibrancy of living, the senses play, and thoughts arise, link themselves in series, and move about as if in extension. Every thought and action is mirrored as if in a

---

<sup>97</sup>Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 23.

<sup>98</sup>The Revelation of Divine Love, quoted by R. H. Blyth in Zen in English Literature, p. 99.



colorless crystal that takes on the color of whatever is reflected in it, yet this crystal remains unstained.

These two aspects of his nature, the passive and the active, are "undivided and unconfused"--two yet one, one yet two. Action arises within non-action, mind within No-mind, and distinction within non-distinction. Where the turning point is, where action neither arises nor does not, is where he normally lives. This is Now, a dimensionless point of complete readiness, waiting without purpose for whatever might issue, and receiving and giving without pause.

A person who sets out in quest of enlightenment as if it were an entity has habitually assumed a certain point of fixity, his ego, from which his thoughts have been running, as it seems, outward. That same point of fixity, which is a very stubborn one, is taken by Zen as a starting-point from which to turn back and "look within." It seems that before one realizes his absolute freedom, his mental activity must return in a sort of backwash of movement to a point where no forms are emanating from it and where it is held in a stasis of "imageless beatitude" or equilibrium. This is far from being a state of blankness. It is that "full emptiness" which I mentioned a moment ago. When a single thought stirs in this full No-mind, just as it stirs, the yogin is at the fountainhead of creation, the timeless moment in which

non-movement and movement are one. He is inside this moment, and it is here that he will stay. But this is where he has always been, even when he filled his Now with the needless pain of looking before and after. Now he no longer imagines a time-lag between himself and his objects, and no longer sees barriers of space and materiality. Red is red, blue is blue. No "I see" comes between the mirror and experience.

No one who has not spent time in a Zen monastery is qualified, I think, to discuss the methods of the Zen masters. Dr. Suzuki has given us a great deal of information about koans, but the exact means of using them is still unclear. It is understandable that the method should not be fully disclosed. Its principal object is to discourage intellectual analysis, and it depends to some extent on surprise. It is also possible that not much can be said about it because methods must vary with individuals. The personal experiences cited by Dr. Suzuki show great individual variation.

By way of information, I will say that the koan is a short statement, problem, or "theme" whose content is intellectually unanalyzable. It is usually a saying by one of the older Zen masters, and serves both as a "pointer" and as a yardstick for measuring achievement. Such problems are the following:

1. A monk asked Chao-chou, "Is there Buddha-nature

in this dog?" Chao-chou replied, "Wu!" (in Japanese, Mu, meaning "No".)

2. Hear the sound of one hand.

3. What are your original features which you have even prior to your birth?

4. Stop the booming of the distant bell.

5. Prince Nata, tearing himself asunder, gives his flesh to his mother and his bones to his father. Then he appears in his original nature and preaches the Dharma (law) to his parents.

From Dr. Suzuki's discussion in his Essays, Second Series, it seems that one principal koan is used which represents the student's own type of mental fixation or problem. But other koans, apparently, are used, perhaps leading up to this in lesser degrees of satori, and certainly used by way of examination and confirmation. Whatever their exact use, they seem to set up a direction without setting up a tangible goal. With reference to the principal koan (which is the only one that Dr. Suzuki treats at length), it is held up before the mind as a small entity but also as a great hollow question that cannot be answered until questioner and question become one in the state of equilibrium or "fixation" (daigi). In satori the student suddenly knows its full content. A koan, I should say, then, is a problem to be answered which can only be answered experientially. Knowledge of its content is not acquired

but "seen", and such knowledge may be used but not expounded. All of these larger koans, Dr. Suzuki says, in one form or another ask the question, "What is reality?" To answer that question is to be it.

Charges of self-hypnosis and autosuggestion are always being hurled at this kind of methodized practice. But it is no less legitimate than, say, the acquisition of piano technique with the idea in mind of its eventual transcendence. Everyone is an artist, just as everyone is a Buddha, but it takes a certain effort to have "skill in means" so that what was originally there unexpressed may flow out in expression. Once the point of unconscious use is reached, the means stop obtruding themselves; the fingers skim over the keys as if technique and player no longer existed. Silence is transmuted into sound, and between the two there sits a dead man who does not know the difference between the two. He himself is the instrument.

No teacher can make you what you already are. You may listen to him, imitate him, and almost worship him. But he can do little more than give you a technique and then wait. The day that you can push him off the porch as he has been pushing you, as a certain Zen disciple did to his master, is the day he has been waiting for. This is the day when your hidden knowledge meets with your unconscious skill. The two are in each other's service, one as pure possibility, the other as purposeless means.

Before the Zen student comes face to face with his principal koan, there must have been an intense metaphysical search stemming from a sense of spiritual unrest. It is doubtful, Dr. Suzuki says, that Zen experience could take place without such a background. This search need not have been through the byways of erudition, but it must have been deep and fundamental. The student must have an intense desire to know the answer to the question, "What is reality?"--a desire so strong that he is willing to risk anything, even his "soul."

Zen training, therefore, although its end is "a special transmission outside the scriptures," which no teacher can give, involves some basic understandings to drive this search toward its proper end, and to insure rightness of direction and the right degree of satori. It thus seeks to supply a technique of meditation, which consists in the absence of technique.

First, "Come as you are" must be thoroughly understood. You are not looking for something that you are not, or seeking to be transformed, or trying to "purify" yourself. You are seeking realization of a purity that is already there buried under the "defilements" of imagined limitation. This seeking is a sort of "seeking without seeking," for it is purpose itself that creates limitations. "Self-improvement" does no good, because it is attached to something. Your essential nature floats

freely and attaches itself to things, but is in itself unattached. And there need be no purgation or repentance in the usual Christian sense. All idea of sin is washed away in at-onement, or crucifixion. Repentance, Hui-neng said, serves no purpose if it means merely being sorry about the past; it must apply to the future as well, and must be a continuous process. "Let us purify our own mind from one Kṣana [moment] to the other" and burn thoughts in the fire of creation in the same moment that they appear.<sup>99</sup> "As to dwelling upon purity, our nature is intrinsically pure; and so far as we get rid of all delusive 'idea' there will be nothing but purity ..."<sup>100</sup> Even "delusion" is a delusion. "Since delusion has no abiding place, it is delusive to dwell upon it."<sup>101</sup> As to dwelling on the mind, mind also is delusive. To abide neither in abiding nor in non-abiding, to think thoughtlessly without accompanying thoughts about "doing" something, and to live as if dead--this is "the formless repentance."

"Take refuge in yourself" is Hui-neng's formless formula. To dwell in Enlightenment, Orthodoxy, and Purity (the Threefold Guidance) or "to take refuge in the Buddha" means no more than not letting your energy be misapplied to any such objects. "If they say they take refuge in the

---

<sup>99</sup>Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 53.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

<sup>101</sup>Ibid.

Buddha, do they know where He is? Yet if they cannot see Buddha, how can they take refuge in Him?"<sup>102</sup> As Saraha said, "In so far as one is within something, one cannot see it (from without)."<sup>103</sup>

Hui-neng also taught, concerning the "three bodies of the Buddha" (Tri-kaya), that with our physical bodies we take refuge in the Dharmakaya (essence-body), the Sambhogakaya (enjoyment-body, or creative principle), and the Nirmana-kaya (form-body). " ... within yourself you will find the Tri-kaya which, being the manifestation of the Essence of Mind, are not to be sought from without."<sup>104</sup>

In short, no words will say what reality is. When you know that it resides in no words, even in such a word as "reality," you will no longer be "enslaved by a doctrine of release."<sup>105</sup> Dual and non-dual, Nirvana and Samsara-- all these pairs of terms are only guideposts. The ultimate knowledge is before words.

Wordiness and intellection--  
The more with them the farther astray we  
go;  
Away therefore with wordiness and intel-  
lection,  
And there is no place where we cannot  
pass freely.

The two exist because of the one,  
But hold not even to this one;

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., p. 58.

<sup>103</sup> Saraha's Treasury of Songs, Stanza 67.

<sup>104</sup> WeilLang, p. 59.

<sup>105</sup> Saraha's Treasury, Stanza 6.

When the mind is not disturbed,  
The ten thousand things offer no of-  
fence:

When no offence is offered by them, they  
are as if not existing;  
When the mind is not disturbed, it is as  
if there is no mind.<sup>106</sup>

Not even "ultimate knowledge" can be the goal. An intense desire for Supreme Enlightenment must be cherished by the prospective Bodhisattva, and this, as I have said, involves giving knowledge away. If the mind recedes toward a point of dimensionless subtlety, it is with the knowledge that this subtlety is universalized and limitlessly extensive. It is, as Fa-tsang said, both "rolled up" and "spread out." Śūnyatā, therefore, is not itself without Karuṇā (compassion), its self-expression. Karuṇā, says Alan Watts, is "the moral equivalent of all-inclusiveness."<sup>107</sup> It holds all things in indiscriminate unity without judgment. This is the universal charity which does not reject form. "Compassion" in the Bodhisattva is neither pity (which implies inequality) nor sympathy (which implies equality), but participation in and unconscious identification with all limited phenomena. Compassion does not stand away from the world far enough to be called "other."

---

<sup>106</sup>Seng-ts'an, "Inscribed on the Believing Mind," quoted by Suzuki in Essays I, p. 196.

<sup>107</sup>Zen (Stanford, California: James Ladd Delkin, 1948), p. 17.



This unified goal, understood at the outset of the Bodhisattva's training, and expressed in his vow not to enter Nirvana until all beings have been delivered, is the expression of an intention to use enlightenment rather than to "have" it--or, rather, to be a using of enlightenment. When the Bodhisattva "cherishes an intense desire for Supreme Enlightenment," this means that he does not wander away from the direction of his will--this will being Love. "Love, says William Law, "wills nothing but its own increase, so everything is as oil to its flame ... "108

Compassion is identified with formative activity, Method, "skilful means" (upāya), and affection (rāga). In Hui-neng's vocabulary it is also identified with dhyāna or prajña.<sup>109</sup> Whatever may be said of the koan as a device, I believe any Zen master would agree that the student does not meditate "on" it. It is dhyāna itself that meditates, and not on an object, while he practices action without attachment. "He" has nothing to do with it.

" ... there is actually no formula for the attainment of

---

<sup>108</sup>Selected Mystical Writings (London: Rockliff, 1948), p. 140.

<sup>109</sup>There are some variations in terminology here. More often Prajna and Karuna are spoken of as Hui-neng speaks of Samadhi and Prajna. I have here adopted Hui-neng's terms. But it makes little difference, except for consistency, because the two terms can be separated logically only.

the Consummation of Incomparable Enlightenment. The reason herein is that [the] Tathagata is a signification implying all formulas. ... Subhuti, the basis of [the] Tathagata's attainment ... is wholly beyond ... 110

The movement of dhyana is a cooperative enterprise, with the questioner assisting almost, one might say, as a willing victim. He must "search" strenuously, stay fully alert, bend all his energies in one direction, and perform what the Gita calls "knowledge-sacrifice." Complete permissiveness without interference from the ego and still without a lapse in vigilance is a subtle state of mind to realize. No taint of purpose, even the purpose of permitting, must be present. "Be still and know I am God" means "Be still," not "Quiet yourself." All reflexive action upon oneself must disappear, with the mind neither holding nor rejecting anything, releasing all thoughts immediately, letting the dead bury the dead. No thought of a goal must be present, or of suppression, cessation, or enlightenment--only a willingness. Eugen Herrigel's archery master said, concerning Herrigel's unsuccessful efforts with the bow, "What stands in your way is that you have a much too wilful will. You think that what you do not do yourself does not happen."

"What must I do, then?"

"You must learn to wait properly."

"And how does one learn that?"

---

110 Diamond Sutra, XVII.

"By letting go of yourself, leaving yourself and everything yours behind you so decisively that nothing is left of you but a purposeless tension."

"So I must become purposeless--on purpose?" The master did not reply to this.<sup>111</sup>

If the questioner learns how to wait properly, a sustaining power (adhithana) will carry him on--but the waiting itself is active. An erect sitting position (āsana) much like that of Indian yoga is used. Breathing is controlled. "Gradually as an effect of steadying the mind on one object by meditation ... the mind flows steadily in that state without any interruption, and the mind even ceases to think that it is thinking the object ..."<sup>112</sup> Similarly, Eugen Herrigel stood day after day with a bow stretched taut and an arrow ready for flight, waiting strenuously for "it" to shoot. When the moment of "active passivity" came, when he was just dead enough, so to speak, for the shot to come as a surprise, "it" shot. "It is there!" the master cried.

Later he asked his pupil, "Do you now understand what I mean by 'It shoots?' 'It hits?'"

"I'm afraid I don't understand anything more at all," Herrigel answered. "Is it 'I' who draws the bow, or is it the bow that draws me into the state of highest

<sup>111</sup>Zen in the Art of Archery, tr. by R. F. C. Hull (New York: Pantheon, 1953), pp. 51-2.

<sup>112</sup>S. N. Dasgupta, op.cit., p. 336.

tension? Do 'I' hit the goal or does the goal hit me?"<sup>113</sup>

Ananda Coomaraswamy says, "The moment of release is sudden (sub-it-aneus, 'going stealthily'), comparable, in fact, to that of an arrow loosed without further effort from the bow ... , being already 'that-become' ... when the archer's stance, grip and draw are correct,--the arrow corresponding to the Self and the target to Brahma ..."<sup>114</sup>

Now, dhyāna, or Prajñā, is only the active side of samādhi ("equilibrium"). " ... do not be under the wrong impression," Hui-neng says, "that these two are independent of each other, for they are inseparably united and are not two entities. Samadhi is the quintessence of Prajna, while Prajna is the activity of Samadhi. At the very moment that we attain Prajna, Samadhi is therewith; and vice versa. ... A disciple should not think that there is a distinction between 'Samadhi begets Prajna' and 'Prajna begets Samadhi.' To hold such an opinion would imply that there are two characteristics in the Dharma."<sup>115</sup> That is to say, while one is actively "being meditated," the state of samādhi, or inactivity, is already present; otherwise there could be no activity. A single glance at the process of meditation will tell you that the yogin's will is in

<sup>113</sup>Op. cit., p. 88.

<sup>114</sup>Time and Eternity, p. 38.

<sup>115</sup>Sutra of Wei Lang, p. 46.

"empty" equilibrium while mental activity seeks its own best way to release that will (or love) without any obstruction of purposefulness. Without this obstruction, this is exactly the macrocosmic pattern that Buddhism has given us. So that a man in meditation, when he knows how to accomplish the full sacrifice, which knowledge consists precisely in not knowing how and in not interposing his own imagined doing, he will be in the innocent state of nature, which accomplishes everything by non-doing and no-purpose.

There is a mysterious limit to meditation. When it has reached this limit, there is a state of impasse or exhaustion, then what is called a "plunge into the abyss." This is only as it appears to the ego before it winks out--and this is the last we are to hear of the ego. It gives itself up and is lost in no-mindness.

Dr. Suzuki describes this event in the enlightenment of the Buddha: "Cornered, as it were, into this situation, his whole being reacted against it. He now felt that he had no question to solve, no self to stand up against an enemy. His self, his intellect, indeed, his whole being was poured into the question. That is to say, he now became the question itself. There differentiation of questioner and question, of self and not-self, disappeared, and there was just one undivided unknown. He was buried in this unknown."

"There was then, as we may picture to ourselves, no Shakyamuni the questioner, no ego-conscious self, no question set before his intellect and threatening his existence, and along with them no heavens sheltering him, no earth supporting him. If we could have stood beside Buddha at that time and looked into his being, we might have detected there nothing but one big question-mark occupying the entire universe. This was the state of his mind, if we can say that he then had any kind of mind."<sup>116</sup>

If Zen ended here, it would resemble many other schools which consider this state the ultimate end to be reached. As long as there is a blind darkness, a self-contained sentience like that of a man in dreamless sleep, there is only a deep unknowing so full that there is no room for a knower and a known. But then there is a moment when consciousness awakes in the Unconscious--just as it awakes, when it is neither conscious nor unconscious, but act pure. With the Buddha this moment was at dawn, when it was neither dark nor light, but between--just that very instant between.

This is the "momentless moment," the moment of no duration, when consciousness is an act in and of the Unconscious. The two are exactly simultaneous, arising and not arising. The yogin has become, or is becoming, the consciousness of the Unconscious. It is the stability in

---

<sup>116</sup>"Enlightenment," loc. cit., p. 141.

process that he finds in this moment. He is the eye that sees, the formless subject which is the seeing itself. He is just-about-to-be and having-just-been. He is the active passivity which is the arrow's mode of release.

It is not remarkable that no words can tell of this deep intuition. Words are later, the forms that make words possible are later--and yet not later, because they are of that, and all times are of that. The intellect cannot understand this, because the intellect is a product of life. But life can understand, because life is in the very act all the time of creating a self that is always new and so sustains itself--by destroying itself on the spot. Satori is a life-experience of life itself, and anything that can be said about it is nonsense.

In satori the world is seen from its underside. "It is like appreciating a fine piece of brocade. On the surface there is an almost bewildering confusion of beauty, and the connoisseur fails to trace the intricacies of the threads. But as soon as it is turned over all the intricate beauty and skill is revealed. ... the reason side has been there all the time, and ... it is because of this unseen side that the visible side has been able to display its multiple beauty."<sup>117</sup> It should be noted, however, that this refers to Oriental embroidery.

The Bodhisattva now stands at the gateway between

---

<sup>117</sup>Zen Doctrine of No-Mind, p. 55.

Nirvana and Samsara. He is that gate itself, astride an invisible line. One side (if I may be so dualistic) is unseen and single, the other is visible and various. The one passes through to the other, the other passes back. They are of the same stuff by the same agency, and in that hollow gateway they are self-identical.

Thirty spokes unite in one nave,  
And because of the part where nothing  
exists we have the use of a car-  
riage wheel.

Clay is molded into vessels,  
And because of the space where nothing  
exists we are able to use them as  
vessels.

Doors and windows are cut out in the walls  
of a house,

And because they are empty spaces, we are  
able to use them.

Therefore, on the one hand we have the  
benefit of existence, and on the other  
we make use of non-existence.<sup>118</sup>

But even the idea of a gateway is not Zen. Where no difference can be told between one side and another, there can be no middle either. There is no awakening, no enlightenment. All the time, which is now, the Unconscious meditates consciously in the utmost freedom, giving itself over to whatever may happen in it, and nothing ever happens that is not of itself--unborn, unbecome, but acting "as if." Life suffices for Zen. It accepts it as the mystery it is and lives in the heart of it, as it always has.

---

<sup>118</sup>Tao Te Ching, XI.



#### IV. ART IN ZEN

No one knows better than the Japanese artist the truth of the saying, Ars imitatur naturam in modo sua operationis, "Art imitates Nature in the manner of its operation." He is skill, artifice, māyā, an accomplishing means that works incomprehensibly and uncomprehendingly within emptiness. Try to touch him and you find nothing. The ten thousand things stream from this nothing without his knowing that he does anything or how he accomplishes anything. He is like a hollow instrument.

Ars imitatur naturam has never meant in Zen the conscious imitation that until recent years has all but paralyzed the West in its expression. After all, an apple that you "can almost pick out of the picture" has the defect of being inedible, so the artist can hardly be called a success. In Japan the accent is on operatio, and the man himself is operatio--without being busy. "He rests more usefully than others labour."<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> Meister Eckhart, tr. by C. de B. Evans (London: Watkins, 1947), I, 25.

A remark by Lieh-tzu sums up the Japanese attitude toward imitation:

"There was once a man in Sung who carved a mulberry leaf out of jade for his prince. It took three years to complete, and it imitated Nature so exquisitely in its down, its glossiness, and its general configuration from tip to stem, that, if placed in a heap of real mulberry leaves, it could not be distinguished from them. This man was subsequently pensioned by the Sung State as a reward for his skill. Lieh Tzu, hearing of it, said: 'If it took the Creator three years to make a single leaf, there would be very few trees with leaves on them.'<sup>120</sup>

The arts have come pouring out of Zen in almost crazy profusion. Anything that involves a self-using--not necessarily utility--is done beautifully, skilfully, with impeccable taste and an exact sense of sufficiency and placement. "Art" means work, finished or in progress. Growing rice is an art; writing poetry is an art; living is an art. But none of these is "an" art; it is just art--skill.

This makes it necessary for us to revise our ideas of "fine" and "useful," "art" and "craft". There are arts in Japan which consist almost entirely in "using," without any visible product. Such are the arts of fencing

---

<sup>120</sup>Taoist Teachings, 2d Edition, tr. by Lionel Giles (London: Murray, 1947), p. 108.

and Judo. The Zen artist is never attached primarily to a purpose. The end to be achieved, if you press the point, is an exteriorization of the beginning; the product is a reflection of the spirit. Between the two there is a bodiless means which does nothing. It does not know who or what it is, but out of this dead mind there spontaneously arise manifestations with a feeling of their own livingness, as if they were svayambhū, "self-become." "Spring comes, grass grows of itself"--this is the formless formula for a landscape or a poem.<sup>121</sup> The activity that arises out of this dead man is incessant and inexhaustible.

"Art" in Japan extends to every aspect of daily living. It includes not only painting, poetry, music, dance, drama, and architecture, but cookery, gardening, dress, flower arrangement, ceramics, archery, swordsmanship, butchering, tea-drinking, speech, calligraphy ... The Japanese are surrounded by beauty. But with all this profusion, the artifacts themselves are not rich in appearance. There is a certain spareness about them. They understate. Three flowers in a plain bowl certainly do not create the impression that a full Victorian bouquet does. The three-line poems, haiku, seem slight and devoid of meaning. The interiors of houses are almost bare. A treasured piece of pottery used in the tea ceremony

---

<sup>121</sup>Zenrinkushu, loc. cit., p. 20.

may be muddy in color and irregular, with an obvious defect in its glaze. In the one-cornered painting style of Bayen (Ma-yuan) there may be only a small man in a small boat in one small corner of the picture; the rest of it will be the bare material painted upon.

These objects are arresting in themselves because they seem to suggest something beyond their poor display. If they lack something, you begin trying to supply the lack. Meanwhile you are looking straight at them, absorbing their color, texture, shape, and feeling. You are putting yourself into them, being them, as you could never do if your attention were scattered by too much detail and your mind satisfied by symmetry. Seen in isolation, obviously imperfect, perhaps with a suggestion of decay, they appeal with a direct appeal that no other art that I know of does.

The same quality that makes for skill is also, as I have said, called Compassion. In its more limited sense this may mean pity or sympathy. It is through the small that we reach the great and return to the small as sufficient. The pathos of much of Japanese art--the transience expressed in age and in the movement of irregularity; the poverty, the loneliness, the smallness and homeliness and imperfection--escapes sentimentality by eliciting a direct response to the familiar, and, while we are self-forgetful, carrying us beyond itself to the emptiness from which it

came. The subtlety is there in the suggestion of mystery beyond the slight appearance. Sometimes, in fact, the objects seem barely to emerge from a sea of emptiness.

The artist is generously endowed with this quality of compassion. In Japan it is especially strong. The Japanese for as far back as their history goes have felt the aliveness of things and have treated all beings with self-effacing, ritualistic respect as gods. In Shinto everything is a god. The house is a god, the stove is a god, the cooking pot is a god. When you work with wood, you do so with proper respect for the god of wood and with appropriate ritual chants, in an atmosphere of purest cleanliness. All artists are more or less animists. They feel a natural kinship with the life within things, and with the formative power of that life, its measure, its rhythms, and its vital coming-to-be.

How tender the Japanese feeling is for everything in the environment is illustrated in a hokku by Issa:

Lean frog,  
Don't give up the fight!  
Issa is here!<sup>122</sup>

And the gentleness of Bashō's

First winter rain.  
The monkey also seems  
To want a small straw cloak.<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup>Harold G. Henderson, The Bamboo Broom (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1934), p. 87.

<sup>123</sup>Blyth, Haiku, I, 334.

Sentient leeks in Shosei's poem--

The wind-bells ringing  
While the leeks  
Sway.<sup>124</sup>

This sympathy extends not only to animals, insects, flowers, vegetables, trees, and all the animate creatures in nature, but even to those usually called inanimate. In a Nō play called Yuki the snow says, "I too rely on the light of the beneficent Buddha."<sup>125</sup>

The ritualistic element so predominant in the art, customs, and even in the speech, of Japan is directly attributable to this feeling. The idea of doing something in the service of a god, the self-naughting, the respect, call for close attention to the god's excellences, the worthiness of the work done, and the temple-like purity of the surroundings. The skill is a sacrifice. The utmost discipline is demanded in not putting oneself forward as important and in doing one's best work. This means that attention is constantly centered on what is going on now, at this moment. The tea-house has this ritual purity, and all Japanese art has this close, immediate attention, very often formalized in a way that seems mannered but actually is done in the spirit of austerity for the most economical means of its accomplishment. This close attention is the mark of the artist, who much resembles a

---

<sup>124</sup>Ibid., p. 294.

<sup>125</sup>Beatrice Lane Suzuki, Nōgaku (New York: Dutton, 1932), p. 43.

scientist in the detailed (but sympathetic) examination of his material--or a lover who, forgetful of self, learns every curve, muscle, and expression of the loved one's body.

With such tendencies already present in the people, it is hardly surprising that Japan should take kindly to Buddhism, to Taoism, and to Zen via both. It is easy to see how Buddhism, extending the Shinto idea of a god in everything to the idea that every sentient being can be a Buddha, and that all Buddhas are one in the one Buddha, could incorporate and universalize the fertile intuitions of the people. The doctrine of egolessness was a natural one for a respectful and self-deprecating people to assimilate. The Hua-yen teaching of interpenetration, which came through Zen, broadened and deepened their feelings into a wisdom and universal compassion which permitted the utmost use of their capabilities. And it is easy to understand how Zen, with its practical, vigorous outlook and its complete acceptance of life as it is--so complete as to be death-defying--should appeal to a populace that already had the greatest of all heroism, humility. The strength of the Samurai is the fearlessness of the Bodhisattva, whose heart, as Aśvaghōṣa said, "has become free from timidity." It is the self-forgetfulness, the absence of seeking, and the acceptance of things in the knowledge that all is good, that constitutes the solid core, and

account for the almost incredible industry and ingenuity, of the Japanese.

Zen introduced the beautiful tea ceremony, influenced the Shinto-born Nō play, invented styles of flower arrangement, and in general spread into all aspects of Japanese art, giving it some of its most admirable qualities in simplicity, directness, suggestion, and the ease of uncalculated expression. Many Zen masters have been and are painters, poets, archers, swordsmen, masters of flower arrangement ... They are diligent teachers. Their teaching of technique is exacting, and a rigorous spiritual discipline goes with it. Often it would seem that the arduous course followed would stifle expression, but, once mastered, it leads to the utmost spontaneity. This is because the final end of its teaching is the individual's dying to himself--being selfless, being unconsciously conscious.

Before I come specifically to some of the Zen-influenced Japanese arts--Tea, Nō, haiku, brush-and-ink, and so on--I must mention the contribution of China. It is well known, of course, that China gave Japan its written characters (which are the source of Chinese painting; painting is but a branch of calligraphy), as well as many methods, materials, and subjects. In fact, its influence is immeasurable. But the Japanese are certainly not "a nation of imitators" as is so often said. Their work bears



their own unmistakable stamp.

Spiritually, by way of Zen, the Chinese influence is most important. Zen, Dr. Suzuki says, was the only form of Buddhism that China could accept, and the fact that Zen came by way of China in turn gave it a quality of down-to-earthness. The Chinese have the unshakable conviction that God is nothing if not immanent. Heaven and earth shuttle back and forth in the greatest intimacy; the one falls down in rain and the other ascends in mist. It is a substantial interworking. The Chinese understand the ungraspability of the immediate, and appreciate both what they grasp in the hand and what they do not. They have a tendency to neglect religion in the vague sense (Dr. James Bissett Pratt noted that their temples were scandalously untidy and unattended) and to observe it in the communal and individual. This individualism has often run to solitude and voluntary poverty, but never, so far as I know, to asceticism. Asceticism is not in the Chinese makeup. The self-sufficiency, the love of nature, the poverty and gentle mysticism, and the immanent accent, are all present in Zen.

Confucian teachings as well as Confucian ceremonialism rubbed off on Zen. But the most important influence was that of the Taoism of Lao-tse and Chuang-tse.

In the very first words of the Tao Te Ching, one of the keynotes of Japanese art is sounded: "The Tao that

can be expressed is not the eternal Tao." This is reflected in the slightness and delicacy of an art that has nothing of its own to assert, but is swallowed up in that which cannot be asserted.

Tao, when put into use for its hollow-  
ness, is not likely to be filled.  
In its profundity it seems to be the  
origin of all things.  
In its depth it seems ever to remain. (IV)

Here again is the great depth of space surrounding the small object, the permanence as against the transience, and the hollowness of the individual who lets the form arise.

The highest goodness is like water. Water is beneficent to all things but does not contend. It stays in places which others would despise. Therefore it is near Tao. (VIII)

This non-contending water is the principle of (among other things) Judo. Water has its strength in yielding. It bends aside for the smallest reed. If you try to grasp it, it yields and swallows up your hand. Similarly, when an opponent rushes at you, you do not strive in the opposite direction but yield and enclose him in a vacuum. This "highest goodness," by humbly pursuing a course unknown to it, can wear away mountains of stone.

I have already quoted the next passage, but it is so central that I will quote it again:

Thirty spokes unite in one nave,  
And because of the part where nothing  
exists

We have the use of a carriage wheel.  
 Clay is moulded into vessels,  
 And because of the space where nothing  
 exists we are able to use them as  
 vessels.

Doors and windows are cut out in the walls  
 of a house,  
 And because they are empty spaces, we  
 are able to use them.

Therefore, on the one hand, we have the  
 benefit of existence, and on the  
 other, we make use of non-existence. (XI)

The Japanese artist is that hollow space, open to  
 the silent breath which flows through an aperture and  
 emerges as sound.

Tao is a thing that is both invisible and  
 intangible;  
 Intangible and invisible, yet there are  
 forms in it;  
 Subtle and obscure, there is essence in it;  
 This essence being invariably true, there  
 is faith in it. (XXI)

Faith, as I have said before, is trust--the willingness to  
 be anything or nothing.

In that most delightful of all sages, Chuang-tse,  
 we find an anecdote that might have come out of Zen:

"His cook was cutting up an ox for the ruler Wān-  
 hui. Whenever he applied his hand, leaned forward with  
 his shoulder, planted his foot, and employed the pressure  
 of his knee, in the audible ripping off of the skin, and  
 slicing operation of the knife, the sounds were all in  
 regular cadence. Movements and sound proceeded as in the  
 dance of 'the Mulberry Forest' and the blended notes of  
 'the Ching Shau.' The ruler said, 'Ah! Admirable! That  
 your art should have become so perfect!' (Having finished  
 his operation), the cook laid down his knife, and replied

to the remark, 'What your servant loves is the method of the Tao, something in advance of any art. When I first began to cut up an ox, I saw nothing but the (entire) carcass. After three years I ceased to see it as a whole. Now I deal with it in a spirit-like manner, and do not look at it with my eyes. The use of my senses is discarded, and my spirit acts as it wills. Observing the natural lines, (my knife) slips through the great crevices and slides through the great cavities, taking advantage of the facilities thus presented. ...

"A good cook changes his knife every year;--(it may have been injured) in cutting; an ordinary cook changes his every month;--(it may have been) broken. Now my knife has been in use for nineteen years; it has cut up several thousand oxen, and yet its edge is as sharp as if it had newly come from the whetstone. There are the interstices of the joints, and the edge of the knife has no (appreciable) thickness; when that which is so thin enters where the interstice is, how easily it moves along! The blade has more than room enough. Nevertheless, whenever I come to a complicated joint, and see that there will be some difficulty, I proceed anxiously and with caution, not allowing my eyes to wander from the place, and moving my hand slowly. Then by a very slight movement of the knife, the part is quickly separated, and drops like (a clod of) earth to the ground. Then standing up with the knife in

my hand, I look all round, and in a leisurely manner, with an air of satisfaction, wipe it clean, and put it in its sheath.' The ruler Wān-hui said, 'Excellent! I have heard the words of my cook, and learned from them the nourishment of (our) life.'<sup>126</sup>

The rapidity, the fluency, the no-mindedness, the "spirit-moveth-where-it-listeth" attitude are typical of Zen. The extreme care and caution are there also, together with the "slight response suitable to the occasion."<sup>127</sup>

Throughout Chinese art history, both in principle and in practice, we can see the movement of the current which joined with that of the Japanese. It was not an inundation, but a confluence--a confluence remarkably summed up in Zen. In the fourth century there was Ku K'ai-chih, a portrait painter who left the eyes out of his subjects for several years, saying that "those mysterious parts" required special understanding. In copying the old characters he advised that "the brush and eye travel boldly forward" so that the copy would not be a mere reproduction.<sup>128</sup> In the same century Tsung Ping said, "Cherishing

---

<sup>126</sup>Works, Book III, Part 1, Sec. 3, par. 2 (Legge).

<sup>127</sup>"Why do they not do as I do, letting go of each thought as though it were void, as though it were rotten wood, a piece of stone, the cold ashes of a fire long dead, or else just making the slight response suitable to the occasion?" --Huang Po Doctrines, p. 47-8.

<sup>128</sup>Shio Sakanishi, The Spirit of the Brush (London: Murray, 1948), p. 24.

the Way, a virtuous man responds to objects. Clarifying his mind, a wise man appreciates forms. As to landscapes, they exist in material substance and soar into the realm of the spirit."<sup>129</sup> Hsieh Ho's first principle of the famous Six Principles was that "through a vitalizing spirit, a painting should possess the movement of life."<sup>130</sup> And in Ching Hao (first half tenth century) there is the Zennish bit of advice: "Forget all about the brush and ink. Then you shall learn the truth about landscapes."<sup>131</sup> "A resemblance," he said, "reproduces the formal aspect of objects, but neglects their spirit, but truth shows the spirit and substance in like perfection."<sup>132</sup> When form is presented for the sake of form alone, it is an idol rather than a symbol. This was the reason for the Buddha's objection to having images made of himself, for, as he said, he was "not a man." Yet the prohibition was made with the idea in mind that he was "not a god" either. He was often pictured as the Tree of Life, the outer manifestation of a seed.

In Chinese poetry, too, the feeling of Japanese haiku--their pictorial quality (especially strong in Buson),

---

<sup>129</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>130</sup>Ibid., p. 50.

<sup>131</sup>Ibid., p. 95.

<sup>132</sup>Ibid., p. 84.

the nostalgic note, the suggestion of richness in loneliness together with the consciousness of what is missing (sabi), and the almost aesthetic acceptance of poverty (wabi)--may be seen in Li Tai-po, Po Chü-i, and Tu Fu. This, from Li Tai-po, has a strong note of sabi:

In the deserted garden among the crumbling  
walls  
The willows show green again,  
While the sweet notes of the water-nut  
song  
Seem to lament the spring.  
Nothing remains but the moon above the  
river--  
The moon that once shone on the fair  
faces  
That smiled in the king's palace of Wu.<sup>133</sup>

The brevity, the objectivity, and the capturing of a mood in a few details, are again seen in

The dew is white upon the staircase  
of jewels,  
And wets her silken shoes. The night  
is far gone.  
She turns within, lets fall the crystal  
curtain,  
And gazes up at the autumn moon, shining  
through.<sup>134</sup>

In Po Chü-i the idea of transience is very often expressed, as is that of solitude. In Japanese art, it is irregularity that expresses this transience, at the same time indicating a freedom in the movement felt in asymmetry. In the following poem by Po Chü-i the haiku masters would never have permitted the personal pronoun,

---

<sup>133</sup>Works of Li Po, tr. by Shigeyoshi Obata (New York: Dutton, 1922), p. 74.

<sup>134</sup>Ibid., p. 46.

and would have avoided the harsh directness of the imagery.

Turned to jade are the boy's rosy  
cheeks:  
To his sick temples the frost of win-  
ter clings. ...  
Do not wonder that my body sinks to  
decay;  
Though my limbs are old, my heart is  
older yet.<sup>135</sup>

The dead wife's comb discovered under one's heel in the bedroom, the cold moon, the cricket climbing up the pot-hanger on a cold night--such small details are more characteristic of the Japanese. They indicate rather than state. What they really mean is not to be said.

#### 1. War, Swordsmanship, Archery.

Some basic Zen attitudes are expressed (1) in a document called Hagakure started in the 17th century and concerned with military operations; (2) in the instructions of Fencing Master Takuan (1573-1645), and (3) in the instructions of a Zen master to his pupil Eugen Herrigel, in Herrigel's beautiful little book, Zen in the Art of Archery. These three illustrate effectively the idea of whole readiness, of a "purposeless tension" so entire that nobody is left to hold it in place--it just rests in its own equilibrium--and the fluid and accidental nature of the action that issues from this.

The document called Hagakure says: "When you are

---

<sup>135</sup>More Translations from the Chinese, tr. by Arthur Waley (New York: Knopf, 1937), p. 55.



to measure swords with your enemy, be ready at once to lay down your life before him. As long as you are the least concerned with your escaping safely you are doomed."<sup>136</sup> One of its principal tenets was that "no great work has ever been accomplished without going mad, that is, ... without breaking through the ordinary level of consciousness and letting loose one's hidden powers."<sup>137</sup> This readiness to die is also a characteristic of the Bodhisattva.

I shall let Fencing Master Takuan speak for himself:

"There are two kinds of discipline, the one in Ultimate Reason and the other in technique. The first is ... to reach the ultimate reason of things where there are no scheduled regulations directing your action; there is just One Mind which goes on its own way. But the mastery of technical details is also necessary; when you have no knowledge of them, you fail to see how to go ahead with the work before you; you are therefore to know, in your case, how to handle the sword ... "

The question was asked as to where to keep the mind focused. Takuan replied, "When it is placed on your right hand, it stops in the right hand, and hampers the movements of the other parts of the body. When it is placed on the eyes, it stops with them and interferes with the working of

<sup>136</sup>Tr. by Suzuki in Zen Buddhism and Its Influence, p. 50.

<sup>137</sup>Ibid., p. 46. Quotation from Dr. Suzuki himself.

the entire body. So with any other points of the body. ... Where should the mind be placed in order to secure a maximum of mental and bodily efficiency? My answer is: Have no thought at all as to where to place the mind, for then the mind will fill the entire body even to the tips of fingers and toes. If the hands are to be moved, they obey the mind at once ... Have no thought, no deliberation, no discrimination, and the mind will be present everywhere working itself to its fullest capacity ..."

"When an empty gourd is pressed on water, it will dance up and down with each touch, and you can never make it stay in one place. When the mind is not arrested by anything, it is just as lively as the gourd. 'Keep your mind awakened without having it abide anywhere' ... "

" ... the utmost degree of perfection is gained when your mind is no more troubled with how to strike the opponent and yet knows how to use the sword in the most effective way when you stand before him. You just strike him down, forgetting that you have a sword in your hand and that somebody is standing against you. No idea of personality is here--all is empty; the opponent, yourself, the striking sword, the sword-holding arms; not only that, even the idea of emptiness is also done away with. From this absolute emptiness there is the most wonderful display of activities.

"When Bukko Kokushi ... was threatened for his life by the Mongolian invaders, he referred to 'the cutting in

twain of the spring breeze in a flash of lightning.' The sword lifted by the murderous soldier of Yüan to kill him appeared as if it were no more than a flash of lightning; there was in the act of killing nothing concerning him any more than the spring breeze softly blowing about him. To him the sword threatening his life was a nothing, the person about to strike him down was a nothing, the self so called who was about to break down was also a nothing; in this play of Emptiness, there was no mind to be arrested, there were no points at which the mind was made to stop. The lightning flashed, the breeze blew, the sword moved, the man fell, and Emptiness remains as ever before."<sup>138</sup>

I have already mentioned Eugen Herrigel waiting with his bow (for several years) until "it" released the arrow. I do not feel justified in quoting at length from this book, which everyone should read for himself. But the entire process described by Herrigel is a process of meditation, even to the controlled rhythmic breathing, which reminds of Chuang-tse's butcher's "cadence." Rhythm is the soul of art, as it is of all form. By this I am not referring to what we ordinarily call rhythm, but to vital rhythm which resides in even the most irregular fragment of sentient matter. What a man imposes upon the

---

<sup>138</sup>Tr. by Suzuki, Ibid., pp. 78-87 passim.

objects that he deals with artistically is the inner rhythm of all things, which through these objects is carried over to other men. They recognize themselves in it, are lost in it, and for a while are themselves without deception. Rhythm is measure, or law, or Dharma. Concerning the function of rhythm in art, I know no better statement than this one of William Butler Yeats: "The purpose of rhythm, it has always seemed to me, is to prolong the moment of contemplation, the moment when we are both asleep and awake, which is the one moment of creation, by hushing us with an alluring monotony, while it holds us waking by variety, to keep us in that state of perhaps real trance, in which the mind liberated from the pressure of the will is unfolded in symbols."<sup>139</sup>

The ideas of artlessness and childlikeness are uppermost in Herrigel's book. "... it is necessary for the archer to become, in spite of himself, an unmoved center. Then comes the supreme and ultimate miracle: art becomes 'artless,' shooting becomes not-shooting, a shooting without bow and arrow ..." (p. 20). The archer's hand simply bursts open "like the skin of a ripe fruit" (p. 50). This is his satori. For art in Japan, as Dr. Suzuki says in his introduction to this book (p. 9), is not intended for use or enjoyment only, but for spiritual training and

---

<sup>139</sup>Quoted by Barry Ulanov in A History of Jazz in America (New York: Viking, 1954), at page 123.

knowledge. At the end of his course of training the archer is the arrow, and the arrow is buried in the goal, which also is himself.

Now, in Hindu scriptures the Supreme Deity is said to be breathing rhythmically and to be meditating. He is "stable in mind" (stithaprajnāsyā) and "steadfast in contemplation" (samādhistitha), and is unconsciously practicing austerity or discipline (tapas). This figure also appears in Buddhism. The Buddha is said to be in a particular kind of samādhi, holding up the universe with his sustaining power (adhithana), which is law (Dharma), or the law of his own self-being (svadharma)--his vocation. Suddenly (I say this, but it should not be thought of in time) "one thought" flashes in the uniform ground. This is illumination, or creation. It is a "new birth." It is like a luminous spark which snaps suddenly in the midst of a solid flame. It is a "seeing," a consciousness of himself as form, although this is an unconscious consciousness. The entire past and future are contained in this moment, which is itself a wholly present moment. "As God willed to be, so He is." When the Buddha is depicted as turning the wheel of the law, he is shown outside the wheel with his finger touching it at one point, which is both beginning and end of the circle.

Any artist will tell you that when a painting, a musical composition or a poem comes into his mind, it comes

unbidden, suddenly, as a complete surprise, and that it is entire in its form. It is a complete formal intuition, and a release like that of the arrow. The "spread-out" result of the initial flash, as in the case of a painting, for example, has as its principal feature that of simultaneity in which all elements are rhythmically fused into one moment of intuition. So that the significance of artistic creation with relation to self-nature can be clearly seen. It is man's self-nature (itself a microcosmic symbol of the divine) which is released by a flash of consciousness within a stable and ready Unconscious--or a "will in purposeless tension." The artist's projection of something "other" than himself is actually only a projection, an image, of himself. It is creation. But he does not merely "project" it; he is it. In Herrigel this projection is that of the arrow which is one with the goal. With the saint, as with the artist, such an intuition results in "works." These are the "spread-out" aspect of a "rolled-up" moment, issuing from him "as the spider puts out and gathers in, as herbs spring up upon the earth, as hair of head and body grow from a living man ... "140

## 2. Brush and Ink.

This lightninglike moment is seen once more in calligraphy and painting. In calligraphy the artist may practice

---

<sup>140</sup> Mundaka Upanishad, I.1.7 (Aurobindo tr.)

for several years on only the two characters that stand for his name. He is meditating, not "on" them, but silently and mysteriously within himself. When the moment comes, he fairly slings the characters onto the paper in what may appear to us to be a mad scrawl. But it is beautifully balanced and whole, with all its elements--movement, pressure, quality of emotion of the ink, and position on the paper--in a marvelous unity, which, the Japanese say, reveals the artist's entire character.

I have said "painting," but Zen painting, like calligraphy, is usually done with brush and black ink (sumi), the statement being made that "If one paints with ability the five colors will appear." The two arts of calligraphy and painting can hardly be considered apart--not because painting is calligraphic, but because the techniques are similar. An essential part of the training of every artist in Japan is the study of the Chinese character (sho). Calligraphy is regarded as a higher accomplishment than painting. In fact, I have heard Sabro Hasegawa, a Japanese abstract painter much of whose work is based on calligraphy, say that "Today in abstract art we have arrived almost at the state of calligraphy," and he implied that this was a most desirable state of affairs.<sup>141</sup> The Chinese and Japanese, of course, grow up with the great advantage of having brushes as their writing implements almost from the beginning.

---

<sup>141</sup>In a lecture at the American Academy of Asian Studies, January 7, 1955.

of their lives. Even so, it may take thirty years or so of hard practice to become an accomplished calligrapher. The signatures appearing on Japanese paintings are at least as important as the paintings themselves, and calligraphy is very often (in the tea-house, for instance) displayed for itself. Great honors have been bestowed upon calligraphers. The art is practiced by everyone from the Emperor on down. Three outstanding names in the field are those of the Emperor Saga, the nobleman Tachibana Hayashi, and the priest Kōbō Daishi, who introduced the "Diamond Vehicle" into Japan.

In calligraphy, as in painting, the paper used is rough and very absorbent so that the work must be done quickly and cannot be gone over a second time or corrected. The black ink (sumi) is a very eloquent medium. It can be a deep, voluptuous black or a strong, rough, structural black; it can be of a delicate featheriness or of a filminess so transparent that it can hardly be seen. This responsive medium, applied with a supple-tipped brush onto thin paper, translates every shade of the artist's feeling with the utmost directness.<sup>142</sup> The relationship of the ink to the vital quality of the painting is expressed to some extent in this passage from the Chinese artist Ching Hao's notes on brush-work:

"There are four aspects to brush-work: muscles,

---

<sup>142</sup> For a discussion of the materials, see Henry P. Bowie, On the Laws of Japanese Painting (Dover Publications, U.S., no city or date given).



flesh, bones, and spirit. Short and interrupted strokes are called muscles. Those that rise and fall, forming inner reality, are called flesh. Those strokes which are firm and straight both in life and death are called bones, while the lines which are undefeatable are called the spirit. From this it may be known that if the ink is stronger than the quality of an object demands, then the drawing loses its formal significance; if the ink is too delicate, the vital spirit is spoiled. If the muscles are dead, there is no flesh; those strokes that are too effeminate have no bones.<sup>143</sup> These expressions, "bones," "flesh," and so on, are very common in Chinese writings on art. There is a strong sense of the livingness of the subject, and the ink is admirably suited for expressing this livingness.

When it comes to talking about paintings, Alice's question is apropos: "What is the good of a book without pictures?" They are their own language, and the only perfect description, as Aristotle said, is tautology. But I would like to point out some essential characteristics of Japanese painting in general:

1. Emptiness. There is a great deal of empty space in these paintings. It is almost as if the objects were there to define and punctuate the emptiness. This emptiness has the vastness of eternity, in which a form is but

---

<sup>143</sup>In Shio Sakanishi, op.cit., p. 89.

of small importance. Man is often shown as very small and lonely, lost in a great sea of space. Emptiness is also "indescribability," "ungraspability."

2. Transience. The point of view, which in Western art is usually fixed, in Oriental art is moving. This gives the painting a sense of transience, but also a sense of freedom. Asymmetry, imperfection, fragility, and age add to this impression of transience.

3. Interpenetration. This is conveyed in many ways. For instance, in the fuller landscapes man is shown as being contained within the landscape as a minor part of it which seems to be growing along with everything else. Again, there is often a certain fluidity about the pictures, a certain melting quality, in which it is often difficult to tell just where a mountain ends and mist begins, or where water ends and the sky begins. This is also shown in the swirling garments of people, which seem to merge with the clouds. This interpenetration is often seen in Sesshu. In "Spring," for instance, the whole landscape grows together as an organic unity--crags, a waterfall, trees, a small tea-house, a pathway--all very well defined in the foreground but becoming mistier and mistier in the background (which, by the way, is usually shown as above rather than behind), and all hovering on the brink of a mysterious misty chasm.

4. Momentariness. This is an essential ingredient

of all art. I mean it in the sense that it results in a momentary intuition of the whole. In Japanese art the sense of momentariness is particularly strong because of the compression into small, apparently slight, subjects immediately seeable; and because the rapidity of execution fuses them into immediate unity. This instantaneous quality suddenly brings emptiness and form together, so that there is no time for sentimental speculation.

Many of the other qualities I have mentioned as characteristic of Japanese art may be seen in these paintings--poverty, the sense of richness in loneliness, and so on.

The essential quality of all Japanese art is said to be yūgen, a term which I must confess I do not understand too well. The two symbols which represent it are yu, meaning "secluded," and gen, meaning "dark," "profound," "mysterious." Dr. Suzuki has described it as a vaguely sensed movement in obscurity.

In the portraits of Bodhidharma, and in all the rapid-fire and typically Zen drawings there is a verve and vitality that lends itself naturally to humor. These little productions are dashed down with such zest that even when the subject is not humorous there is a sense of utter delight in them. The monkeys, the foliage, the birds, the people, are conveyed with a sense of intimacy and of appreciation of the subject in and for itself, a total

familiarity with it, a sharing of its spirit. One in particular delights me. This is Ashikaga Yoshimitsu's "The Poet Su Tung-p'o. The little donkey is running gaily along, his legs exactly caught in swift brush-strokes, with blobs for hoofs--and they are the most elegant hoofs. The poet himself is a fine example of the mass that can be enclosed in a few quick, suggestive lines. His hat is a short, thick stroke perfectly executed. As I say, it does no good to talk about pictures. These are all just right. Nothing could be taken away without destroying them, and nothing added without decorating them.<sup>144</sup>

### 3. Haiku.

In haiku we have another example of the "one-moment" that holds everything. These tiny "songs without words"--they consist of only three verses, usually containing a total of seventeen syllables--express in their brief forms an experience so vast as to be ineffable and unthinkable (acintya).

In fact, if I were to try to summarize the whole of Zen, both its philosophy and its art, I believe I would select this one word, acintya (unthinkable), or, even better, acitta (without thought). But citta means much more than thought. It means presence, the whole body-mind-heart complex in all its divinity. So that when one is "with-

---

<sup>144</sup>See E. Grosse, Le Lavis en Extrême Orient (Paris: G. Cres & Cie., n.d.)

out presence," he is, shall I say, absent even when he is wholly present--that is to say, he is not present to himself; he is selfless. He is Citta, but he does not have Citta. There is no vantage-point from which he can see himself, so that his self-presence is a totally mysterious one, a sort of absence. Supreme Reality is this kind of presence, so totally present and unknown to itself that it is called The Unconscious, The Mystery.

Now, an artist, perhaps more than any other person except the true saint, has this kind of self-unconsciousness and the faculty of creating himself apparently outside himself. He lives in flowers, trees, insects, and other men. Goethe conceived of the poet as one who lives vicariously.<sup>145</sup> Keats in one of his letters said, "The poetical nature has no self--it is everything and nothing; it has no character ... A poet has no identity--he is continually in for and filling some other body."<sup>146</sup> And I have read many similar statements by artists.

I make these observations to show why it is that, even with all this mystery, emptiness, transience, and loneliness, the doctrine of selflessness provides at the same time the most immediate, concrete, and active possible way of living. The artist is alone as God is alone,

---

<sup>145</sup>Arnold Bergsträsser, Goethe's Image of Man and Society (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), p. 23.

<sup>146</sup>Quoted by Laurence Binyon in The Flight of the Dragon (London: Murray, 1953), p. 37.

empty as He is empty--but the life of the whole universe is his life.

Now that I am coming to a verbal art, I should like to make some further observations.

Ananda Coomaraswamy calls attention to the non-verbal character of the Eastern arts, to their having been made rather than "thought up."<sup>147</sup> This statement applies to all Japanese art, which is objective rather than verbal. Even haiku, which are called poems, are objects. Their brevity, concreteness, and extreme suggestiveness indicates that what they have to say can neither be thought nor spoken, but must be presented as a thing made--an image or symbol. Yet in another way, Japanese art is completely non-objective. In the Sumiye (ink sketches), for example, which might be expected to be more objective than poems, Dr. Suzuki notes, "If Sumiye attempts to copy an objective reality it is an utter failure; it never does that, it is rather a creation."<sup>148</sup> In other words, we have in Japanese art a perfect fusion of subject and object; the object is subjectified, and the subject objectified.

Culture, Coomaraswamy says, suggests "agriculture"; wisdom was originally "skill," and asceticism was "hard work." We tend to overemphasize thought and to consider

---

<sup>147</sup> Am I My Brother's Keeper?, p. 29.

<sup>148</sup> Essays III, 325.

it superior to manual labor; hence our distinction between "fine" and "useful"--an invidious distinction. Many of our "fine" productions tend to be literary. Imitation in painting, for example, is literary in that it describes an object. With us, things must usually have a verbally utterable "message"; art must be capable of being talked about. Today, with abstract painting, a familiar question is, "What does it mean?" No one thinks to ask what a piece of pottery, with a perfectly abstract shape, "means," because it can be put to a use.

Art, in St. Thomas's definition, is "the undeviating determination of work to be done."<sup>149</sup> "Art is a habit of the practical intellect"--the word "habit" here being used in the sense of habitus, meaning something like "quality" or "inherent virtue." "Such a habit," says Jacques Maritain, "is a virtue, that is to say a quality which, triumphing over the intellective faculty, at once sharpening and hardening the point of its activity,"--this is Zen's golden needle that embroiders the fabric of the world--"raises it in respect of a definite object to a maximum of perfection, and so of operative efficiency."<sup>150</sup> (The italics are Maritain's.)

Coomaraswamy also points out that Christ was a

---

<sup>149</sup>Art and Scholasticism, tr. by J. F. Scanlan (New York: Scribner's, 1934), p. 8.

<sup>150</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

carpenter and the son of a carpenter, and that the primary matter is spoken of as "wood." This primary matter is the substance of mind (Buddhism, as I have said, makes no differentiation between mind and matter) which by means of skill makes the universe out of itself.

In light of these remarks we can see the resolution of what Blyth calls the basic contradiction in Japanese art--the apparent paradox of concreteness and "real feelings" as against an impression of "unreality." It is the "unreality" which makes of the artifact a symbol rather than an idol. (I do not mean that I disagree with Blyth; he implies this point.)

In haiku we see most clearly the feeling for the tangible and the immediate. The degree of observation is sometimes almost hypersensitively acute, as for instance in--

Petals of the mountain rose  
Fall now and then.  
To the sound of the waterfall?

--Bashō<sup>151</sup>

The sea darkens.  
Voices of the wild ducks  
Are faintly white.

--Bashō

In this last, the senses are fused, as they frequently are in mystical experience.

Nothing can compare with these small gems for

---

<sup>151</sup>All these translations are from R. H. Blyth, Haiku, Vol. I, unless otherwise indicated.



concreteness, sensuousness, immediacy, and tender love of familiar objects. On the other hand, nothing can capture more effectively the vast and inexpressible. Professor Blyth says, "Haiku, and not haiku alone, but the whole of Japanese art and literature are aimed at the same infinity as that of the western world ... , but not through space, not through the horizon. It is the infinite grasped in the hand, before the eyes, in the hammering of a nail, the touch of cold water, the smell of chrysanthemums, the smell of this chrysanthemum."<sup>152</sup>

Here, for instance, is the great together with the humble--the moon lying in a saucepan with the potatoes--

Even to the saucepan  
Where potatoes are boiling,--  
A moonlit night.

--Kyoroku

And here again, rather more obviously perhaps, the great in the small--

Reflected  
In the eye of the dragon fly,  
The distant hills.

--Issa

These seem very slight, but they grow and grow. One begins to want them to be as subtle as possible. There is a thorough enjoyment in bringing out their richness with your own skill--which of course is part of the idea.

---

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., Preface xiii.

In translation we get only a faint idea of their flavor. To one who knows no Japanese, Harold Henderson's word-by-word translations in The Bamboo Broom give just a little better idea--not much, but just a little. Our word order is different, we are at the mercy of our own syllable stresses, and of course all the qualities of sound--especially of onomatopoeia and assonance--are lost. Ranetsu's hokku, for instance, "One plum blossom is one plum-blossom's extent of warmth," reads, "Plums one bloom one bloom's extent's warmth." This is fairly close as far as intellectual meaning goes. But who can capture the sound of ume ichi rin ichi rin hodo no atatakasa? It has a contrapuntal beat that would challenge a Gerard Manley Hopkins. In the following example cited by Blyth, one can hear in the first verse the sound of the driver's horn--rappa fuite--and in the second verse the sound of the horses' hoofs--

Rappa fuite  
Fumoto no michi go kokoru yoku  
nobiru bashaya san.

"Michi go kokoru yoku" trots right along.

Haiku, again, have all the characteristics I have mentioned--simplicity, poverty, loneliness, transience, asymmetry (the verses are five syllables, seven, and five; but we might also call suggestion a sort of asymmetry), homeliness, freedom, selflessness (this could also be called objectivity), and ineffability.

The subjects are by no means confined to cherry blossoms, waterfalls, and butterflies. In Issa (1762-1826) we find the utmost realism, quite unlike that of the usually gentler, more deeply religious Bashō (Matsuo Bashō, 17th century, considered the greatest of haiku poets). However, I would not call the following, from Issa, unreligious--

The autumn storm;  
A prostitute shack,  
At 24 cents a time.

The brevity of haiku, like the swiftness of the Sumiye sketches, suits them for humor, and there is a great deal of humor, especially if we broaden the meaning of the word to include the charm of a love for leeks, blue-bells, and frogs. This one has that sort of charm--

The snake slid away,  
But the eyes that glared at me,  
Remained in the grass.

--Kyoshi

When haiku are not definitely sad or mystical, they have that same zest and verve that distinguishes many of the Zen sayings. In the collection of Zen sayings called Zenrinkushu we find the two moods very close together-- the laughter and tenderness very close to the feeling of transience and infinity.

#### 4. The Tea Ceremony and Nō Plays.

Although there is a great deal to say about both

of these, I have put them together because both are synthetic arts.

The Art of Tea (Cha no Yu) belongs specifically to Zen. It is a communal ceremony--but not too communal. The guests are usually limited to five--"more than the Graces and less than the Muses," as Mr. Okakura says.<sup>153</sup>

The garden path (roji) which leads to the tea-house symbolizes the first stage of meditation. Here the world is left behind. The small, frail-appearing hut that houses the ceremony (this hut, however, is an extremely expensive and expert piece of work) suggests both poverty and transcendence. Humility is shown by the guests as they stoop to enter by means of a low door. The small hut--it will hold no more than five--is empty except for the tea utensils and one or two precious objects of reverence on the Tokonoma in the alcove. This Tokonoma is a raised structure the prototype of which is the altar in the Zen chapel. The object of the day may be a flower arrangement (sometimes only one flower beautifully displayed), a painting, or calligraphy. These objects are always different--transcendence again, in emptiness.

The familiar Japanese themes hold throughout. Age is suggested in the tea utensils, all of which are old, homely or imperfect except for a new bamboo dipper and a

---

<sup>153</sup>Okakura-Kazuko, The Book of Tea (Tokyo: Kenyusha, n.d.), p. 48.

snow-white napkin. These suggest transience--the replacement of the old by the new. Both house and garden are informal (very carefully so). The house is slightly run down in appearance. Everything is of the most spotless purity; there is not a speck of dust anywhere.

The guests wear simple, sober clothing, and speak politely in subdued voices, saying exactly what they are expected to say. They pay reverence to the object or objects on the Tokonoma, and address each other with great respect--and the tea-master with particular respect.

In this atmosphere of simple, pure, refined poverty the tea ceremony begins. It lasts for perhaps four hours, being conducted slowly, calmly, and attentively, with the attention of the guests turned toward all its details.

This ceremony is at once the most sensuous and the most austere of all rituals. It satisfies all the senses, but at the same time is highly disciplined and utterly tranquil. Through their own satisfaction and harmony all the senses are cleansed. There is the sound of the tea-water singing in the kettle, the rustle of pine trees over the roof, the drip of the water-bucket outside; there are the small clicks of the tea implements being moved about. There is the smell of pine, and the fragrance of the tea itself, and perhaps the fragrance of flowers (although "noisy" flowers, either as to fragrance or color, are not allowed). There is the faintly bitter taste of the tea.

Beautiful forms are seen in the flower arrangement, the painting or calligraphy, and the vessels of the ceremony; beautiful movements in the dipping of the water and passing of the tea. The bowls are touched, and their texture and color are appreciated.

The East recognizes six senses, the sixth being thinking, of which the brain is the internal organ. In the tea ceremony this sense is as passive as the others, performing its function naturally without claiming to be "a mind" any more than an ear, if it could, would claim to be "an audition." Thought, with all the impartiality and passivity of sight, hearing, and the rest, receives what is given without judgment, and rests pleasantly in the harmony of the other senses, enjoying tranquil, unthinking, flowing impressions of nature in harmony--a nature which is its own. There is stability and contentment in the flow itself, a deep inner knowledge of permanence in transience.

Respect, and contentment with simplicity are perhaps the most dominant notes of Cha no Yu. There is the respect of the guests for one another, and for the tea-master, the flowers, the calligrapher, the utensils, the hut--respect for everything in nature. The visitors are content with things just as they are.

Purity is further observed in sincerity. A book called Nambō-Roku, quoted by Dr. Suzuki as being an almost

sacred book of the tea-cult, says, " ... both master and visitors are expected to be on terms of absolute sincerity; no ordinary measures of proportion or etiquette or conventionalism are to be followed. A fire is made, water is boiled, and tea is served: this is all that is needed here ... For what we want to do here is to give full expression to the Buddha-mind."<sup>148</sup>

It is obvious that a great deal of conventionalism is followed. But the movements are the simplest, most efficient possible ones. And even if the atmosphere is very studiously planned and established, the mood of tranquillity and imperturbability justifies this; for the purpose of the ceremony runs far beyond mere observances.

It is the calm, imperturbable mind of the Buddha which is sought here--sought without seeking. When Ikkyu asked Tea-master Juko (the founder of the tea ceremony, died 1502) what the essential element of his tea-drinking was, Juko replied that it was the Quiet Mind. Ikkyu then had a cup of tea brought and given to the master, but just as he was about to drink it, shouted "Kwatz!" and smashed the cup with his iron rod. Juko remained quite unperturbed --thus showing his ability to drink Tealess Tea.<sup>149</sup>

The dramatic arts provide us with perhaps the most

---

<sup>148</sup>Zen and Its Influence, p. 137.

<sup>149</sup>Related by Blyth in Haiku, I, 155.

glaring example of vicariousness. The actor is never himself. One night he is Rupert the Terrible, the next night he is the sweetest of the sweet. Between times he meditates on his next appearance. As for the playwright, he is everyone. Here I believe we will see the doctrine of selflessness well illustrated.

The NŌ play originated with Shinto. In its earliest phases it was a religious ceremony based upon the idea that the sun-goddess Amaterasu had hidden herself in a cave, thus plunging the world into darkness, and that the deities had assembled around the cave dancing and singing to lure her out again. At the end she reappeared, and this, as Mrs. Suzuki explains, gave rise to the thought that music and dance were pleasing to the gods. Thereafter the plays were performed for them as a matter of giving them enjoyment.

As far as intellectual elements go, the content of the plays is mixed. Shinto, Pure Land Buddhism, and Zen rub elbows--the Zen contribution supplied largely by the great Seami (born 1373), who wrote many of the plays and received many suggestions from the Zen priests who were his friends. Some of the material is taken from ancient Chinese and Japanese sources, some from sayings in the Buddhist sutras. The new mingles with the old, poetry with prose, and Chinese words with Japanese.

These are by no means the only contrasts. Settings



and properties are extremely simple and suggestive. For example, four posts suggest a house, branches suggest a forest. The fan serves as a sword, a brush, or almost anything that can be held in the hand. Costumes, on the other hand, are elaborate, with many under-ropes, making the characters appear huge and magnificent. The main character (shite) and his supporters wear masks; the others do not. The dialogue ranges from prose through an irregular poetic form into song, covering all the possibilities of human voice and vocal expression. As in the Greek drama, a chorus comments (sometimes quite sententiously) on the action, but sometimes also speaks for the shite. The climax of the play is a dance.

The tempo and mood of the entire production are set by the musicians. The tempo, varying with the emotional intensity of the drama, is carried by the drums, supplemented by the voices of the musicians, and punctuated at certain intervals and in crises by the piercing cry of a flute. Anyone who has heard Japanese musicians groaning musically and uttering short cries at moments of climax in the dance, while the drums increase the speed of their complex rhythms, knows what a powerful effect this creates. Before the climax of the play there is an *andante* movement to calm the minds of the audience. This movement is gradually intensified until it reaches its highest emotional pitch.

Pictorial appeal is very strong, and gesture is conventionalized and suggestive. One stiff hand carried slowly to the forehead and as slowly lowered suggests grief. An old man is not portrayed as realistically withered and ugly; this would only mar the production. His age is suggested by the fact that his steps come slightly after the musical beat.

Here there are many apparently conflicting elements to combine, yet the result is a total unity. The effect, Mrs. Suzuki says, is that of calm, simplicity, and eternal loneliness (sabi).

Once more we have the familiar combination of extreme concreteness with suggestive simplicity and asymmetry. In Nō, as in the tea ceremony, the appeal is to several senses--eye, ear, and mind--with a strong rhythmic beat to guide and sustain the mood. As in the tea ceremony, there is a continuous catharsis of the senses as they drink in the tangible and are purified in emptiness. This continual cleansing brings about a quiet contemplation.

Here also, as in all the other arts, self-forgetting and artlessness are stipulated. The spectator, it is said, should "forget the theatre and look at the Nō. Forget the Nō and look at the actor. Forget the actor and look at the idea (or spirit). Forget the idea and you will understand the Nō."<sup>150</sup> As for the actor, he should play his part,

---

<sup>150</sup>B. L. Suzuki, Nōgaku, p. 33.

Seami said, "as far as madness, that is to play in an ecstasy when the self is forgotten in enjoyment."<sup>151</sup> I may add that the burden of the play is carried by one actor almost solo. It has been said therefore that Nō is not dramatic --whatever this may mean in neat logical categories. At any rate, attention is centered upon one man.

Now, intellectually it is possible--especially if the performance is a poor one--to think of John Jones as Hamlet, for instance; to think of the two successively and disjointedly, and to fail to put them together. But a successful actor actually lives the role he is playing, and we live it with him. After the performance we may discover that he is not that other character, and that we are sitting here as we were before. No matter; he has been, and we have been, that other person. We have all been entirely absorbed in the illusion.

Supreme Reality, Sankara said, is like a king playing a shepherd in a play. When he reveals himself, we know him for what he "really" is--not a shepherd but a king. This is true as far as it goes, but it attempts to reduce everything to one term, saying in effect that the illusion as illusion was not as "real" as the final reality itself. I am not sure that Sankara intended this. But Zen's point would be that the king never stops being a shepherd (or non-being never ceases appearing as being--"the unreal hath no being;

---

<sup>151</sup>Ibid., p. 34.

the real never ceaseth to be").<sup>152</sup> The shepherd cannot be rejected, because he is himself, while at the same time he is not.

In a Nō play, or any play, the actor and audience, on the one hand, forget themselves and are formlessness living and moving about on the stage as form. On the other hand, the ingredients of the play, by means of asymmetry, suggestion, and mystery, place this sensuous form beyond its own limits at exactly the same time that its gestures are being made. ("Beings are unmanifest in their origin, manifest in their midmost state, unmanifest likewise are they in dissolution.")<sup>153</sup>

I could think of no better illustration of the Mahayana statement that "Form is emptiness and emptiness is form" or that form is "distinction within non-distinction." Both things are true simultaneously. It is the "midmost state" which prevails. The unmanifest is manifest, and the manifest is ineffable. Non-being and being both cancel and establish one another--the one as emptiness, the other as the active means or "skill" or "compassion" of appearing as multiple and still being undivided. These two, in "one moment"--now--are the true condition of reality.

The arts merely symbolize. They do not mean to say

---

<sup>152</sup> Bhagavad Gita, II, 16.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid., II, 28.

that we are to shuttle in and out of our own minds periodically as an actor would identify himself with one role after another, and then go back to his "everyday consciousness" or his own "reality." They symbolize what is our everyday consciousness--the innocent, artless, unconscious consciousness of a child--more than that, of an unborn, unconceived child--who through his own mysterious working ("a movement in the indescribable") has a power of vision which sees itself as if it were everything else than what it essentially is. The fiction of an objective "I" with which we constantly identify ourselves to the exclusion of everything else, thus creating our own limitation and our own sorrow, is only the habitual assumption of a role which keeps us bound within a false and narrow compass. Actually we are capable of extending ourselves infinitely through the whole of manifested being--our own manifested being--back to emptiness once more. This is our potentiality because it is our actuality, and it is our actuality because it is our own free act.

As Anaxagoras said, "Everything is everything."

---oOo---

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

(Note: This bibliography contains not only works quoted but also valuable material consulted.)

- Anonymous, Theologia Germanica, ed. by Thomas S. Kepler (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1952), 192p.
- Aśvaghosa, The Awakening of Faith, tr. by Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki (Chicago, Open Court, 1900), 149p.
- Bergsträsser, Arnold, Goethe's Image of Man and Society (Chicago: Regnery, 1949), 361p.
- Bhagavad-Gita, tr. by Annie Besant and Bhagavan Das (Madras: Theosophical Publishing Co., 1950), 460p.
- Binyon, Laurence, The Flight of the Dragon (London: Murray, 1953), 112p.
- Blyth, R. H., Buddhist Sermons on Christian Texts (Kokudoshā, 1952), 93p.
- Haiku (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1952), Vol. I, 422p.
- Zen in English Literature (Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1942), 446p.
- Bowie, Henry P., On the Laws of Japanese Painting (Dover Publications, no city or date), 105p. and plates.
- Buddhist anthologies:
- A Buddhist Bible, Revised and enlarged, ed. by Dwight Goddard (New York: Dutton, 1952), 677p.
- Buddhist Texts, ed. and tr. by Edward Conzé et al. (Oxford: Bruno Cassirer, 1954), 322p.
- Buddhism in Translations, selected and translated by Henry Clarke Warren (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1953), 496p.
- Gotama the Buddha, presented by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy and I. B. Horner (London: Cassell, 1948), 224p.

- Channing-Pearce, M., The Terrible Crystal (London: Kegan Paul, 1940), 232p.
- Chatterjee, Satischandra, and Dhirendramohan Datta, An Introduction to Indian Philosophy (University of Calcutta, 1950), 443p.
- Chuang-tse (Chuang-tzu):
- Chuang Tzu, Mystic, Moralist, and Social Reformer, tr. by Herbert A. Giles (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1889).
- Works, tr. by James Legge, in Sacred Books of the East, ed. by F. Max Muller, Vol. XXXIX and XL (in one volume), entitled "The Sacred Books of China" (London: Oxford, 1927).
- Conzé, Edward, Buddhism (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), 212p.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K., Am I My Brother's Keeper? (New York: John Day, 1947), 110p.
- The Dance of Shiva (Bombay and Calcutta: Asia Publishing House, 1948), 196p.
- Elements of Buddhist Iconography (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935), 95p. and plates.
- Hinduism and Buddhism (New York: Philosophical Library, n.d.), 86p.
- Time and Eternity (Ascona, Switzerland: Artibus Asiae, 1947), 140p.
- Dasgupta, S. N., Yoga Philosophy (University of Calcutta, 1930), 380p.
- Dasgupta, Shashibhusan, An Introduction to Tantric Buddhism (University of Calcutta, 1946), 235p.
- Obscure Religious Cults (University of Calcutta, 1946), 501p.
- Diamond Sutra (The Jewel of Transcendental Wisdom), tr. from the Chinese by A. F. Price (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), 72p.
- Eckhart, Meister: Meister Eckhart, tr. by C. de B. Evans (London: Watkins, 1947), 2 vols.

- Eliot, Charles, Kt., Japanese Buddhism (London: Arnold, 1935), 449p.
- Evans-Wentz, W. Y., ed., The Tibetan Book of the Dead, tr. by Lama Kazi Dawa-Samdup (London: Oxford, 1949), 248p.
- The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation, various translators (London: Oxford, 1954), 254p.
- Tibet's Great Yogi Milarepa, tr. by Lama Kazi Dawa-Samdup (London: Oxford, 1951), 315p.
- Fung Yu-lan, A History of Chinese Philosophy, tr. by Derk Bodde (Princeton University Press, 1953), 2 vols.
- Grosse, E., Le Lavis en Extrême Orient (Paris: G. Crès & Cie., n.d.), Introduction and plates.
- Guénon, René, Introduction to the Study of the Hindu Doctrines, tr. by Marco Pallis (London: Luzac, 1945), 351p.
- Herrigel, Eugen, Zen in the Art of Archery, tr. by R. F. C. Hull (New York: Pantheon, 1953), 109p.
- Huang Po, The Huang Po Doctrine of Universal Mind, tr. by Chu Ch'an (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), 52p.
- Hui-neng (Wei Lang), The Sutra of Wei Lang, tr. by Wong Mou-lam (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), 52p.
- Lao-tse, Tao Te Ching, tr. by Ch'u Ta-kao (London: Buddhist Society, 1954), 94p.
- Law, William, Selected Mystical Writings of William Law (London: Rockliff, 1948), 425p.
- Lieh-tzu, selections, in Taoist Teachings from the Book of Lieh Tzu, tr. by Lionel Giles (London: Murray, 1947), 121p.
- Li Tai Po, Works of Li Po, tr. by Shigeyoshi Obata (New York: Dutton, 1922), 209p.
- Maritain, Jacques, Art and Scholasticism, tr. by J. F. Scanlan (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1934), 232p.
- Okakura-Kazuko, The Book of Tea (Tokyo: Kenyusha, n.d.), 117p.
- Pallis, Marco, Peaks and Lamas (New York: Knopf, 1949), 397p.



- Plotinus, Enneads, tr. by Stephen Mackenna and B. S. Page, in Five volumes variously titled (London: Medici Society; Boston: Hale, Cushman & Flint, dated seriatim 1926, 1921, 1924, 1926, 1930), in "The Library of Philosophical Translations."
- Po Chu-i, selections, in More Translations from the Chinese, tr. by Arthur Waley (New York: Knopf, 1937).
- Pratt, James Bissett, The Pilgrimage of Buddhism (New York: Macmillan, 1928), 758p.
- Sakanishi, Shio, The Spirit of the Brush (London: Murray, 1948), 108p.
- Secret of the Golden Flower, The, tr. from Chinese into German by Richard F. Wilhelm, and from German into English by Cary F. Baynes, Eighth Impression (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1950), 158p.
- Senzaki, Nyogen, and Ruth S. McCandless, Buddhism and Zen (New York: Philosophical Library, 1953), 91p.
- Siddheswarananda, Swami, "A Hindu View of Christian Theology," in Vedanta for Modern Man, ed. by Christopher Isherwood (New York: Harper, 1951), pp. 299-318.
- Spiegelberg, Frederic, The Religion of No-Religion (Stanford, Calif.: Delkin, 1953), 140p.
- Suzuki, Beatrice Lane, Nōgaku, (New York: Dutton, 1932), 124p.
- Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro, "Enlightenment," in The Review of Religion, Vol. XVIII, Nos. 3-4, March 1954 (Columbia University Press), pp. 133-144.
- Essays in Zen Buddhism (First Series) (London: Rider, n.d.), 385p.
- Essays in Zen Buddhism (Second Series) (London: Rider, 1950), 348p.
- Essays in Zen Buddhism (Third Series) (London: Rider, 1953), 367p.
- The Essence of Buddhism, 2d Ed. (London: Buddhist Society, 1947), 72p.
- An Introduction to Zen Buddhism (London: Rider, n.d. [c. 1948]), 136p.

- Living by Zen (London: Rider, 1950), 187p.
- A Manual of Zen Buddhism (London: Rider, 1950), 192p.
- Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra (London, Routledge, 1930),
- Zen Buddhism and its Influence on Japanese Culture (Kyoto: East Buddhist Society, 1938),
- The Zen Doctrine of No-Mind (London: Rider, 1949), 155p.

Takakusu, Junjiro, The Essentials of Buddhist Philosophy, ed. by W. T. Chan and Charles A. Moore, 2d Ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1949), 221p.

Tillich, Paul, The Courage to Be (New Haven, 1952).

- The Religious Situation (New York: Holt, 1932), 182p.

Ulanov, Harry, A History of Jazz in America (New York: Viking, 1954), 382p.

Upanishads:

Eight Upanishads, tr. by Sri Aurobindo (Pondicherry, Sri Aurobindo Ashram, 1953), 247p.

Thirteen Principal Upanishads, tr. by R. E. Hume (Madras, 1949, from plates of Cumberledge, Oxford, 1921), 588p. Wherever possible I have used the Aurobindo translation as conveying the meaning more clearly, but the Hume translation is also very helpful.

Waley, Arthur, tr., More Translations from the Chinese (New York: Knopf, 1937), 154p.

- The Way and Its Power (London: Allen & Unwin, 1934), 262p.

Warner, Langdon, The Enduring Art of Japan (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1952), 113p. and plates.

Watts, Alan W.; "Faith and Works in Buddhism," in The Review of Religion, May 1941.

- Myth and Ritual in Christianity (New York: Vanguard Press, n.d. [1953]), 262p.

----The Spirit of Zen (London: Murray, 1936), 136p.

----The Supreme Identity (New York: Pantheon Books, 1950), 204p.

----Zen (Stanford, Calif.: Delkin, 1948), 42p.

Whyte, L. L., The Next Development in Man (New York: Holt, 1948), 322p.

Woodroffe, John, Kt., Shakti and Shākta (Madras: Ganesh & Co., 1951), 734p.

Zenrinkushu, in R. H. Blyth, Haiku (q.v.).

---