

STUDIES IN ZEN

DAISETZ TEITARO SUZUKI, D.LITT.
Professor of Buddhist Philosophy in the Otani University, Kyoto



Published for the Buddhist Society, London

by

RIDER . LONDON

RIDER AND COMPANY
178-202 Great Portland Street, London, W.1

AN IMPRINT OF THE



HUTCHINSON GROUP

London Melbourne Sydney
Auckland Bombay Toronto
Johannesburg New York



First published 1955
Second Impression 1957

Printed in Great Britain
by The Anchor Press, Ltd.,
Tiptree, Essex

CONTENTS

	Editor's Foreword	Page 7
<i>Chapter I</i>	The Zen Sect of Buddhism (1906)	11
II	Zen Buddhism (1938)	48
III	An Interpretation of Zen-Experience (1939)	61
IV	Reason and Intuition in Buddhist Philo- sophy (1951)	85
V	Zen: A Reply to Dr. Hu Shih (1953)	129
VI	Mondo (1953)	165
VII	The Role of Nature in Zen Buddhism (1953)	176
	Index	207

exalted spiritual position and to leave all their fellow-creatures suffering in ignorance. They come down into this world of particulars, as it were, from their idealistic altitude. They live like the masses; they suffer, endure, and hope. But their inner life is not disturbed by any tribulation of this world. The process of spiritual development of a Zen follower is pictorially illustrated in the popular book called *Ju Gyu no Zu*—that is, *The Ten Ox-herding Pictures*—in which the spiritual training of the Zen Sect is likened to the taming of an ox.

PHILOSOPHY OF ZEN

No attempt will here be made to expound the philosophy of Zen which underlies those enigmatic *ko-an*, a few samples of which have been given above, but I shall limit myself to giving to the reader a translation of certain passages in the "Sermons of the Sixth Patriarch" (*Fa pao t'an ching*), which was really an epoch-making work in the history of the Zen Sect. The book was compiled by his disciples from their notebooks. (10)

"Have your hearts thoroughly purified, and think of the Maha-prajna-paramita. O my good and intelligent brethren, all beings are from the beginning in possession of the Bodhi-prajna [transcendental intelligence or wisdom], and the reason why they are unable to realize it is due to their confused subjectivity. You should, therefore, exert yourselves according to the instruction of a great enlightened teacher, and have an insight into the nature of being. The Buddha-nature is the same in the ignorant as in the intelligent; but as there is a difference between enlightenment and confusion, some are called benighted, while others are enlightened. I shall now speak about the doctrine of Maha-prajna-paramita, and lead you to the way of intelligence. Listen to me with hearts true and sincere, as I speak unto you.

"O my good and intelligent brethren, people are talking all the time about Prajna, but they do not compre-

the fact of faith as it is. Those who are generally addicted to talking on things which they have never experienced personally, who have taken symbols for things and intellectual representations for realities, will for the first time in their lives realize, when they are so bluntly treated by Zen teachers, how superficial and confused their minds were, and how unsteady was the foundation of their faith. They will thus, under the Zen training, learn to define their notions of things clearly and accurately; they will also be induced to reflect within themselves, as well as on things outside, from a point of view quite different from those they had held. Even if they are unable to grasp the signification of the *ko-an*, this reflective habit which they are going to acquire (though this is not the main object of Zen) will considerably help the pupils in their moral and intellectual training.

When one case is settled, another and perhaps more complicated one will be given, so that the pupil will be able to see the prevalence of one principle in all cases, and this will be continued as long as he desires.

The conative or affective phase of Zen discipline is accomplished by the means of *zazen* (*dhyana*). In this the pupil is required to sit quietly for a certain length of time, during which he will think of the *ko-an* given to him. *Zazen* can be practised by the pupil alone or in the company of others in a hall especially built for the purpose.

Zazen is not meant to induce a trance or a state of self-hypnotism. It aims at keeping the mind well poised and directing attention on any point one wills. Most people, especially in these days of commercial and industrial rush, are so given up to excitements, impulses, and sensationalism that they often prematurely exhaust their nervous energy, and finally lose equilibrium of mind. Zen professes to remedy this useless waste of energy on the one hand, and to increase, as it were, a reserve stock of mentality.

In conclusion, it may be of interest to our readers to see what a Zen teacher of modern times has to say about the practice of Zen, and here I give some extracts from

the Reverend Soyen Shaku's work entitled *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot*, which is a collection of some of his addresses delivered during his recent visit to America. He occupies a very prominent position in the Zen hierarchy in Japan, and is the Abbot of the historical monasteries of Kamakura, Engakuji and Kenchoji, where the Zen Sect of Japan was founded.¹

"What is *dhyana*? *Dhyana* literally means, in Sanskrit, pacification, equilibration, or tranquillization, but as a religious discipline it is rather self-examination or introspection. It is not necessarily to cogitate on the deep subjects of metaphysics, nor is it to contemplate the virtues of a deity, or the transitoriness of mundane life. To define its import in Buddhism, roughly and practically, it is the habit of withdrawing occasionally from the turbulence of worldliness and of devoting some time to a quiet inspection of one's own consciousness. When this habit is thoroughly established, a man can keep serenity of mind and cheerfulness of disposition, even in the midst of his whirlwind-like course of daily life. *Dhyana* is, then, a discipline in tranquillization. It aims at giving to the mind the time for deliberation, and saving it from running wild; it directs the vain and vulgar to the path of earnestness and reality; it makes us feel interest in higher things which are above the senses; it discovers the presence in us of a spiritual faculty which bridges the chasm between the finite and the infinite; and it finally delivers us from the bondage and torture of ignorance, safely leading us to the other shore of Nirvana.

"*Dhyana* is sometimes made a synonym for *samatha* and *samadhi* and *samapatti*. *Samatha* is tranquillity and practically the same as *dhyana*, though the latter is much more frequently in use than the former. *Samapatti* literally is

¹ The *Sermons of a Buddhist Abbot* to which Dr. Suzuki refers is a book published by the Open Court Publishing Co. of Chicago in 1906, and includes Dr. Suzuki's translations into English of a number of addresses given by the Ven. Soyen Shaku in the U.S.A. during his stay there in 1905-6. On his death he was buried in the monastery of Engakuji at Kamakura, where Dr. Suzuki himself has lived for a great many years. It is to be remembered that this article was itself written in 1906.—ED.

'put together evenly' or 'balanced', and means the equilibrium of consciousness in which takes place neither wakefulness nor apathy, but in which the mind is calmly concentrated on the thought under consideration. *Samadhi* is a perfect absorption, voluntary or involuntary, of thought in the object of contemplation. A mind is sometimes said to be in a state of *samadhi* when it identifies itself with the ultimate reason of existence and is only conscious of the unification. In this case, *dhyana* is the method or process that brings us finally to *samadhi*.

"Now, the benefits arising from the exercise of *dhyana* are more than one, and are not only practical but moral and spiritual. Nobody will deny the most practical advantage gained through presence of mind, moderation of temper, control of feelings, and mastery of one's self. A passion may be so violent at the time of its agitation that it will fairly consume itself to utter destruction, but a cool-headed man knows well how to give it the necessary psychological time of rest and deliberation, and thus to save himself from plunging headlong into the Charybdis of emotion. And this cool-headedness, though in some measure due to heredity, is attainable through the exercise of *dhyana*.

"Intellectually, *dhyana* will keep the head clear and lucid, and whenever necessary, make it concentrate itself on the subject at issue. Logical accuracy depends greatly on the dispassionateness of the arguing mind, and scientific investigation gains much from the steadiness of the observing eye. Whatever be a man's intellectual development, he has surely nothing to lose, but a great deal to gain, by training himself in the habit of tranquillization.

"In these days of industrial and commercial civilization, multitudes of people have very little time to devote themselves to spiritual culture. They are not altogether ignorant of the existence of things which are of permanent

value, but their minds are so engrossed in details of everyday life that they find it extremely difficult to avoid their constant obtrusion. Even when they retire from their routine work at night, they are bent on something exciting which will tax their already overstretched nervous system to the utmost. If they do not die prematurely, they become nervous wrecks. They seem not to know the blessings of relaxation. They seem to be unable to live within themselves and find there the source of eternal cheerfulness. Life is for them more or less a heavy burden, and their task consists in the carrying of the burden. The gospel of *dhyana*, therefore, must prove to them a heaven-sent boon when they conscientiously practise it.

"*Dhyana* is physiologically the accumulation of nervous energy; it is a sort of spiritual storage battery in which an enormous amount of latent force is sealed—a force which will, whenever demand is made, manifest itself with tremendous potency. A mind trained in *dhyana* will never waste its energy, causing its untimely exhaustion. It may appear at times, when superficially observed, dull, uninteresting, and dreamy, but it will work wonders when the occasion arises; while a mind ordinarily addicted to dissipation succumbs to the intensity of an impulse or a stimulus without much struggling, which ends in complete collapse, for it has no energy in reserve. Here, let me remark incidentally, can be seen one of the many characteristic differences between Orientalism and Occidentalism. In all departments of Oriental culture a strong emphasis is placed upon the necessity of preserving the latent nervous energy, and of keeping the source of spiritual strength well fed and nourished. Young minds are trained to store up within, and not to make any wasteful display of their prowess and knowledge and virtue. It is only shallow waters, they would say, that make a noisy, restless stream, while a deep whirlpool goes on silently. The Occidentals, as far as I can judge, seem to be fond of making a full display of their possessions with the frankness of a child; and they are prone to a strenuous and dissipating life, which will soon drain all the nervous

force at their command. They seem not to keep anything in reserve which they can make use of later on at their leisure. They have indeed candid and open-hearted traits, which sometimes seem wanting in the Orientals; but they certainly lack the profound depth of the latter, who never seem to be enthusiastic, clamorous, or irrepressible. The teaching of Lao-tze or that of the *Bhagavadgita* was not surely intended for the Western nations. Of course, there are exceptions in the West as well as in the East. Generally speaking, however, the West is energetic and the East mystical; for the latter's ideal is to be incomprehensible, immeasurable, and undemonstrative even as absolute being. And the practice of *dhyana* may be considered in a way one of the methods of realizing this ideal.

“In the *Candradipa-samadhi Sutra*, the benefits of *dhyana* practice are enumerated as follows: (1) When a man practises *dhyana* according to the regulation, all his senses become calm and serene, and, without knowing it on his part, he begins to enjoy the habit. (2) Loving-kindness will take possession of his heart, which then, freeing itself from sinfulness, looks upon all sentient beings as his brothers and sisters. (3) Such poisonous and harassing passions as anger, infatuation, avarice, etc. gradually retire from the field of consciousness. (4) Having a close watch over all the senses, *dhyana* guards them against the intrusion of evils. (5) Being pure in heart and serene in disposition, the practiser of *dhyana* feels no inordinate appetite in lower passions. (6) The mind being concentrated on higher thoughts, all sorts of temptation and attachment and egoism are kept away. (7) Though he well knows the emptiness of vanity, he does not fall into the snare of nihilism. (8) However entangling the nets of birth and death, he is well aware of the way to deliverance therefrom. (9) Having fathomed the deepest depths of the Dharma, he abides in the wisdom of Buddha. (10) As he is not disturbed by any temptation, he feels like an eagle

that, having escaped from imprisonment, freely wings his flight through the air.

"The practice of *dhyana* is often confounded with a trance or self-hypnotism—a grave error which I here propose to refute. The difference between the two is patent to every clear-sighted mind, for a trance is a pathological disturbance of consciousness, while *dhyana* is a perfectly normal state of it. Trance is a kind of self-illusion, which is entirely subjective and cannot be objectively verified; but *dhyana* is a state of consciousness in which all mental powers are kept in equilibrium, so that no one thought or faculty is made predominant over others. It is like the pacification of turbulent waters by pouring oil over them. In a smooth, glossy mirror of immense dimension no waves are roaring, no foam is boiling, no splashes are spattering. And it is in this perfect mirror of consciousness that myriads of reflections, as it were, come and go without ever disturbing its serenity. In trances certain mental and physiological functions are unduly accelerated while others are kept altogether in abeyance, the whole system of consciousness thus being thrown into disorder; and its outcome is the loss of equilibrium in the organism, which is the very opposite to what is attained through the practice of *dhyana*.

"Again, some superficial critics think that Buddhist *dhyana* is a sort of intense meditation on some highly abstract thoughts, and that the concentration, which works in the same way as self-hypnotism, leads the mind to the state of trance called Nirvana. This is a very grievous error committed by those who have never comprehended the essence of religious consciousness, for Buddhist *dhyana* has nothing to do with abstraction or self-hypnosis. What it proposes to accomplish is to make our consciousness realize the inner reason of the universe which abides in our minds. *Dhyana* strives to make us acquainted with the most concrete and, withal, the most

universal fact of life. It is the philosopher's business to deal with dry, lifeless, uninteresting generalizations. Buddhists are not concerned with things like that. They want to see the fact directly, and not through the medium of philosophical abstractions. There may be a god who created heaven and earth, or there may not; we might be saved by simply believing in his goodness, or we might not; the destination of evil-doers may be hell and that of good men paradise, or, this may be reversed. True Buddhists do not trouble themselves with such propositions as these. Let them well alone; Buddhists are not so idle and superficial as to waste their time in pondering over the questions which have no vital concern with our religious life. Buddhists through *dhyana* endeavour to reach the bottom of things, and there to grasp with their own hands the very life of the universe, which makes the sun rise in the morning, makes the bird cheerfully sing in the balmy spring breeze, and also makes the biped called man hunger for love, righteousness, liberty, truth and goodness. In *dhyana*, therefore, there is nothing abstract, nothing dry as a bone and cold as a corpse, but all animation, all activity and eternal revelation.

"Some Hindu philosophers, however, seem to have considered hallucinations and self-suggested states of mind as real, and the attainment of them as the aim of *dhyana* practice. Their conception of the eightfold *dhyana*-heaven in which all sorts of angels are living is evidence of it. When the mythical beings in those regions practise *dhyana*, they enter into different stages of *samadhi*. They (1) come to think that they are lifted up in the air like a cloud; (2) they feel the presence of some indescribable luminosity; (3) they experience a supernatural joy; (4) their minds become so clarified and transparent as to reflect all the worlds like a very brilliant mirror; (5) they feel as if the soul has escaped bodily confinement and expanded itself to the immensity of space; (6) they now come back to a definite state of consciousness, in which all mental functions are presented, and the past and present and future reveal themselves; (7) they then have the feeling of

absolute nothingness, in which not a ripple of mentation stirs; (8) lastly, they are not conscious of anything particular, nor have they lost consciousness, and here they are said to have reached the highest stage of *samadhi*.

"But, according to Buddhism, all these visionary phenomena as the outcome of *dhyana* are rejected, for they have nothing to do with the realization of the religious life. In the *Surangama Sutra* fifty abnormal conditions of consciousness are mentioned against which the practiser of *dhyana* has to guard himself, and among them we find those psychological aberrations mentioned above."

LITERATURE

Zen is very prolific in writings though it claims to be an avowed enemy of letters. It has produced many learned scholars to whom we are indebted for our being able to trace every stage of its historical development. Among many books treating of the history of Zen thought we must mention the following as the most important: *Records of the Transmission of the Lamp*, which was compiled early in the Sung dynasty. It is in Japanese known as *Keitoku Dento Roku* and in Chinese as *Ching-teh Chuan-teng Lu*. Bodhidharma, who is traditionally regarded as the first Chinese patriarch of the Zen Sect, left some writings, though their historical accuracy cannot be guaranteed. They are collected under the title of *The Six Essays of Shoshitsu* (*Shoshitsu Rokumon Shu* in Japanese and *Shao-shih Liu-men Chi* in Chinese). Seng-tsan, the third Patriarch, has a metrical composition known as "*Inscription on the Believing Mind*" (*Shinjin no Mei*, *Hsin-hsin Ming*), and Hui-neng, the sixth Patriarch, has a book compiled by his disciples with the title *The Platform Sutra on the Dharma-treasure* (*Hobo Dangyo*, *Fa-pao Tan-ching*). The following two works, respectively by Daishu Yekai (Tai-chu Hui-hai, of the eighth century) and Obaku Kiun (Huang-po Hsi-yun of the ninth century), are important contributions to the study of Zen thought: *On the Essentials of Sudden Enlightenment*

II. ZEN BUDDHISM (1938)

IN MORE than two hundred years of quiet and steady development since its introduction in the sixth century by Bodhidharma (Jap: Bodaidaruma or simply Daruma) from the West, that is, from Southern India, Zen Buddhism established itself firmly in the land of Confucianism and Taoism. Zen is proffered as a teaching which is:

A special transmission outside the Scriptures,
Not depending upon the letter,
But pointing directly to the Mind,
And leading us to see into the Nature itself, thereby
making us attain Buddhahood.

By whom and when this declaration was first formulated is not known, but it was during the early part of the T'ang dynasty that Zen really began to take hold of the Chinese mind. The laying of its foundation is traditionally ascribed to Bodhidharma, but it was Yeno (Hui-neng) and his followers in the T'ang dynasty who developed it as an independent Buddhist school and a great spiritual power. It was they who emphasized that it did not depend on the letter, that is, intellection, but directly seized upon the Mind itself, which is Reality.

I propose to analyse this four-line declaration, and see what constitutes the essentials of Zen teaching.

When Zen claims to be "a special transmission outside the Scriptures", we may take this to imply the existence of an esoteric teaching in Buddhism which came to be known as Zen. But the phrase simply means that Zen is not dependent on the letter or the Scriptures, which here stand for conceptualism, and all that the term implies. Zen abhors words and concepts, and reasoning based on them. We have been misled from the first rising of consciousness to resort too much to ratiocination for the prehension of Reality. We tend to regard ideas and words

as facts in themselves, and this way of thinking has entered deeply into the constitution of our consciousness. We now imagine that when we have ideas and words we have all that can be said of our experience of Reality. This means that we take words for Reality itself and neglect experience to reach what really constitutes our inmost experience.

Zen upholds, as every true religion must, the direct experience of Reality. It aspires to drink from the fountain of life itself instead of merely listening to remarks about it. A Zen follower is not satisfied until he scoops with his own hands the living waters of Reality, which alone, as he knows, will quench his thirst. This idea is well expressed in the *Gandavyuha Sutra*, the Chinese version of which is known as "the forty-volume Kegon". The following dialogue between Sudhana and Sucandra is quoted from the Chinese version (Fas. XXXII), for the Sanskrit text, as we now have it, lacks this portion altogether. When Sudhana, the youthful pilgrim, comes to Sucandra, the householder, he begins by asking him, as he asks every teacher he visits in his long and arduous spiritual pilgrimage: "I have already awakened my mind to the supreme incomparable Enlightenment, but I am not yet learned enough to discipline myself in the life of the Bodhisattva or to come to the realization of it. Pray tell me about it."

When Sudhana was impressed by Sucandra's attainment of what he called emancipation by immaculate Prajna-light, he expressed his earnest desire to know it.

Sucandra said: "A man comes to this emancipation face to face when his mind is in Prajnaparamita, and stands in intimate correspondence with it; for then he attains self-realization in all that he perceives and understands."

Sudhana: "Does one attain self-realization by listening to talks and discourses on Prajnaparamita?"

Sucandra: "That is not so. Why? Because Prajnaparamita sees intimately into the truth and reality of all things."

Sudhana: "Is it not that thinking comes from hearing and that by thinking and reasoning one comes to perceive what suchness is, thereby attaining self-realization?"

Sucandra: "That is not so. Self-realization never comes from mere listening and thinking. O son of a good family, I will illustrate the matter by analogy. Listen! In a great desert there are no springs or wells; in the spring-time or in the summer, when it is warm, a traveller comes from the west going eastward; he meets a man coming from the east and asks him: 'I am terribly thirsty; pray tell where I can find a spring and cool refreshing shade where I may drink, bathe, rest, and get thoroughly revived?'

"The man from the east gives the traveller, as desired, all the information in detail, saying: 'When you go further east the road divides itself into two, right and left. You take the right one, and going steadily further on you will surely come to a fine spring and refreshing shade.' Now, son of a good family, do you think that the thirsty traveller from the west, listening to the talk about the spring and the shady trees, and thinking of going to that place as quickly as possible, can be relieved of thirst and heat and get refreshed?"

Sudhana: "No, he cannot; because he is relieved of thirst and heat and gets refreshed only when, as directed by the other, he actually reaches the fountain and drinks of it and bathes in it."

Sucandra: "Son of a good family, even so with the Bodhisattva. By merely listening to it, thinking of it, and intellectually understanding it, you will never come to the realization of any truth. Son of a good family, the desert means birth and death; the man from the west means all sentient beings; the heat means all forms of confusion, thirst, greed and lust; the man from the east who knows the way is the Buddha or the Bodhisattva, who abiding in all-knowledge has penetrated into the true nature of all things and the reality of sameness; to quench the thirst and to be relieved of the heat by drinking of the refreshing fountain means the realization of the truth by oneself.

"Again, son of a good family, I will give you another illustration. Suppose the Tathagata had stayed among us for another kalpa and used all kinds of contrivance and, by means of fine rhetoric and apt expressions, had succeeded in convincing the people of this world as to the exquisite taste, delicious flavour, soft touch, and other virtues of the heavenly nectar; do you think that all the earthly beings who listened to the Buddha's talk and thought of the nectar could taste its flavour?"

Sudhana: "No, indeed; not they."

Sucandra: "Because mere listening and thinking will never make us realize the true nature of Prajnaparamita."

Sudhana: "By what apt expressions and skilful illustrations, then, can the Bodhisattva lead all beings to the true understanding of Reality?"

Sucandra: "The true nature of Prajnaparamita as realized by the Bodhisattva is the true cause of all his expressions. When this emancipation is realized he can aptly give expression to it and skilfully illustrate it."¹

From this it is evident that whatever apt expressions and skilful contrivances the Bodhisattva may use in his work among us, they must come out of his own experience, and also that, however believing we may be, we cannot cherish real faith until we experience it in our own lives and make it grow out of them.

Again, we read in the *Lankavatara Sutra*: "The ultimate truth (*Paramartha*) is a state of inner experience by means of Noble Wisdom (*Aryavijna*), and as it is beyond the ken of words and discriminations it cannot be adequately expressed by them. Whatever is thus expressible is the product of conditional causation to the law of birth and death. The ultimate truth transcends the antithesis of self and not-self, and words are the products of antithetical thinking. The ultimate truth is Mind itself, which is free from all forms, inner and outer. No words can therefore describe Mind, no discriminations can reveal it."²

¹ An abstract from the Chinese translation of the *Gandavyuha Sutra*, popularly known as the 'Forty-volume Kegon' by Prajna, a Professor of the Tripitaka during the T'ang dynasty.

² See my English translation of the *sutra*.

Discrimination is a term we frequently come across in Buddhist philosophy. It corresponds to intellection or logical reasoning. According to Buddhism, the antithesis of "A" and "not-A" is at the bottom of our ignorance as to the ultimate truth of existence, and this antithesis is discrimination. To discriminate is to be involved in the whirlpool of birth and death, and as long as we are thus involved, there is no emancipation, no attainment of Nirvana, no realization of Buddhahood.

We may ask: "How is this emancipation possible? And does Zen achieve it?"

When we say that we live, it means that we live in this world of dualities and antitheses. Therefore to be emancipated from this world may mean to go out of it, or to deny it by some means, if possible. To do either of these is to put ourselves out of existence. Emancipation is, then, we can say, self-destruction. Does Buddhism teach self-destruction? This kind of interpretation has often been advanced by those who fail to understand the real teaching of Buddhism.

The fact is that this interpretation is not yet an "emancipated" one, and falls short of the Buddhist logic of non-discrimination. This is where Zen comes in, asserting its own way of being "outside the Scripture" and "independent of the letter". The following *mondo* will illustrate my point:

Sekiso (Shih-shuang) asked Dogo:¹ "After your passing, if somebody asks me about the ultimate truth of Buddhism, what shall I say?"

Dogo made no answer but called out to one of his attendants. The attendant answered: "Yes, master"; and the master said: "Have the pitcher filled with water." So ordering, he remained silent for a while, and then turning to Sekiso said: "What did you ask me about just now?" Sekiso repeated his question. Whereupon the master rose from his seat and walked away.

Sekiso was a good Buddhist student and no doubt understood thoroughly the teaching as far as his intel-

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XV, "Sekiso".

lectual understanding went. What he wanted when he questioned his master concerning the ultimate truth of Buddhism was to grasp it in the Zen way. The master was well aware of the situation. If he had wished to explain the matter for Sekiso along the philosophical line of thought he could, of course, have given citations from the Scriptures, and entered into wordy explanations of them. But he was a Zen master; he knew the uselessness and fruitlessness of such a procedure. So he called to his attendant, who immediately responded. He ordered him to fill the pitcher and the deed was immediately done. He was silent for a while, for he had nothing further to say or to do. The ultimate truth of Buddhism could not go beyond this.

But Dogo was kindhearted, indeed too kindhearted, and asked Sekiso what his question was. Sekiso was, however, not intelligent enough to see into the meaning of the entire transaction which had taken place before his eyes. He stupidly repeated his question which was already answered. Hence the master's departure from the room. In fact, this abrupt departure itself told Sekiso all that he wished to know.

Some may say that this kind of answering leads the questioner nowhere, for he remains ignorant just as much as before, perhaps even worse than before. But does a philosophical or explanatory definition give the questioner any better satisfaction—that is, put him in any better position as to real understanding of the ultimate truth? He may have his conceptual stock of knowledge much augmented, but this augmentation is not the clearing up of his doubt—that is, the confirmation of his faith in Buddhism. Mere amassing of knowledge, mere stocking of time-worn concepts, is really suicidal in so far as real emancipation is concerned. We are too used to so-called explanations, and have come to think that when an explanation of a thing is given there is nothing more to ask about it. But there is no better explanation than actual experience, and actual experience is all that is needed in the attainment of Buddhahood. The object of

the Buddhist life is to have it in actual actuality and in full abundance, and this not loaded with explanatory notes.

To give another Zen way of treating this problem: Tokusan (Teh-shan) once remarked: "To ask is an error, but not to ask is also faulty." This is tantamount to saying: "To be or not to be—that is the question." This questioning has indeed been the curse or the blessing of human consciousness ever since it came into existence. A monk came out of the congregation and proceeded to bow before Tokusan, as was customary for a disciple when he was about to ask instruction of the master. But Tokusan struck him, without even waiting for him to finish his bowing. The monk naturally failed to understand him and made his protest: "I am just beginning to bow before you, O Master, and why this striking?" The Master lost no time before saying: "Nothing is gained by my waiting for you to speak."¹

From the so-called "religious" point of view there is nothing in this or, for that matter, in the previous *mondo* that savours of piety, faith, grace, love, and so on. Where, then, is the religiosity of Zen Buddhism? I am not going to discuss this question here. I only wish to remark that Buddhism, including Zen and all other schools, has a different set of terms wherewith its followers express their spiritual experience in accordance with their psychology and way of thinking and feeling.

We now come to the second two lines of the Zen declaration: "Pointing directly to one's own Mind, and seeing into the Nature, which is the attainment of Buddhahood." What are "Mind", "Nature", and "Buddha"?

"Mind" here does not refer to our ordinarily functioning mind, the mind that thinks according to the laws of logic and feels according to the psychology described by the professors, but the Mind that lies underneath these thoughts and feelings. It is *Cittamatra*, the subject of talk in the Lankavatara Sutra. This mind is also known as Nature, i.e. Reality (*Svabhava*), that which constitutes the

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XV, "Tokusan".

basis of all things. The Mind may be regarded as the last point we reach when we dig down psychologically into the depths of a thinking and feeling subject, while the Nature is the limit of objectivity beyond which our ontology cannot go. The ontological limit is the psychological limit, and vice versa; for when we reach the one, we find ourselves in the other. The starting point differs; in the one we retreat inwardly, as it were, but in the other we go on outwardly, and in the end we arrive at what might be called the point of identity. When we have the Mind, we have the Nature: when the Nature is understood, the Mind is understood; they are one and the same.

The one who has a thoroughgoing understanding of the Mind and whose every movement is in perfect accordance with the Nature is the Buddha—"he who is enlightened". The Buddha is the Nature personified. Thus we can say that all these three items—Nature, Mind, and Buddha—are the different points of reference; as we shift our positions, we speak in terms of respective orders. The ideal of Zen as expressed in its four-line declaration is directly to take hold of Reality without being bothered by any interrupting agency, intellectual, moral, ritualistic, or what not.

This direct holding of Reality is the awakening of Prajna, which may be rendered as "transcendental wisdom". Prajna awakened or attained is Prajna-paramita (in Japanese *Hannya-haramitsu*). This transcendental wisdom gives the solution to all the questions we are capable of asking about our spiritual life. Wisdom is not, therefore, the intellect we ordinarily know; it transcends dialectics of all kinds. It is not the analytical process of reasoning, it does not work step by step; it leaps over the abyss of contradiction and mutual checking. Hence *Paramita*, "reaching the other shore".

As the awakening of Prajna is the leaping over an intellectual impasse it is an act of Will. Yet as it sees into the Nature itself, there is a noetic quality in it. Prajna is both Will and Intuition. This is the reason why Zen is

strongly associated with the cultivation of the will-power. To cut asunder the bonds of ignorance and discrimination is no easy task; unless it is done with the utmost exertion of the will, it can never be accomplished. To let go the hold of a solitary branch of the tree, called intellect, which outstretches over a precipice, and to allow ourselves to fall into a supposedly bottomless abyss—does this not require a desperate effort on the part of one who attempts to sound the depths of the Mind? When a Zen Buddhist monk was asked as to the depths of the Zen river while he was walking over a bridge, he at once seized the questioner and would have thrown him into the rapids had not his friends hurriedly interceded for him. The monk wanted to see the questioner himself go down to the bottom of Zen and survey its depths according to his own measure. The leaping is to be done by oneself; all the help outsiders can offer is to let the person concerned realize the futility of such help. Zen in this respect is harsh and merciless, at least superficially so.

The monk who was trying to throw the questioner over the bridge was a disciple of Rinzai (Lin-chi), one of the greatest masters in the T'ang history of Zen in China. When this monk, who was still a stranger to Zen, asked the master Rinzai what was the ultimate teaching of Buddhism, the master came down from his seat and, taking hold of the monk, exclaimed: "Speak! Speak!" How could the poor bewildered novice in the study of Zen, thus seized by the throat and violently shaken, speak? He wanted to hear the master "speak" instead of his "speaking" in regard to this question. He never imagined his master to be so "direct", and did not know what to say or do. He stood as if in ecstasy. It was only when he was about to bow before the master, as reminded by his fellow-monks, that a realization came to him as to the meaning of the Scripture and the demand to "speak". Even when an intellectual explanation is given, the understanding is an inner growth and not an external addition. This must be much more the case with the Zen understanding. The basic principle, therefore, underlying the

whole fabric of Zen is directed towards the self-maturing of an inner experience. Those who are used to intellectual training or moral persuasion or devotional exercises no doubt find in Zen discipline something extraordinary which goes against their expectations. But this is where Zen is unique in the whole history of religion. Zen has developed along this line ever since the T'ang era when Baso (Ma-tsu) and Sekito (Shih-t'ou) brought out fully the characteristic features of the Zen form of Buddhism. The main idea is to live within the thing itself and thus to understand it. What we generally do in order to understand a thing is to describe it from outside, to talk about it objectively as the philosopher would have it, and to try to carry out this method from every possible point of observation except that of inner assimilation or sympathetic merging. The objective method is intellectual and has its field of useful application. Only let us not forget the fact that there is another method which alone gives the key to an effective and all-satisfying understanding. The latter is the method of Zen.

The following few examples illustrate the Zen method for the understanding of Buddhism. Zen, being a form of Buddhism, has no specific philosophy of its own except what is usually accepted by the Buddhists of the Mahayana school. What makes Zen so distinctive is its method, which is the inevitable growth of Zen's own attitude towards life and truth.

Shodai Yero (Chao-t'i Hui-lang, 738-824), who wished to know Zen, came to Baso, and Baso asked: "What made you come here?"

"I wish to have a knowledge of the Buddha."

"No knowledge can be had of him; knowledge belongs to the devil."

As the monk failed to grasp the meaning of this, the master directed him to go to Sekito, a contemporary leader of Zen, who he suggested might enlighten the knowledge-seeking monk. When Yero came to Sekito, he asked: "Who is the Buddha?"

"You have no Buddha-nature," the master said.

"How about the animals?" demanded the monk.

"They have."

"Why not I?", which was the natural question issuing from an extremely puzzled mind.

"Just because you negate yourself."¹

This, it is said, opened the mind of Yero to the truth asserted by both Sekito and Baso.

Superficially considered, there is no logical consistency in the remarks of these masters. Why does knowledge belong to the devil? Why is not the monk endowed with the Buddha-nature when, according to Buddhist philosophy, it is taught that all beings are in possession of the Buddha-nature and that because of this fact they are all destined to attain Buddhahood? But that we are all Buddhas or that we are endowed with the Buddha-nature is the statement of a fact and not at all the inference reached by means of logical reasoning. The fact comes first and the reasoning follows, and not conversely. This being so, the Zen master desires to see his disciples come into actual personal touch with the fact itself and then to build up, if they wish, any system of thought based on their experience.

Shinro (Chen-lang), another master, came to Sekito and asked: "What is the idea of Bodhi-Dharma's coming over to China from the West [that is, from India]?" This question was asked frequently in the early days of Zen history in China. The meaning is the same as asking: "What is the truth of Buddhism?"

Said Sekito: "Ask the post standing there."

The monk confessed: "I fail to understand."

"My ignorance exceeds yours," said Sekito.

The last remark made the monk realize the purport of the whole *mondo*.²

One or two more instances on ignorance follow. When Sekito saw Yakusan (Yao-shan) absorbed in meditation, Sekito asked: "What are you doing there?"

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XIV, "Tanshu Shodai Yero".

² *Op cit.*, Fas. XIV, "Shinro of the Uokoku-ji Chosa".

"I am not doing anything," replied Yakusan.

"If so, you are sitting in idleness."

"Sitting in idleness is doing something."

"You say you are not doing anything," Sekito pursued further; "but what is that anything which you are not doing?"

"Even the ancient sages know not," was the conclusion given by Yakusan.¹

Sekito (700-790) was one of the younger disciples of Yeno (Hui-neng) and finished his study of Zen under Gyoshi, of Seigen. He was once asked by his monk, Dogo: "Who has attained to the understanding of Yeno's doctrine?"

"One who understands Buddhism."

"Have you then attained it?"

"No, I do not understand Buddhism."²

The strange situation created by Zen is that those who understand it do not understand it, and those who do not understand it understand it—a great paradox, indeed, which runs throughout the history of Zen.

"What is the essential point of Buddhism?"

"Unless you have it, you do not understand."

"Is there any further turning when one thus goes on?"

"A white cloud is free to float about anywhere it lists—ininitely vast is the sky."³

To explain this in a more rational manner I may add that Buddhism teaches that all is well where it is; but as soon as a man steps out to see if he is all right or not, an error is committed which leads to an infinite series of negations and affirmations, and he has to make peace within. To Eckhart every morning is "Good Morning" and every day a blessed day. This is our personal experience. When we are saved, we know what it is. However much we inquire about it, salvation never comes.

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp.*

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

III. AN INTERPRETATION OF ZEN-EXPERIENCE (1939)

THE philosophy of Zen Buddhism is that of Mahayana Buddhism, for it is no more than a development of the latter. But the development took place among a people whose psychology or mentality widely varies from the Indian mind whose product Buddhism is. As I view it, Buddhism, after Nagarjuna and Vasubandhu and their immediate followers, could not continue its healthy growth any longer in its original soil; it had to be transplanted if it was to develop a most important aspect which had hitherto been altogether neglected—and because of this neglect its vitality was steadily being impaired. The most important aspect of Mahayana Buddhism which unfolded itself in the mental climate of China was Zen. While China failed to perfect the Kegon (or Avatamsaka) or the Tendai system of Mahayana thought, she produced Zen. This was really a unique contribution of the Chinese genius to the history of mental culture generally, and it was due to the Japanese that the true spirit of Zen has been scrupulously kept alive and that its technique has been completed.

When it is asked what Zen is, it is very difficult to give an answer satisfactory to the ordinary questioner. For instance, when you ask whether Zen is a philosophy or a religious faith, we cannot say it is either, as far as we understand these two terms in their usual sense. Zen has no thought-system of its own; it liberally uses Mahayana terminology; it refuses to commit itself to any specified pattern of thinking. Nor is it a faith, for it does not urge us to accept any dogma or creed or an object of worship. It is true that it has temples and monasteries where images of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas (would-be Buddhas) are enshrined in some specially sanctified quarters, but the monks do not hesitate to treat them uncereemoniously when they find it more useful for the elucidation of their subject matter. What the Zen masters stress most

is a certain kind of experience, and this experience is to express itself in ways most characteristic of Zen. Those ways, they consider, constitute the essential features of Zen as differentiated from the other schools of Buddhism, as well as from all religious or philosophical thought-systems of the world. What modern students of Zen have to do is to make a thorough examination of Zen-experience itself and of the ways in which the experience has expressed itself in history.

2

To study Zen means to have Zen-experience, for without the experience there is no Zen one can study. But mere experience means to be able to communicate it to others; the experience ceases to be vital unless it is adequately expressible. A dumb experience is not human. To experience is to be self-conscious. Zen-experience is complete only when it is backed by Zen-consciousness and finds expression in one way or another. In the following I will attempt to give a clue to the understanding of Zen-consciousness.

Daian (died 883), the Zen master of Dai-i San, once gave this to his congregation: "(The conception of) being and non-being is like the wistaria winding round the tree."

Sozan, hearing this, lost no time in undertaking a long journey, for he wished to find out the meaning of Daian's most enigmatic statement. Seeing the master engaged in making a mud-wall, he approached and asked: "(The conception of) being and non-being is like the wistaria winding around the tree; did you really say that?"

The master said: "Yes, my friend."

Sozan queried: "When the tree is suddenly broken down and the wistaria withers, what happens?"

The master threw up his mud-carrying board and laughing loudly walked away towards his living quarters. Sozan followed and protested: "O Master, I come from

a remote district three thousand *li* away, I have sold my clothing to pay for the travelling expenses, and this for no other purpose than to get enlightened on this subject. Why do you make fun of me?"

The master felt pity for the poor monk and told his attendant to gather up money enough for his return trip. He then turned toward Sozan, saying: "Some day you may happen to see a master who is known as 'One-eyed Dragon' and he will make you see into the matter."

Later, Sozan came to Myosho and told him about the interview he had with Daian of Dai-i San. Myosho said: "Daian is all right through and through, only he misses one who really understands his mind." Sozan now proposed the same question to Myosho, saying: "What happens when the tree is broken down and the wistaria withers?" Myosho said: "You make Daian renew his laughter!" This made Sozan at once comprehend the meaning of the whole affair, and he exclaimed: "After all there is a dagger in Daian's laughter." He reverentially bowed in the direction of Dai-i San.

3

In this account, what strikes one most is the disparity between the question and the answer, for as far as our common sense or logic allows us to see, no connection whatever exists between the statement concerning being and non-being and the master's laughter or, as is given later on, Yengo's repetition of his own master. The question in regard to being and non-being is a philosophical one dealing with abstract ideas. All our thoughts start from the opposition between being and non-being; without this antithesis no reasoning can be carried on, and therefore the question is a fundamental one: "What will become of our thought-system when the conception of being and non-being is wiped out?" When the tree dies, naturally the wistaria withers. Being is possible only with non-being, and conversely. This world of particulars is

for the most fundamental experience, have an insatiable longing for a spiritual rest which may not necessarily yield to logical treatment. In other words, we cannot wait for a perfect thought-system which will solve most satisfactorily all the mysteries of life and the world; we impatiently aspire for something more practical and of immediate utility. Religion talks of faith, teaching that God somehow takes care of us, all the intellectual difficulties notwithstanding. Let the antithesis of being and non-being remain as it is; for what is beyond our intellectual comprehension may best be left in the hands of God. The faith that somehow or other things are all well with God, in whom we have our being, delivers us from doubts and worries.

The Zen way of deliverance, however, is not that of religion; to be free from doubts and worries, Zen appeals to a certain inner experience and not to a blind acceptance of dogmas. Zen expects us to experience within ourselves that the suchness of things—the antithesis of being and non-being—is beyond the ken of intellectual painting or dialectical delineation, and that no amount of words can succeed in describing, that is, reasoning out, the what and why of life and the world. This may sound negative and may not be of positive use to our spiritual life. But the real trouble with us whenever we try to talk about things beyond intellection is that we always make our start from intellection itself, although this may be natural and inevitable; therefore, when Zen-experience and other such things are talked about they sound empty as if they had no positive value. But Zen proposes that we effect a complete *volte-face* and take our stand first on Zen-experience itself and then observe things—the world of being and non-being—from the point of view of the experience itself. This is what may be designated as an absolute standpoint. The usual order of things is hereby reversed; what was positive becomes negative and what was negative becomes positive. “Emptiness” is reality and “reality” is emptiness. Flowers are no longer red, and the willow leaves are no longer green. We are no longer a

plaything of *karma*, of "cause and effect", of birth and death; values of the changing world are no longer permanent ones; what we consider good or bad from the worldly point of view is neither good nor bad, for it has only a relative value. Logically, too, the antithesis of being and non-being holds good only for our relative knowledge, for our discursive understanding. After the Zen-experience, an entirely new order of things takes place, a complete change of front is effected, and the result is that a relative world of changes and multiplicities is contemplated *sub specie aeternitatis*. This in a way may be considered the meaning of "No paintings, no delineations can do justice to it".

10

Can we say, then, that Zen teaches a kind of mystical contemplation of life and the world? Before this is answered, let me make a further remark about Yengo and Goso, who also had a great deal to do, as we saw, with the problem of being and non-being.

When Yengo asked Goso concerning the breaking down of the tree and the withering of the wistaria, Goso emphatically declared: "You are caught in your own trap." The truth is that the Zen-experience by itself is not enough; it must be elaborated by means of Zen-consciousness or Zen-dialectic, if it is to be articulate and communicable not only to others but to oneself. The experience needs to be rationalized, as it were; it wants to speak out. It wants to assert itself, to be conscious of itself; and to do this, Zen has its own way, has opened up quite a unique one—absolutely unique, we may say. Where no paintings, no drawings can portray a perfect world of Zen-experience, how can we speak of being and non-being, of tree and wistaria, of birth and death, of synthesis and antithesis, of immanence and transcendence, of destruction and construction, of breaking down and withering and being reduced to nothingness? All these

ideas and categories are so many instruments we have devised for our own convenience in this world of action and work; but unless we know how to make use of them as occasion requires, they turn against us and trap us; that is, we are ensnared and enslaved by them. When the Zen-experience is not properly made articulate it becomes an instrument of mischief. The experience is a double-edged sword, requiring careful handling, and in this handling Zen follows its own tradition, which first originated in the philosophy of Mahayana Buddhism and later managed to follow up the channel of Chinese psychology.

II

I am not certain whether Zen can be identified with mysticism. Mysticism as it is understood in the West starts generally with an antithesis and ends with its unification or identification. If there is an antithesis, Zen accepts it as it is, and makes no attempt to unify it. Instead of starting with dualism or pluralism, Zen wants us to have a Zen-experience, and with this experience it surveys a world of suchness. It has adopted Mahayana terminology, it is true, but it has the tendency to resort to concrete objects and happenings. It does not reduce them to oneness—which is an abstraction. When all things are reduced to oneness, it asks to what this One is reducible. If all comes from God, lives in God, and returns to God, Zen wants to know where this God is or lives. If the whole world with all its multiplicities is absorbed into Brahman, Zen asks us to point out the whereabouts of Brahman. If the soul survives the body, Zen calls on you to locate the soul or to bring it out before us.

A master was asked where he might be found after his death, and he said: "Lying on my back in the wilderness, my limbs pointing straight up to the sky!" When another master was asked about the immutability of Nirvana, he replied: "The fallen leaves follow the running

stream while the autumnal moon rises above the solitary peak." Another appeared in the pulpit apparently ready to give a sermon, but as soon as he mounted it, he declared that his discourse was over, saying: "Fare well!" After a while he resumed: "If there is any who has no understanding yet, let him come out." A monk made an advance toward the master and bowed down reverentially, whereupon the master, raising his voice, said, "How painful!" The monk stood up and was about to propose a question, but the master cried "Ho!" and drove him out. When another monk approached, saying: "What is the most wonderful word [expressing the highest truth]?", the master merely remarked: "What say you?" Going carefully over all these *mondo* (dialogues), where do we find traces of mysticism in Zen? The masters give no hint whatever as to the annihilation or absorption of the self in the absolute, or the casting of the world into the abyss of Nirvana.

12

Mystics, I believe, generally agree with this characterization of God: "God is not an 'object' for human understanding. He utterly transcends knowledge, and everything one says of Him is untrue." "'Be still,' Eckhart says in a sermon, 'and prate not of God (i.e. the Godhead), for whatever you prate in words about Him is a lie and is sinful.' 'If I say God is good, it is not true; for what is good can grow better; what can grow better can grow best. Now these three things (good, better, best) are far from God, for He is above all,' i.e. all such distinctions. No word that voices distinctions or characteristics, then, may be spoken of the Godhead. Eckhart's favourite names are: 'the Wordless Godhead'; 'the Nameless Nothing'; 'the Naked Godhead'; 'the Immovable Rest'; 'the Still Wilderness, where no one is at home.'" (Rufus Jones, *Studies in Mystical Religion* (London 1909), pp. 225-226.)

However mystical one may be, one cannot avoid using

the term "God" or "Godhead" or some concept corresponding to it. But this is not so with Zen. Zen avoids, not necessarily deliberately but unavoidably I believe, abstract terms. When the question arises concerning such terms, the Zen master turns them down, making the questioner realize the fact that they have no direct hold on life. Zuigan Shigen asked Ganto (A.D. 829-887): "What is the original eternal reason?"

Ganto: "Moving!"

Zuigan: "What about it when moving?"

Ganto: "It is no more the original eternal reason."

This made Zuigan reflect for some time over the matter. Ganto continued: "When you assert, you are still in the world of senses; when you do not assert, you sink into the ocean of birth and death!"

Ganto does not wish to see his disciple stay with the original eternal reason, nor does he want him to lose the sight of it. He knows that Zen is neither to assert nor to deny, that Zen is the suchness of things. The Zen masters are not mystics and their philosophy is not mysticism.

13

In this respect, Kwasan's answer, which he gave uniformly to the various questions regarding Buddha, Mind, and Truth, is significant.

Kwasan (died 960) used to quote the passage from Sojo's work, *The Sacred Treasure*: "Learning-and-disciplining is called (the stage of) Hearing; non-learning (the stage of) Approximation; and when these two (stages) are transcended, we pass on to (the stage of) Truth."

A monk came up and asked: "What is the stage of Truth?"

The master said: "I know how to beat the drum."

Another time a monk asked: "What is the first principle?"

"I know how to beat the drum."

The master's response was the same when he was

asked by still another monk: "I do not ask you about 'Mind is Buddha', but I wish to know what is meant by 'Not Mind, Not Buddha'."

"I know how to beat the drum," quickly came from the master.

On another occasion, a monk asked: "How would you treat him if a man of the highest attainment should come?"

Still the master would not give up his favourite expression: "I know how to beat the drum."

Let me note here that Kwasan was probably once a drum-beater in his career as a monk, and it is likely that not only did he say, "I know how to beat the drum", but that, so saying, he actually beat the drum, or at least he went through the whole process, keeping time, "Do-ko-dong, do-ko-dong!"

When you say "this" or "that", however abstract and universal it may be, you are singling the particular "that" or "this" out of multiplicities, thus making it one of them. We cannot help this as long as we are what we are, so many "that's", or so many "this's". The only way to escape this infinite regression is actually to beat the drum, or to dance up and down with a rice-bowl, or to sing out loudly "La-la-la!"

A nun called Ryutetsuma one day came to see Isan (died 853), the veteran master. ("Isan" is believed to be the posthumous name of Reiyu who founded a Chinese sub-sect of Zen at Dai-i San or Isan.) The master, seeing her approach, said: "Old Cow, are you come?" This is as if to say: "It is best for an old lady like you to stay home comfortably and enjoy these long spring days. What makes you leave your quiet peaceful hut? An altogether unnecessary tottering out!" The nun, however, announced: "To-morrow they are going to have a great religious function at Taisan. I wonder if you are going

of view we like to take. Zen has added nothing to the sum-total of reality, nor has it subtracted an iota of it. Zen is radical realism rather than mysticism.

We must remember here, however, that Zen does not mean to ignore our moral thoughts, aspirations, and feelings which determine the value of life while on earth. Zen is essentially concerned with the thing most fundamental and most primary, and as to what relates to our worldly lives it leaves all this where it properly belongs. Everything that exclusively belongs, as it were, to the dualistic sphere of existence is taken up by moral philosophy, religion, political science, and other fields of human consciousness, while Zen aims at taking hold of what underlies all these phenomenological activities of the Mind.

15

Rudolf Otto, while referring to Fichte's mysticism together with Eckhart's, which he differentiates from Sankara's, writes: "Thus the true relationship of the man who is saved is for Fichte, as it was for Eckhart: To know that he is one with the One, life with the Life, not united but absolutely unified, and *at the same time*, to stand in this world of multiplicity and division, not straining after its dissolution, but with Eckhart, working righteousness in it, and with Fichte, completing in it the living deed of ethical culture, and thus with both teachers bringing into this very world of non-being and of death, Being and Life. He must do this in such a way that his transcendental possession is itself the very source of power and the impelling force to moral and cultural activity."¹

Even with Eckhart and Fichte, we observe that the basis of their philosophy lies in the dualism of being and non-being, of life and death, oneness and multiplicity.

¹ *Mysticism, East and West*, trans. by Bertah L. Bracey and Richarda C. Payne (New York 1932), p. 230. By permission of The Macmillan Co., Publishers.

let him know. The monk as he was told stepped forward. Baso lost no time in giving him a slap over his ear and said: "The secret's already out."

When these Zen incidents are observed from the point of view of relativity and dualism, they appear to have no sense whatever; but when looked at from the inside, as it were, there looms up the big character, "Zen", which is the key to all the "mysteries" so far cited. What Zen dislikes most is mediation, deliberation, wordiness, and the weighing of advantages. Immediacy is impossible as long as we are onlookers, contemplators, critics, ideamongers, word-manipulators, dualists, or monists. All these faults are corrected and Zen is revealed when we abandon our so-called common-sense or logical attitude and effect a complete about-face, when we plunge right into the working of things as they move on before and behind our senses. It is only when this experience takes place that we can talk intelligently about Zen-consciousness from which the Zen-incidents or Zen-dialogues making up the annals of Zen are produced.

17

Zen therefore is not mysticism, although there may be something in it reminding one of the latter. Zen does not teach absorption, identification, or union, for all these ideas are derived from a dualistic conception of life and the world. In Zen there is a wholeness of things, which refuses to be analysed or separated into antitheses of all kinds. As they say, it is like an iron bar with no holes or handles to swing it about. You have no way to take hold of it; in other words, it cannot be subsumed under any categories. Thus, Zen must be said to be a unique discipline in the history of human culture, religious and philosophical.

Zen often speaks of a flash of lightning as if it valued an instantaneous or instinctive action in dealing with the fundamental problems of life. When somebody asks you

about Buddhahood or Godhead, you strike the questioner, saying: "What a blockheaded fellow of a monk!" There is no time lost between asking and striking, and you may think this is an immediacy, which is Zen. But the fact is far from it. Zen has nothing to do with rapidity or immediacy in the sense of being quick. A flash of lightning refers to the non-mediating nature of Zen-experience.

Zen-experience, one may say, is a kind of intuition which is the basis of mysticism. We have to be careful, however, about the use of the term "intuition". If we make it presuppose the existence of an antithesis of some form, Zen is not this kind of intuition, which we may designate as static or contemplative. If Zen-experience is an act of intuition, it must be distinguished from the static form, and let us call it dynamic or actional. The following Zen-incidents may, I hope, help one to understand what I mean by dynamic intuition which is Zen-experience.

18

So some more Zen-incidents are given here, in order to indicate which way Zen-consciousness tends. They are culled at random from a Zen work known as *The Transmission of the Lamp*. When these incidents are perused thoughtfully and without bias one may be able to come in touch with an invisible thread running through them.

1. An officer once visited Gensha (834-908), who treated him to a dish of cake. The officer asked: "They speak of our not knowing it while using it all the time. What is this 'it'?" Gensha looked as if he were not paying attention to the questioner, for he innocently picked up a piece of cake and offered it to the officer to eat. The latter finished it and repeated the question. The master said: "There you are! It is daily made use of and yet you know it not!"

2. One day Chosa had all his monks work in the field to gather wood. The master said: "You all partake of my power." "If so, why do we all have to work in the

field?"—This came from the monks at work. Chosa reprimanded them, saying: "If you did not all work, how can we gather enough wood for our kitchen?"

3. When Nansai visited Seppo (822-908), the latter made him see Gensha. Gensha said: "Says an ancient master: 'This is the matter I alone have the knowledge of.' What do you say to that?" Nansai replied: "You should know that there is one who does not seek being known." Gensha concluded: "What is the use of your going through so many hardships, then?"

4. A monk asked Gensha: "What is my Self?" Replied Gensha: "What do you want to do with your Self?"

5. A monk came to Gensha and wished to know how he was discoursing on the principle of Zen. Said Gensha: "I have very few listeners." Monk: "I wish to have your direct instruction." "You are not deaf?" came straightway from the master.

6. When Seppo with all his monks was working on the farm, he happened to notice a snake. Lifting it up with a stick, the master called the attention of the whole gathering: "Look, look!" He then slashed it in two with a knife. Gensha came forward, and picking up the slain snake threw it away behind them. He then went on working as if nothing had happened. The whole party was taken aback. Said Seppo: "How brisk!"

7. One day Gensha entered the pulpit, and for a while he sat quietly without saying a word. He then began: "All the kindheartedness I have given out to you without reserve. Do you understand?" A monk ventured the question: "What is the meaning of a perfect silence?" The master said: "No talking in sleep!" Monk: "Please tell, O master, about what concerns us most in Zen." "No use dreaming!" "I may be dreaming, but how about you?" Said the master: "How could you be so senseless as not to know what's what?"

IV. REASON AND INTUITION IN BUDDHIST PHILOSOPHY (1951)

FOR "intuition" Buddhists generally use "*prajna*" (1)¹ and for reason or discursive understanding, *viññana* (2). *Viññana* and *prajna* are always contrasted.

The terminology we have in philosophy does not seem to be sufficient to express what I have in mind, but I will try my best to explain what the Buddhist idea of "intuition" is and, in connection with it, of reason.

Prajna goes beyond *viññana*. We make use of *viññana* in our world of the senses and intellect, which is characterized by dualism in the sense that there is one who sees and there is the other that is seen—the two standing in opposition. In *prajna* this differentiation does not take place; what is seen and the one who sees are identical; the seer is the seen and the seen is the seer. *Prajna* ceases to be *prajna* when it is analysed into two factors as is done in the case of *viññana*. *Prajna* is content with itself. To divide is characteristic of *viññana*, while with *prajna* it is just the opposite. *Prajna* is the self-knowledge of the whole in contrast to *viññana*, which busies itself with parts. *Prajna* is an integrating principle while *viññana* always analyses. *Viññana* cannot work without having *prajna* behind it; parts are parts of the whole; parts never exist by themselves, for if they did they would not be parts—they would even cease to exist. Mere aggregates have no significance, and this is why in Buddhist philosophy all *dhammas* (elements) (3), when they are regarded as individual existences, are declared to have no *atman* (4). The *atman* is a unifying principle, and the idea is that, as long as all *dhammas* are conceived without any reference to that which unifies them, they are just disconnected parts, that is, they are non-existent. *Prajna* is needed to make them coherent, articulate, and significant. The Buddhist conception of impermanence and suffering is not to be

¹ For Notes see p. 124.

explained merely from the moral and phenomenological points of view. It has an epistemological background. *Vijnana* without *prajna* kills; it works for individualization and, by making each individual disconnected with others, *vijnana* makes them all impermanent and subject to the law of *karma*. It is by *prajna* that all *dharma*s are observable from a unitive point of view and acquire a new life and significance.

Prajna is ever seeking unity on the grandest possible scale, so that there could be no further unity in any sense; whatever expressions or statements it makes are thus naturally beyond the order of *vijnana*. *Vijnana* subjects them to intellectual analysis, trying to find something comprehensible according to its own measure. But *vijnana* cannot do this for the obvious reason that *prajna* starts from where *vijnana* cannot penetrate. *Vijnana*, being the principle of differentiation, can never see *prajna* in its oneness, and it is because of the nature of *vijnana* that *prajna* proves utterly baffling to it.

To illustrate this point let us see what kind of statements *prajna* will make when it is left to itself without the interference of *vijnana*. One statement which is very common is: "I am not I, therefore I am I." This is the thread of thought running through the Buddhist *sutras* known as the "*Prajnaparamita*" (5), consisting of six hundred "volumes" in Chinese translation. In the *Diamond Sutra* (6), belonging to the *Prajnaparamita* class, we have this: "What is known as *prajna* is not *prajna*, therefore it is known as *prajna*." When this is rendered into popular language it takes this form: "I am empty-handed and, behold, the spade is in my hands (7)." "When a man walks on the bridge, the bridge flows while the water does not."

In still another way, "the logic of *prajna*" may demand this of us: "Do not call this a staff (8); if you do, it is an affirmation; if you do not, it is a negation. Apart from affirmation and negation say a word, quick, quick!" It is important to note here that *prajna* wants to see its diction "quickly" apprehended, giving us no intervening moment for reflection or analysis or interpretation. *Prajna* for this

reason is frequently likened to a flash of lightning or to a spark from two striking pieces of flint. "Quickness" does not refer to progress of time; it means immediacy, absence of deliberation, no allowance for an intervening proposition, no passing from premises to conclusion (9). Prajna is pure act, pure experience. But we must remember that here is a distinct noetic quality which really characterizes *prajna*, and this is the sense in which *prajna* is often regarded as an intuitive act—which interpretation, however, remains to be more fully examined.

Going back to the "staff" paradox, when the master of Buddhist philosophy produced the staff and demanded its definition, not by means of intellection, not by an objective method, the following happened: Someone came forward from the assembled group, took the staff, broke it in two, and without saying a word left the room. On another occasion, the answer came in this form: "I call it a staff." A third answer was possible: "I do not call it a staff." (10)

The staff is one of the things carried by the masters when they appear at the "Dharma Hall", and naturally they make use of it frequently while engaged in a discourse. Let me give some more examples in which the staff is very much in evidence.

When a monk asked a master as to the universality of *bodhi* (11) (enlightenment), the master took up his staff and chased him. The monk, surprised, ran away. The master said: "What is the use? When you see another master sometime later you may argue the point again." This story is not really to find a *prajna* definition of the staff, but incidentally the staff comes out and gives its own definition. The same master had another occasion to refer to the staff. One day he produced it before the disciples and said: "For the last thirty years, while living in this mountain retreat, how much of my life I owe to this staff!" A monk asked: "What power could it be that you owe to it?" The master said: "While walking along the mountain trails, while crossing the mountain streams, it has supported me in every possible way."

But do you know who the Buddha is, who the patriarch is? Can you tell me what makes them talk as they do? You ask again how to escape the bondage set by the triple world. But let me see what this so-called triple world is. Is there anything that will obstruct your way in any sense? Does your hearing do this? Does your sight do this? Where is the world of differentiation which you imagine to be obstructing your freedom? Where is the bondage you want to escape from?

"The wise men of old, seeing you so troubled with illusions and hypotheses, threw their whole being before you and exclaimed: 'Here is the whole truth! Here is the ultimate reality!' But I will say: 'Here! Is there anything you can mark as this or that? If you tarry even for a moment you have already lost its trail!'"

"Not to tarry even for a moment", "Say a word quick, quick!", "Thirty blows on your head!"—all these admonitions on the part of the master point to the nature of *prajna*-intuition, and, as this immediacy characterizes *prajna*-intuition, it is mistakenly identified with ordinary intuition. This being the case, I should like to have *prajna* classified as a very special form of intuition—that which may be termed "*prajna*-intuition" in distinction from the kind of intuition we have generally in philosophical and religious discourses. In the latter case there is an object of intuition known as God or reality or truth or the absolute, and the act of intuition is considered complete when a state of identification takes place between the object and the subject.

But in the case of *prajna*-intuition there is no definable object to be intuited. If there is one, it can be anything from an insignificant blade of grass growing on the roadside to the golden-coloured Buddha-body ten feet six in height (15). In *prajna*-intuition the object of intuition is never a concept postulated by an elaborate process of reasoning; it is never "this" or "that"; it does not want to attach itself to any one particular object. The master of Buddhist philosophy takes up the staff because it is always available, but he is ever ready to make use of any-

thing that comes his way. If a dog is near, he does not hesitate to kick it and make it cry out, in order to demonstrate the universality of the Buddha-nature (16). He cuts off the finger-tip of a little boy-monk to let him realize what is the meaning of the finger-lifting—the favourite method used by a certain master in teaching his inquirers (17). As for breaking a dish or a cup or a mirror (18), or upsetting a fully prepared dinner table (19), or refusing to feed a hungry travelling monk (20), the masters think nothing of such incidents inasmuch as they help the truth-seekers to come to an understanding of Buddhist philosophy.

As the methods of demonstrating *prajna*-intuition permit of an infinite variety, so the answers given to a problem set by the master also vary infinitely; they are never stereotyped. This we have already seen in the case of the staff. To understand the staff in the *viññana* way of thinking will allow only one of the two, negation or affirmation, and not both at the same time. It is different with *prajna*-intuition. It will declare the staff not to be a staff and at the same time declare it to be one, and the master's demand to go beyond affirmation and negation is, we can say, in one sense altogether ignored and in another not at all ignored. And yet either answer is correct; it all depends upon whether you have an instance of *prajna*-intuition or not. If you have it, you can establish your case in whatever way suits you best at the moment. You may even break the staff in two; you may take it away from the master and throw it down on the ground; you may walk away with it; you may swing it in the way of a skilled sword-player. There are many more ways to manifest the "mysteries" of the staff. *Viññana* cannot do this unless it is dissolved in *prajna*-intuition. There is a keypoint in all this and to comprehend it constitutes *prajna*-intuition.

This key-point cannot be expressed as a concept, as something distinct to be placed before the mind. All is veiled in obscurity, as it were. Something seems to be hinted at, but it is impossible to put one's finger on it.

It is alluring enough, but *viññāna* finds it beyond its grasp. *Viññāna* wants everything to be clear-cut and well-defined, with no mixing of two contradictory statements, which, however, *prajña* nonchalantly overrides.

The difficulty in defining the "object" of *prajña*-intuition can also be seen from the following *mondo* (question and answer), in one of which it is disposed of as *acintya*, i.e. as beyond human understanding. As long as the understanding is based upon the principle of bifurcation, where "you" and "I" are to be set apart as standing against each other, there cannot be any *prajña*-intuition. At the same time, if there were no bifurcation, such intuition could not take place. *Prajña* and *viññāna* may thus be said to be in a sense correlated from the point of view of *viññāna*-discrimination, but this is really where the root of misinterpreting the nature of *prajña* grows.

Yikwan, the master of Kozenji, of the T'ang dynasty, was asked by a monk: "Has the dog Buddha-nature?" The master said: "Yes, it has." The monk asked: "Have you the Buddha-nature?" "No, I have not." "When it is said that all beings are endowed with the Buddha-nature, how is it that you have it not?" "It is because I am not what you call 'all beings'." "If you are not, are you a Buddha?" "No, I am neither." "What are you, then, after all?" "I am not a 'what'." The monk finally said: "Can it be seen or thought of?" The master replied: "It is beyond thought or argument, and therefore it is called the unthinkable (*acintya*)."

At another time he asked: "What is the way (*tao*)?" The master answered: "It is right before you." "Why do I not see it?" Said the master: "Because you have an 'I', you do not see it. So long as there are 'you' and 'I' there is a mutual conditioning, and there can be no 'seeing' in its real sense." "This being the case, if there is neither 'you' nor 'I', can there be any 'seeing'?" The master gave the final verdict: "If there is neither 'you' nor 'I', who wants to 'see'?"

Thus we can see that *prajña*-intuition is an intuition all by itself and cannot be classified with other forms of

intuition as we ordinarily understand the term. When we see a flower, we say it is a flower, and this is an act of intuition, for perception is a form of intuition. But when *prajna* takes the flower, it wants us to take not only the flower but at the same time what is not the flower; in other words, to see the flower before it came into existence—and this not by way of postulation but “immediately”. To present this idea in a more metaphysical fashion: *Prajna* will ask: “Even prior to the creation of the world, where is God?” Or, more personally: “When you are dead and cremated and the ashes scattered to the winds, where is your self?” To these questions *prajna* demands a “quick” answer or response, and will not allow a moment’s delay for reflection or ratiocination.

Philosophers will naturally try to solve these questions in some logically methodical manner worthy of their profession and may pronounce them absurd because they do not yield to intellectual treatment. Or they might say that they would have to write a book to give the subject an intelligent solution if there were any. But the *prajna* method is different. If the demand is to see the flower before it blooms, *prajna* will respond without a moment of delay, saying: “What a beautiful flower it is!” If it is about God prior to the creation of the world, *prajna* will, as it were, violently shake you up by taking hold of your collar and perhaps remark: “This stupid, good-for-nothing fellow!” If it is about your cremation and the scattering of the ashes, the *prajna* teacher may loudly call your name, and when you reply: “Yes, what is it?” he may retort: “Where are you?” *Prajna*-intuition settles such grave questions instantly, while philosophers or dialecticians spend hours, nay, years, searching for “objective evidence” or “experimental demonstration”.

2

The fact is that *prajna* methodology is diametrically opposed to that of *viññāna*, or the intellect, and it is for

this reason that what *prajna* states always looks so absurd and nonsensical to the latter and is likely to be rejected without being taken up for examination. *Vijnana* is the principle of bifurcation and conceptualization, and for this reason it is the most efficient weapon in handling affairs of our daily life. We have thus come to regard it as the most essential means of dealing with the world of relativities, forgetting that this world is the creation of something that lies far deeper than the intellect—indeed, the intellect itself owes its existence and all-round utility to this mysterious something. While this way of *vijnana* appraisal is a tragedy because it causes to our hearts and to our spirits unspeakable anguish and makes this life a burden full of miseries, we must remember that it is because of this tragedy that we are awakened to the truth of *prajna* existence.

Prajna thus is always tolerant toward *vijnana* though outwardly it may seem to be abusive and unreasonably harsh toward it. The idea is to recall it to its proper and original office whereby it can work in harmony with *prajna*, thus giving to both the heart and the mind what each has been looking for ever since the awakening of human consciousness. When, therefore, *prajna* violently breaks all the rules of ratiocination, we must take it as giving the intellect a sign of grave danger. When *vijnana* sees this, *vijnana* ought to heed it and try to examine itself thoroughly. It ought not to go on with its "rationalistic" way.

That *prajna* underlies *vijnana*, in the sense that it enables *vijnana* to function as the principle of differentiation, is not difficult to realize when we see that differentiation is impossible without something that works for integration or unification. The dichotomy of subject and object cannot obtain unless there is something that lies behind them, something that is neither subject nor object; this is a kind of field where they can operate, where subject can be separated from object, object from subject. If the two are not related in any way, we cannot even speak of their separation or antithesis. There must be something

of subject in object, and something of object in subject, which makes their separation as well as their relationship possible. And, as this something cannot be made the theme of intellectualization, there must be another method of reaching this most fundamental principle. The fact that it is so utterly fundamental excludes the application of the bifurcating instrument. We must appeal to *prajna*-intuition.

When we state that *prajna* underlies or permeates or penetrates *vijnana* we are apt to think that there is a special faculty called *prajna* and that this does all kinds of work of penetration or permeation in relation to *vijnana*. This way of thinking is to make *prajna* an aspect of *vijnana*. *Prajna*, however, is not the principle of judgment whereby subject becomes related to object. *Prajna* transcends all forms of judgment and is not at all predicable.

Another mistake we often make about *prajna* is that somehow it tends toward pantheism. For this reason Buddhist philosophy is known among scholars as pantheistic. But that this is an incorrect view is evident from the fact that *prajna* does not belong in the category of *vijnana* and that whatever judgment we derive from the exercise of *vijnana* cannot apply to *prajna*. In pantheism there is still an antithesis of subject and object, and the idea of an all-permeating God in the world of plurality is the work of postulation. *Prajna*-intuition precludes this. No distinction is allowed here between the one and the many, the whole and the parts. When a blade of grass is lifted the whole universe is revealed there; in every pore of the skin there pulsates the life of the triple world, and this is intuited by *prajna*, not by way of reasoning but "immediately". The characteristic of *prajna* is this "immediacy". If we have reasoning to do here, it comes too late; as the Zen masters would say, "a speck of white cloud ten thousand miles away".

Paradoxical statements are therefore characteristic of *prajna*-intuition. As it transcends *vijnana* or logic it does not mind contradicting itself; it knows that a contradiction is the outcome of differentiation, which is the work of

viññana. *Prajña* negates what it asserted before, and conversely; it has its own way of dealing with this world of dualities. The flower is red and not-red; the bridge flows and not the river; the wooden horse neighs; the stone maiden dances.

To speak more logically, if this is allowable with *prajña*-intuition, everything connected with *viññana* also belongs to *prajña*; *prajña* is there in its wholeness; it is never divided even when it reveals itself in each assertion or negation made by *viññana*. To be itself *viññana* polarizes itself, but *prajña* never loses its unitive totality. The Buddhist's favourite illustration of the nature of *prajña*-intuition is given by the analogy of the moon reflected in infinitely changing forms of water, from a mere drop of rain to the vast expanse of the ocean, and these with infinitely varied degrees of purity. The analogy is, however, likely to be misunderstood. From the fact that the body of the moon is one in spite of its unlimited divisibilities, *prajña*-intuition may be taken as suggesting oneness abstracted from the many. But to qualify *prajña* in this way is to destroy it. The oneness or completeness or self-sufficiency of it, if it is necessary to picture it to our differentiating minds, is not after all to be logically or mathematically interpreted. But as our minds always demand an interpretation, we may say this: not unity in multiplicity, nor multiplicity in unity; but unity is multiplicity and multiplicity is unity. In other words, *prajña* is *viññana* and *viññana* is *prajña*, only this is to be "immediately" apprehended and not after a tedious and elaborate and complicated process of dialectic.

3

To illustrate the significance of *prajña* in relation to *viññana*, let me cite some cases from the history of Zen (or Ch'an) Buddhism in China.

(1) When a Zen student called Shuzan-shu came to Hogen, one of the great masters of the Five Dynasties era,

equipped master in the philosophy of *prajna*-intuition, and the way he handled all the baffling problems of philosophy was truly remarkable. To cite a few instances: (25)

A monk asked: "Where does the dead one go?"

Tokusho: "After all, I will not tell you."

Monk: "Why not, master?"

Tokusho: "Because you may not understand."

Monk: "All these mountains and rivers and the great earth—where do they come from?"

Tokusho: "Where does this question of yours come from?"

Monk: "What does the eye of the great seer look like?"

Tokusho: "As black as lacquer."

Monk: "When no tidings are available, what about it?" (26)

Tokusho: "Thank you for your tidings."

Monk: "I am told that when one transcends the objective world (27), one is identified with the Tathagata. What does this mean?"

Tokusho: "What do you mean by the objective world?"
[Is there any such thing?]

Monk: "If so, one is indeed identified with the Tathagata."

Tokusho: "Do not whine like a yakan." (28)

Monk: "It is said that Prince Nata returns his flesh to the mother and his bones to the father, and then, showing himself on the lotus-seat, preaches for his parents. What is the body of the Prince?"

Tokusho: "All the brethren see you standing here."

Monk: "If so, all the worlds partake equally of the nature of suchness."

Tokusho: "Appearances are deceptive."

This is perhaps enough to show Tokusho's attainment in *prajna*-intuition. In one way the Chinese language has a great advantage in demonstrating *prajna* because it can express much with its characteristic brevity and forcefulness. *Prajna* does not elaborate, does not indulge in word-

iness, does not go into details, for all these are features peculiar to *vijnana* or intellection. Reasoning requires many words; indeed, wordiness is the spirit of philosophy. The Chinese language, or rather its use of ideographic signs, evokes concrete images full of undifferentiated implications—a very fitting tool for *prajna*. *Prajna* is never analytical and abhors abstraction. It lets one particle of dust reveal the whole truth underlying all existences. But this does not mean that the ideographs are suitable for discussing abstract subjects.

Tokusho's *mondo* were not always such short ones as cited above, and he often indulged in argumentation.

A monk asked: "According to the saying of an ancient sage, if a man sees *prajna* he is bound by it; if he does not he is bound by it all the same. How is it that *prajna* binds him?"

Tokusho said: "You tell me what *prajna* sees."

Monk: "How is it that one's not seeing *prajna* binds one?"

Tokusho: "You tell me if there is anything *prajna* does not see." He then continued: "If a man sees *prajna*, it is not *prajna*; if he does not see *prajna*, it is not *prajna*. Tell me, if you can, how it is that there are seeing and not-seeing in *prajna*. Therefore, it is said that if one thing (*dharma*—concrete reality) is lacking, the *Dharmakaya* (universal concrete) is not complete, that if one thing (*dharma*) is too much it is not complete either."

"But I would say: 'If there is one *dharma* the *Dharmakaya* is not complete; if there is no *dharma* the *Dharmakaya* is not complete either. For here lies the whole truth of *prajna*-intuition.' " (29)

I have digressed somewhat, but as we are deeply concerned with *prajna* let me quote another master. (30)

A monk asked: "What is *mahaprajna* (great or absolute *prajna*)?"

Seisho, the master, said: "The snow is falling fast and all is enveloped in mist."

The monk remained silent.

The master asked: "Do you understand?"

"No, master, I do not."

Thereupon the master composed a verse for him:

"*Mahaprajna*—
It is neither taking in nor giving up.
If one understands it not,
The wind is cold, the snow is falling."

I have said enough already without going back to the three instances cited above to show what is the essential characteristic of *prajna*-intuition. If it should appeal to the *viññana* point of view or the intellect, the repetition of the statement that was quoted before would make no sense whatever. The one says: "An inch's difference and heaven-and-earth's separation", and the other repeats it; or the one says: "Sogen's one-drop-water", and the other repeats: "Sogen's one-drop-water". There is here no exchange of intellectually analysable ideas. A parrot-like mechanical imitation of the one by the other is not what logically minded people expect of any intelligible demonstration of thought. It is, therefore, evident that *prajna* does not belong to the same order as *viññana*. *Prajna* must be a superior principle, going beyond the limits of *viññana*, when we see how Tokusho, master of Kego philosophy, demonstrated his originality in handling problems of philosophy and religion. He could never get this originality and facility so long as he remained in the *viññana* way of thinking.

4

✓ *Prajna* is the ultimate reality itself, and *prajna*-intuition is its becoming conscious of itself. *Prajna* is therefore dynamic and not static; it is not mere activity-feeling but activity itself; it is not a state of *samadhi* (concentration) (31), not a state of passivity, not just looking at an object; it knows no object; it is the activity itself. *Prajna* has no premeditated methods; it creates them out of itself as they are needed. The idea of methodology is not applicable to it, nor is teleology, although this does not mean

that it is erratic and recognizes no laws. In a sense, however, this disregarding of laws is true of *prajna* because it is its own creator out of its own free will.

Thus *vinana* is evolved out of *prajna*, and *prajna* works its way through it. From the *vinana* point of view, *prajna* is certainly teleological and methodological, but we must remember that *prajna* is not governed by *vinana*, i.e. by something foreign to it, and that, being its own creator, *prajna's* world is always new and fresh and never a repetition. The world was not created so many millions and millions of years ago, but it is being created every moment, and it is *prajna's* work. Reality is not a corpse to be dissected with the surgical knife of *vinana*. If this were the case, when "the god of fire comes for fire" was repeated, the understanding would be said to have been final and conclusive, but the fact is that it was far from it and the "god of fire" had to wait for *prajna* to recognize himself in the most ultimate sense. Epistemologically interpreted, reality is *prajna*; metaphysically interpreted, reality is *sunyata*. *Sunyata*, then, is *prajna*, and *prajna* is *sunyata*.

Psychologically, *prajna* is an experience, but it is not to be confused with other experiences of our daily life, which may be classified as intellectual, emotional, or sensuous. *Prajna* is indeed the most fundamental experience. On it all other experiences are based, but we ought not to regard it as something separate from the latter which can be picked out and pointed to as a specifically qualifiable experience. It is pure experience beyond differentiation. It is the awakening of *sunyata* to self-consciousness, without which we can say that we cannot have any mental life and that whatever thoughts and feelings we may have are like a boat that has lost its moorings, for they do not have any co-ordinating centre. *Prajna* is the principle of unification and co-ordination. We must not think it is an abstract idea, for it is decidedly not, but most concrete in every sense of the term. Because of its concreteness *prajna* is the most dynamic thing we can have in the world. For this reason even the "one drop leaking out of the Sokei spring" is enough to vivify

not only one's whole life but the entire triple world filling the boundlessness of space.

This miracle-working power of *prajna* is illustrated in almost all the Mahayana *sutras*, and I give an instance from the *Kegon Sutra*. When the Buddha attained enlightenment, the whole universe appeared in an entirely changed aspect.

It is evident that when *prajna* asserts itself the whole aspect of the world undergoes change beyond the comprehension of *vinjana*. This may be called performing a miracle on the grandest possible scale. But as long as the performance stays within the limits of *vinjana*, however grand it may be, it cannot be anything more than a petty juggler's artifice, for it does not mean the revolution of our *vinjana* point of view at its basis—called *paravritti* (about-face). Some think that what is described in most of the Mahayana *sutras* is poetic imaginings or spiritual symbolizations, but this is to miss altogether the main issue in the activity and significance of *prajna*-intuition.

When *prajna*-intuition takes place it annihilates space and time relationships, and all existence is reduced to a point-instant. It is like the action of a great fire at the end of the *kalpa* (era) which razes everything to the ground and prepares a new world to evolve. In this new *prajna*-world there is no three-dimensional space, no time divisible into the past, present, and future. At the tip of my finger Mount Sumeru rises; before I utter a word and you hear it, the whole history of the universe is enacted. This is no play of poetic imagination, but the Primary Man manifesting himself in his spontaneous, free-creating, non-teleological activities. The Primary Man is Prince Nata, and, in fact, every one of us, when the flesh is returned to the mother and the bones to the father. This Man, now stripped of everything that he thought belonged to him, is engaged in his *anabhoga-carya* (purposeless activity) which constitutes the *bodhisattva-carya*—a life really constituting *bodhisattva*-hood.

It is interesting to note that the Primary Man is everywhere the same but his expressions are not alike, showing

marked differentiations in accordance with local limitations. In India the Primary Man acts dramatically, wonderfully rich in images and figures. But in China he is practical and in a sense prosaic and direct and matter-of-fact; there are no dialectical subtleties in his way of dealing with *prajna*; he does not indulge in calling up brilliantly coloured imageries. Let me give an example. To the monk who asks about Prince Nata's Primary Man, a Chinese master of Buddhist philosophy answers: "No mistaking about this robust existence six feet high." The monk now asks: "Is it up to the Primary Man, or not, to assume this form?" The master retorts: "What do you call the Primary Man?" Not understanding, the monk wishes to be instructed. The master, instead of giving him instructions as the monk probably desired, proposes the question: "Who is to instruct you?" (32)

While the *mondo* (question and answer) selected here carries in it something of ratiocination, I am afraid it is still unintelligible to modern man. Keisho, the master alluded to here, was not so direct as some other masters might be, for they are sometimes apt to give a kick to such a questioner, or push him away with a remark like this: "I do not know (33)," or "He is right under your nose (34)," or "Carry this lunatic out of my sight (35)!" Let me try to make Keisho more intelligible by "adding legs to the snake".

By the Primary Man is meant ultimate reality or *prajna*, as the case may be. The monk questioner knew that his individual self was subject sooner or later to disintegration; he wanted to find, if possible, something which was untouchable by birth-and-death. Hence the question: "What is the Primary Man?" Keisho was a past master in the art of teaching which developed in China side by side with the rationalistic interpretation of Buddhist thought. He knew full well how futile it was to resort to the latter method when the aspirant after the truth was really earnest in his endeavour to attain the final enlightenment. Such aspirants could never be satisfied with the logical handling of the subject. What they wanted was

not a mere intellectual understanding, which would never give full satisfaction to the aspiring soul. The master, therefore, would not waste time and energy by entering into arguments with the monk who, he knew, would never be convinced by this method. The master was short in his remark, and the Chinese language is remarkably fitted to the purpose. He simply said: "There can be no doubt about this robust existence six feet high." He might easily have said "this body of yours", but he did not go into detail; he simply referred to "this robust existence", well built and of some height. As to the relationship between this physical body and the Primary Man, he gave no hints whatsoever. If there were any, the discovery was left to the monk's own devices, for the idea here, as everywhere else, is to come to an understanding by means of the inner light, by the awakening of *prajna*.

The monk in question, however, did not come up to the master's expectation; he was still on the level of intellection. Hence his inquiry: "Is it up to the Primary Man, or not, to assume this form?" This is tantamount to saying: "Is this self, then, the Primary Man?" The monk's apparent inference was that the highest being, the Primary Man, incorporates himself in this bodily existence in order to make himself approachable to the human senses. The inference may not have been incorrect as far as ratiocination was concerned, but the master's idea was not to stop there. If he had, and had given his approval, the monk would never be saved, for the point of the whole discussion would have been utterly lost. The monk was not to be left with mere intellectualization.

The master fully knew where the monk's weakness lay; hence the question: "What do you call the Primary Man?" The Primary Man was not to be identified with this individual corporeal existence, nor was he to be regarded as a separate being outside of it, as if the Man were another entity like the monk or like the master. The Man and the individual could not be considered wholly one, nothing else remaining, but at the same time they were not to be looked upon as altogether separate and

dualistic. The one was not to be merged into the other; they were two and at the same time one. This undifferentiated differentiation was the point to be grasped by *prajna*-intuition.

The Primary Man is not a kind of general concept abstracted from individual existences. The Man is not an outcome of generalization. If he were, he would be a dead man, a corpse as cold as inorganic matter, and as contentless as mere negation. On the contrary, he is very much alive and full of vitality not only in the physical sense but intellectually, morally, aesthetically and spiritually. He lives in the monk's robust body six feet high and also in the master's body, probably not so robust, not so high, but full of vitality and sensibility. The monk's task was to realize this and not to argue about it. The master then put the questions: "What do you call the Primary Man? Are you the Man himself? No, you are to all appearances and in full reality a monk miserably troubled with the question as to the whatness of the Man. If so, you cannot be he. Where, then, is he?" So long as no satisfactory answer was forthcoming from this exchange of questions, the monk's intelligence could not go beyond the limits of *vijnana*, or sheer rationality.

The monk was helpless here and asked humbly for instruction. But from the master's point of view it was not a matter of just transmitting information. It was from the beginning beyond the sphere of possible instruction. If there could be any instruction, it was to evolve out of one's own *prajna*. If the monk were at all able to ask a question about the Primary Man, something of his nature must reside in the monk, and the best way to know the Man would be to have an "interview" with him by awakening *prajna* in the monk, for *prajna* is the Man. The master's role could not go beyond pointing the way to it, and to awaken it was the monk's. Hence: "Who is to instruct you?"

In spite of all these interpretations of the *mondo*, we do not seem to be any wiser than we were at the beginning. To make the matter more intelligible to the Western

mind, I shall add a few words before we proceed to further *mondo*.

The body is the expression of the will, and what unites the will and the body as an individual self is the inner creative life. The body, the will, and the individual self are concepts worked out by the analytical *vijnana*, but the inner creative life as it creates all these concepts through *vijnana* is immediately apprehended only by *prajna*. When Prince Nata returns his body to his father and mother as its progenitors, he gives up his individual self, which, according to his *vijnana*, he thinks he has, and which may be interpreted as reduced to total annihilation, but Buddhist philosophy tells us that it is then for the first time that he can reveal his Primary Man or Primary Body, in which he preaches to his parents, which means the whole world. This Primary Body seated on the lotus-seat is God's creative activity. The analysing *vijnana* stops here and cannot go any further; God is its postulate; it must wait for *prajna*-intuition to transform this cold postulate-corpse into a creative life-principle.

Let me give a logical argument, hoping it will help clarify the nature of *prajna* in this field. When we say that "A is A" and that this law of identity is fundamental, we forget that there is a living synthesizing activity whereby the subject "A" is linked to the object "A". It is *vijnana* that analyses the one "A" into the subject "A" and the object "A"; and without *prajna* this bifurcation cannot be replaced by the original unity or identity; without *prajna* the divided "A" remains isolated; however much the subject may desire to be united with the object, the desire can never be fulfilled without *prajna*. It is *prajna*, indeed, that makes the law of identity work as an established self-evident truth requiring no objective evidence. The foundation of our thinking thus owes its functioning to *prajna*. Buddhist philosophy is a system of the self-evolving and self-identifying *prajna*.

This consideration will shed light on the repetitive *mondo* cited above in regard to "The one drop of water streaming from the Sokei spring" and "An inch's differ-

ence and heaven-and-earth's separation." In the case of "the god of fire seeks fire", Tokusho could not have an insight into its secret as long as his *vijnana* kept the concept "the god of fire" disjoined from the concept "fire". He had to wait for his *prajna* to come to its self-awakening in order to make the logically fundamental law of identity a living principle of experience. Our *vijnana* is always analytical and pays no attention to the underlying synthetic principle. The one "A" is divided into the subject "A" and the object "A", and by connecting the one with the other by a copula *vijnana* establishes the law of identity, but it neglects to account for this connection. Hence *vijnana's* utter incapacity for becoming a living experience. This is supplied by *prajna*-intuition.

The problem of *prajna*, which constitutes the essence of Buddhist philosophy, is really inexhaustible, and no amount of talk seems to suffice. I will give some more *mondo* here and indicate the trend of thought underlying them. Until the relation between *vijnana* and *prajna*, or that between *prajna*-intuition and *vijnana*-reasoning, is thoroughly understood, such ideas as *sunyata* (emptiness), *tathata* (suchness), *moksa* (emancipation), Nirvana, and others will not be fully absorbed as living ideas.

One important thing to remember before we proceed is that, if we think that there is a thing denoted as *prajna* and another denoted as *vijnana* and that they are forever separated and not to be brought to a state of unification, we shall be completely on the wrong track. The fact is that this world of ours, as reflected in our senses and intellect, is that of *vijnana*, and that this *vijnana* cannot function in its full capacity until it is securely moored in *prajna*; and, further, that though *prajna* does not belong to the order of *vijnana*, we have to denote *prajna* in distinction from *vijnana* as if there were such an entity as *prajna* which is to be subsumed under the category of *vijnana*. Words are useful as the culminating point in the process of thinking, but for that reason they are also misleading. We have to guide carefully our every step in this field.

In the following tabulation those items listed on the *prajna* side must be understood as such only when *vijnana* is enlightened by *prajna*; *prajna* in itself has nothing to be discriminated. For instance, *sunyata* (emptiness) or *tathata* (suchness) is not to be taken as objectively denoted. They are the ideas whereby our consciousness locates its points of reference. Whenever *prajna* expresses itself it has to share the limitations of *vijnana* either in agreement with it or otherwise. Even when *prajna* flatly denies what *vijnana* asserts it cannot go outside the *vijnana* area. To think it does is also the doing of *vijnana*, and in this sense *prajna* cannot escape *vijnana*. Even when the role of *prajna* is emphatically upheld in the drama of human activities, it must not be understood as ignoring the claims of *vijnana*. *Prajna*-intuition and *vijnana*-discrimination are equally important and indispensable in the establishment of a synthetic philosophy. In the *mondo* to be cited later, this relationship of *prajna* and *vijnana* will be noticed.

On the <i>prajna</i> side we may list the following:	On the <i>vijnana</i> side we may have these counterbalancing:
<i>Sunyata</i> (emptiness) ..	A world of beings and non-beings
<i>Tathata</i> (suchness) ..	A world of clear-cut definitions
<i>Prajna</i> -intuition ..	<i>Vijnana</i> -discrimination
Nirvana	<i>Samsara</i> (birth-and-death)
<i>Bodhi</i> (enlightenment) ..	<i>Avidya</i> (ignorance)
Purity	Defilement
The mind (<i>citta</i>) ..	The senses (<i>vijnana</i>)
The <i>Dharma</i> (ultimate reality)	<i>Sarvadharmas</i> (individual entities)
Pure experience ..	Experiences of multitudes
Pure act (<i>akarma</i>) ..	A world of causation
Undifferentiated ..	Differentiated
Non-discrimination ..	Discrimination
No-mind, or no-thought	Individual consciousness
Eternal now, or absolute present	Time relations
Non-duality	Duality
Etc.	Etc.

the master answered, in the form of a counter-question: "What do you want from me?"

The monk said: "If I do not ask you, where can I get the solution?"

"Did you ever lose it?" concluded the master.

Bunsui of Hoji monastery in Kinryo gave this discourse to his monks:

"O monks, you have been here for some time, the winter session is over and the summer is come. Have you had an insight into your Self, or not? If you have, let me be your witness, so that you will have a right view and not be led by wrong views."

A monk came forward and asked: "What is my Self?"

The master answered: "What a fine specimen of manhood with a pair of bright eyes!" (37)

Yentoku of Yentsu-in monastery: (38)

Q. "What is my Self?"

A. "What makes you specifically ask this question?"

Ki of Unryu-in monastery: (39)

Q. "What is my Self?"

A. "It is like you and me."

Q. "In this case there is no duality."

A. "Eighteen thousand miles off!"

Yo of Kori monastery: (40)

Q. "When I lack clear insight into my own Self, what shall I do?"

A. "No clear insight."

Q. "Why not?"

A. "Don't you know that it's one's own business?"

Kaitotsu of Tozen monastery: (41)

Q. "I have not yet clearly seen into my own nature. May I be instructed by you?"

A. "Why are you not thankful for it?"

Tokuichi of Ryugeji monastery: (42)

Q. "What is my Self?"

A. "You are putting frost on top of snow."

and sportive. Followers of *prajna*-intuition naturally avoid getting into a philosophical discussion of abstract ideas; they are partial to figures, imageries, facts of daily experience. The following, picked at random from numerous such examples, will show what I mean here.

A monk asked Zembi of Shurei monastery: (58)

"I understand that all the rivers, however different their sources, pour into the great ocean. How many drops of water could there be in the ocean?"

The master asked: "Have you ever been to the ocean?"

Monk: "What then, after we have been to the ocean?"

The master replied: "You come tomorrow and I will tell you."

The monk who asked about the ocean evidently knows something about Buddhist philosophy; hence his second question: "What after having been there?" Seeing this, the master retorts: "Come tomorrow." They both understand, and the *mondo* serves to give us insight into the nature of *prajna*-intuition. One may ask: "What has the ocean to do with *prajna*?" But the ocean here referred to is the ocean of *sunyata*, in which all the phenomenal world is absorbed, and the counting of drops of water in it is to understand what becomes of the multiplicity absorbed therein. The monk wants to find out what the master will say concerning the relationship between the one and the many, between *prajna* and *vijnana*. To apprehend this no amount of philosophical argument helps, leading only to further confusion, and the expected "tomorrow" will never come. Instead of indulging in epistemological methodology, "I do not know" sums up the essence of *prajna*-intuition.

Seishu of Rinninji monastery: (59)

He once asked a monk: "Do you understand the *Buddha-dharma* (the truth or ultimate reality)?"

The monk said: "No, I do not, master."

"You honestly do not?"

"That is right, master."

"You leave me now and come tomorrow."
 The monk bowed saying: "Fare thee well."
 The master then said: "No, that is not the point."

This "come tomorrow" was taken by the monk in its literal or intellectual sense, and to remind him of his misunderstanding the master soft-heartedly states: "That is not the point." The point is to understand what is not understandable, to know what is unknowable, wherein *prajna*-intuition really consists.

A monk asked Yomyo (60): "I have been with you for a long time, and yet I am unable to understand your way. How is this?"

The master said: "Where you do not understand, there is the point for your understanding."

"How is any understanding possible where it is impossible?"

The master said: "The cow gives birth to a baby elephant; clouds of dust rise over the ocean."

When Seishu (61) was still in his novitiate stage under Joye, the latter, pointing at the rain, remarked: "Every drop of it fills your eyes."

Seishu at the time failed to understand this, but afterwards, while studying the *Avatamsaka Sutra*, the meaning dawned on him. Later, in one of his discourses, he said: "All the Buddhas in the ten quarters of the world are ever facing you. Do you see them? If you say you see, do you see them with the mind or with the eye?"

On another occasion this was his discourse: "It is said that when one sees form (*rupa*) one sees mind (*citta*). Let me ask you, what do you call the mind? The mountains and rivers and the great earth extending before you—this world of pluralities—blue and yellow, red and white, men and women, etc., infinitely varying in forms—are they mind, or are they not mind? If they are the mind, how does it transform itself into an infinite number of things? If they are not the mind, why is it said that when you see form you see the mind? Do you understand?"

"Just because you fail to grasp this point and go on cherishing your confused views in manifold ways, you

erroneously see differences and unities where there are really no differences and no unities.

"Just at this very moment your immediate apprehension of the mind is imperative, and then you will realize that it is vast emptiness and there is nothing to see, nothing to hear. . ."

This idea of "vast emptiness" is quite puzzling and baffling and always tends to be understood from the relative point of view. Buddhist philosophy has *sat* for "being", *asat* for "non-being", and *sunyata* for "emptiness", showing that "emptiness" has a positive connotation and is not a mere negation. *Sunyata* transcends being and non-being; that is, both presuppose the idea of *sunyata*. Therefore, when a Buddhist philosopher declares that there is nothing to see, nothing to hear, etc., we must understand it as not denying the experiences of our daily life but as indeed confirming them in every way. Hence the following:

Keijyu of Hannya monastery (62) came to the "Dharma-Hall" and the monks congregated, hearing the board struck three times, which was the signal for them to come together. The master then recited an impromptu verse:

"Strange indeed—the board thrice struck,
And you monks are all gathered here.
As you already know well how to tell the time,
I need not repeat it over again."

He left the hall without saying anything further.

Buddhist philosophers, including every one of us ordinary sentient beings, not only hear sounds and see flowers, but also offer flowers to the Buddha, burn incense before him, and perform all kinds of acts of religious piety. We may not all claim to be Buddhists; we may even protest against being called religious; but the deeds here mentioned are what we are performing every day. It does not make any difference whether we are Buddhists or Christians or communists.

keeps the master very much alive even after he is cremated and his bones sound like copper. "How?" one may ask, in this second case. The master would say: "Does not the boy-attendant respond to my call, saying: 'Yes, master?'" One might still insist that the boy is not the master. If I were the master I might strike you down, saying: "No such nonsense, O you stupid fellow!" But as I am not, I will say instead: "Your vision is still beclouded by *viñāna*. You see the master on one side and the boy on the other, keeping them separate according to our so-called objective method of interpreting an experience. You do not see them living in each other, and you fail to perceive that death 'objectively' comes to the master but has no power over 'that' which makes the boy respond to the master's call. To see this 'that' is *prajñā*-intuition."

6

This "that" is what is primarily and immediately given to our consciousness. It may be called "undifferentiated continuum", to use Mr. Northrop's term. To the Western mind, "continuum" may be better than *sunyata*, though it is likely to be misinterpreted as something "objectively" existing and apprehensible by *viñāna*. In the "continuum" immediately given, however, there is no differentiation of subject and object, of the seer and the seen. It is the "old mirror" that has not yet been polished, and therefore no world of multiplicities is reflected in the "mirror". It is the Primary Man, in whom neither flesh nor bones are left and yet who can reveal himself not only to his parents but to all his brothers, non-sentient as well as sentient. It is "the father" whose age is not calculable by means of numbers and therefore to whom everything is a "grandchild" of conceptualization. It lives with *prajñā* in the absolute state of quiescence, in which no polarization has taken place. It therefore eludes our efforts to bring it out to the discriminable surface of consciousness. We cannot speak of it as "being" or as

"non-being". The categories created by ratiocination are not at all applicable here. If we attempt to wake it from the eternal silence of "*neti, neti*" (not this, not this) we "murder" it, and what *vijnana* perceives is a most mercilessly mutilated corpse.

Prajna abides here, but it is never awakened by itself. When it is awakened it is always by *vijnana*. *Vijnana*, however, does not realize this fact, for *vijnana* always imagines that without *vijnana* there is no experienceable world, that if *prajna* belongs in this world it must be of the same order as *vijnana*, and therefore that *prajna* can well be dispensed with. But the fact is that *vijnana* is never *vijnana* without *prajna*; *prajna* is the necessary postulate of *vijnana*; it is what makes the law of identity workable, and this law is the foundation of *vijnana*. *Vijnana* is not the creator of the logical law, but it works by means of the law. *Vijnana* takes it as something given and not provable by any means devised by *vijnana*, for *vijnana* itself is conditioned by it. The eye cannot see itself; to do this a mirror is needed, but what it sees is not itself, only its reflection. *Vijnana* may devise some means to recognize itself, but the recognition turns out to be conceptual, as something postulated.

Prajna, however, is the eye that can turn itself within and see itself, because it is the law of identity itself. It is due to *prajna* that subject and object become identifiable, and this is done without mediation of any kind. *Vijnana* always needs mediation as it moves on from one concept to another—this is in the very nature of *vijnana*. But *prajna*, being the law of identity itself, demands no transferring from subject to object. Therefore, it swings the staff; sometimes it asserts; sometimes it negates, and declares that "A is not-A and therefore A is A". This is the "logic" of *prajna*-intuition. The "undifferentiated continuum" is to be understood in this light.

When the "undifferentiated continuum" is the outcome of *vijnana* dialectics, it remains a concept and never an experience. Buddhist philosophy, on the contrary, starts from pure experience, from self-identity, as self-

evolving and self-discriminating activity, and *viññāna* comes into existence. In *viññāna*, therefore, there is always the potentiality of *prajñā*-intuition. When a flower is perceived as an object in the world of multiplicity, we recognize *viññāna* functioning and along with it *prajñā*-intuition. But, as most of us stop at *viññāna* and fail to reach *prajñā*, our vision becomes limited and does not penetrate deeply enough to reach ultimate reality or *sunyata*. So, it is declared that the unenlightened do not see the real flower in the light of suchness (*tathata*). From *viññāna* to *prajñā* is not a continuous process or progress. If it were, *prajñā* would cease to be *prajñā*; it would become another form of *viññāna*. There is a gap between the two; no transition is possible; hence there is a leap, "an existential leap". From *viññāna*-thinking to *prajñā*-seeing there is no mediating concept, no room for intellection, no time for deliberation. So, the Buddhist master urges us to "speak quick, quick!" Immediacy, no interpretation, no explanatory apology—this is what constitutes *prajñā*-intuition.

I stated at the beginning that *prajñā* takes in the whole, while *viññāna* is concerned with parts. This needs to be explained in more detail. If parts are mere aggregates, unconnected and incoherent masses, *viññāna* cannot make them the subject of intellectual analysis. The reason *viññāna* can deal with parts is that these parts are related to the whole, individually and collectively, and as such they present themselves to *viññāna*. Each unit (or monad) is associated with another unit singly and with all other units collectively in a net-like fashion. When one is taken up all the rest follow it. *Viññāna* understands this and can trace the intricacy of relationship existing among them and state that there must be an integrating principle underlying them. Not only this, but *viññāna* can also formulate what such principles are, as is done by philosophy and science. But *viññāna* cannot do this over the entire field of realities; its vision is limited to limited areas, which cannot be extended indefinitely. They have to halt somewhere.

Prajna's vision, however, knows no bounds; it includes the totality of things, not as a limited continuum, but as going beyond the boundlessness of space and the endlessness of time. *Prajna* is a unifying principle. It does this not by going over each individual unit as belonging to an integrated whole but by apprehending the latter at one glance, as it were. While the whole is thus apprehended, the parts do not escape from entering into this vision by *prajna*. We can better describe this experience as the self-evolution of *prajna* whereby the whole is conceived dynamically and not statically.

The continuum is not to be interpreted as merely an accumulation of units or monads; it is not a notion reached by adding one unit to another and repeating the process indefinitely. It is a concrete, indivisible, undefinable whole. In it there is no differentiation of parts and whole. It is, as Zen Buddhist philosophers would say, "an iron bar of ten thousand miles"; it has no "hole" by which it can be grasped. It is "dark"; no colours are discernible here. It is like a bottomless abyss where there is nothing discriminable as subject and object. These statements, we may say, are figurative and do not give much information regarding *prajna*-intuition. But to those who have gone through the actual experience of *prajna*-intuition these figurative, symbolic descriptions are really significant. What is asked of the professional philosopher is to translate them into his terminology according to the technique he uses.

It is evident that the continuum is not the whole attained by the accumulation of units; to be the whole, then, there must be something added to it, and this is what is done by *prajna*-intuition. Therefore, *prajna* must be considered a value-giving principle. When *prajna* goes through the continuum the whole thing acquires a value and every part of it becomes significant and pulsates with life-blood. Each unit, even the most insignificant part, now appears in a new situation, full of meaning. A blade of grass is not something to be trodden under one's feet as standing in no relation to the whole. A grain of rice

inadvertently dropped off the washing pail is truly the root from which the ten thousand things germinate. This is why it is said that *prajna* vivifies while *vijnana* kills. Parts are to be united in the whole to become significant, and this kind of unification, not mechanical or arithmetical, is the doing of *prajna*-intuition. *Vijnana* realizes this only when it is infused with *prajna*.

When we speak of the *prajna*-continuum as undifferentiated or differentiated, we must not think that this process of differentiation is a function given to the continuum from an outside source. The differentiation is evolved from within the continuum, for it is not the nature of the *prajna*-continuum to remain in a state of *sunyata*, absolutely motionless. It demands of itself that it differentiate itself unlimitedly, and at the same time it desires to remain itself. *Prajna* is always trying to preserve its self-identity and yet subjects itself to infinite diversification. That is why *sunyata* is said to be a reservoir of infinite possibilities and not just a state of mere emptiness. Differentiating itself and yet remaining in itself undifferentiated, and thus to go on eternally engaged in the work of creation—this is *sunyata*, the *prajna*-continuum. It is not a concept reached by intellection, but what is given as pure act, as pure experience; it is a point fully charged with creative *élan vital*, which can transform itself into a straight line, into a plane, into a tridimensional body.

Now we can understand what is meant by this saying: Creation is contemplation and contemplation is creation. When *sunyata* remains in itself and with itself, it is contemplation; when it subjects itself to differentiation it creates. As this act of differentiation is not something imposed upon it but an act of self-generation, it is creation; we can say it is a creation out of nothing. *Sunyata* is not to be conceived statically but dynamically, or, better, as at once static and dynamic. The *prajna*-continuum thus creates through contemplation and contemplates through creation.

In *prajna*, therefore, there is an eternal progression and at the same time a never-changing state of unification.

Eternally evolving, endlessly limiting itself, *prajna* never loses its identity in *vijnana*. Logically speaking, *prajna*-creativity involves an interminable series of contradictions: *prajna* in *vijnana* and *vijnana* in *prajna* in every possible form and in every possible manner. There thus takes place a state of infinitely complicated interpenetration of *prajna* and *vijnana*. But we must not understand this spatially. For this most thoroughgoing interpenetration, indefinably complicated and yet subject to systematization, is the self-weaving net of *prajna*, and *vijnana* takes no active part in it. When, therefore, there is *prajna*-intuition, all this "mystery" yields its secrets, whereas, as long as our vision does not go beyond *vijnana*, we cannot penetrate to its very foundation and will naturally fail to perceive how *prajna* works into *vijnana*.

NOTES

(1) *Prajna*, *pra-jna*, is the fundamental noetic principle whereby a synthetic apprehension of the whole becomes possible.

(2) *Vijnana*, *vi-jna-na*, is the principle of differentiation.

(3) *Dharma* is derived from the root "*dhr*", "to subsist", "to endure", and is used for a variety of meanings: "substance", "existence", "object", "teaching", "doctrine", "principle", "truth", "law", "relation", "norm", etc.

(4) *Atman* is "self", "the free-will", "one who is master of self". When Buddhist philosophy denies the existence of the self it means that there is no self-governing free-willing agent in the individual as long as it is a conditioned being, for the individual owes its birth to a combination of conditions which are always subject to dissolution, and anything liable to birth-and-death cannot be thought of as a free-willing, self-governing agent. A free-willing agent means a unifying principle.

(5) *Prajna-paramita* is one of the six perfections (*paramitas*): giving (*dana*), moral precepts (*sila*), humility (*ksanti*), diligence (*virya*), meditation (*dhyana*), and transcendental wisdom or absolute knowledge (*prajna*). "*Paramita*" is generally translated "going over to the other shore"—meaning that when these

the staff a staff; if they want to walk, they walk, if they want to sit they sit; no wavering in any circumstances!" *Sayings of Ummon* (Gotoyegen 1861), fasc. xv, pp. 1-7.

(11) *R.T.L.*, xxi, 38b. (12) *R.T.L.*, xix, 23a; *Sayings of Ummon*. (13) *R.T.L.*, xix, 22b. (14) *R.T.L.*, xix, 23a. (15) *R.T.L.*, v, 80. (16) *R.T.L.*, xix, 25a. (17) *Hekigan-shu* (Ning-po 1876), case xix.

(18) *R.T.L.*, xi, 86b. Isan sent a mirror to his disciple Kyozan. Kyozan, producing it before the congregation, said: "Is this Isan's mirror or is it Kyozan's? If you can say a word about it, I will not break it." The whole Brotherhood did not say a word, and Kyozan smashed it.

(19) *Sayings of Rinzai* (Kyoto 1648). Once when Fuke and Rinzai were invited out to dinner, Rinzai remarked: "A hair swallows the great ocean and the seed of a poppy holds Mt. Sumeru in it: What does this mean?" Fuke, without saying a word, upset the whole table. The following day they were again invited out. Rinzai said: "How much is today's dinner like yesterday's?" Fuke again upset the table. Rinzai said: "What a rude fellow you are!" Fuke retorted at once: "In Buddhism there is neither rudeness nor politeness. What a blind fellow you are!"

(20) Tokusan, on his way to Taisan, felt hungry and tired and stopped at a roadside teahouse and asked for refreshments. The old woman who kept the house, finding that Tokusan was a great student of the *Diamond Sutra*, said: "I have a question to ask you; if you can answer it I will serve you refreshments for nothing, but if you fail you have to go somewhere else for them." As Tokusan agreed, the woman proposed this: "In the *Diamond Sutra* we read that 'The past mind is unattainable; the present mind is unattainable; the future mind is unattainable'; and so, with what mind do you wish to punctuate?" (Refreshments are known in Chinese as *ten-jin* (*t'ien-hsin*), meaning "punctuating the mind", hence the question.) Tokusan was altogether non-plussed, and did not know how to answer. He had to go without anything to eat. "The past mind" and so on require a somewhat detailed explanation which I omit here.

(21) *R.T.L.*, xxiv, 65b. (22) *R.T.L.*, xxv, 78b. (23) *R.T.L.*, xxv, 73b.

(24) As in the case of "An inch's difference and heaven-and-earth's separation", the original Chinese for this quotation is also extremely terse and loses a great deal of its force

have never concealed from him my disappointment in his method of approach. My greatest disappointment has been that, according to Suzuki and his disciples, Zen is illogical, irrational, and, therefore, beyond our intellectual understanding. In his book *Living by Zen* Suzuki tells us:

“‘If we are to judge Zen from our common-sense view of things, we shall find the ground sinking away under our feet. Our so-called rationalistic way of thinking has apparently no use in evaluating the truth or untruth of Zen. It is altogether beyond the ken of human understanding. All that we can therefore state about Zen is that its uniqueness lies in its irrationality or its passing beyond our logical comprehension.’

“It is this denial of the capability of the human intelligence to understand and evaluate Zen that I emphatically refuse to accept. Is the so-called Ch’an or Zen really so illogical and irrational that it is ‘altogether beyond the ken of human understanding’ and that our rational or rationalistic way of thinking is of no use ‘in evaluating the truth and untruth of Zen’?

“The Ch’an (Zen) movement is an integral part of the history of Chinese Buddhism, and the history of Chinese Buddhism is an integral part of the general history of Chinese thought. Ch’an can be properly understood only in its historical setting just as any other Chinese philosophical school must be studied and understood in its historical setting.

“The main trouble with the ‘irrational’ interpreters of Zen has been that they deliberately ignore this historical approach. ‘Zen,’ says Suzuki, ‘is above space-time relations, and naturally even above historical facts.’ Any man who takes this unhistorical and anti-historical position can never understand the Zen movement or the teaching of the great Zen masters. Nor can he hope to make Zen properly understood by the people of the East or the West. The best he can do is to tell the world that

Zen is Zen and is altogether beyond our logical comprehension.

"But if we restore the Zen movement to its 'space-time relations', that is, place it in its proper historical setting, and study it and its seemingly strange teachings as 'historical facts', then, but not until then, an intelligent and rational understanding and appreciation of this great movement in Chinese intellectual and religious history may yet be achieved."

Then follows a brief history of Zen Buddhism in China, beginning in the eighth century with the challenge of Shen-hui to the claim that Shen-hsiu and not Hui-neng was the Sixth Patriarch of Zen after Bodhidharma. Shen-hui proclaimed that the doctrine of Sudden Enlightenment was the sole true teaching of the Buddha and of all who succeeded him, and this in the face of the Gradual Enlightenment proclaimed by Shen-hsiu. As the result of Shen-hui's tremendous and sustained efforts Hui-neng was in due course officially recognized as the Sixth Patriarch in the place of Shen-hsiu. Dr. Hu-Shih then gives a description of the seven schools of Ch'an in the eighth century, and of the great persecution of Buddhism of the ninth century.

Then follows the final section on "The Development of the Method of Ch'an" which is the passage in the article about which Dr. Suzuki has most to say.

"The age of Ch'an as an epoch in the history of Chinese thought covered about four hundred years—from about A.D. 700 to 1100. The first century and a half was the era of the great founders of Chinese Ch'an, —the era of dangerous thinking, courageous doubting and plain speaking. All authentic documents of that period show that the great masters, from Shen-hui and Ma-tsu to Hsuan-chien and I-hsuan, taught and spoke in plain and unmistakable language and did not resort to enigmatic words, gestures, or acts. Some of the famous enigmatic answers attributed to Ma-tsu and his immediate disciples were undoubtedly very late inventions.

"But as the Ch'an schools became respectable and even fashionable in intellectual and political circles, there arose monks and lay dilettantes who talked and prattled in the language of the Ch'an masters without real understanding and without conviction. There was real danger that the great ideas of the founders of the Ch'an schools were deteriorating into what has been called '*ch'an* of the mouth-corners' (*k'ou-t'ou ch'an*). Moreover, Ch'an was rapidly replacing all other forms of Buddhism, and prominent Ch'an masters of the mountains were often called to head large city monasteries. They had to perform or officiate at many Buddhist rituals of worship demanded by the public or the State even though they might sincerely believe that there were no Buddhas or *bodhisattvas*. Were they free to tell their powerful patrons, on whom the institution had to rely for support, that 'the Buddha was a murderer who had seduced many people into the pitfalls of the Devil'? Could there be some other subtle but equally thought-provoking way of expressing what the earlier masters had said outspokenly?

"All these new situations, and probably many others, led to the development of a pedagogical method of conveying a truth through a great variety of strange and sometimes seemingly crazy gestures, words, or acts. I-hsuan himself was probably the first to introduce these techniques, for he was famous for beating his questioner with a stick or shouting a deafening shout at him. It was probably no accident that his school, the Lin-chi school, played a most prominent part during the next hundred years in the development of the peculiar methodology of Ch'an instruction to take the place of plain speaking.

"But this methodology with all its mad techniques is not so illogical and irrational as it has often been described. A careful and sympathetic examination of the comparatively authentic records of the Ch'an schools and of the testimony of contemporary witnesses and critics has convinced me that beneath all the apparent madness and confusion there is a conscious and rational method which may be described as a method of education by the

hard way, by letting the individual find out things through his own effort and through his own ever-widening life-experience.

"Broadly speaking, there are three stages or phases in this pedagogical method.

"First, there is the basic principle which was stated as *pu shuo p'ao*, 'never tell too plainly'. It is the duty of the teacher never to make things too easy for the novice; he must not explain things in too plain language; he must encourage him to do his own thinking and to find out things for himself. Fa-yen (died 1104), one of the greatest teachers of Ch'an, used to recite these lines of unknown authorship:

You may examine and admire the embroidered drake.

But the golden needle which made it, I'll not pass on to you.

"This is so important that Chu Hsi (1130-1200), the greatest Confucianist thinker and teacher of the twelfth century, once said to his students: 'The school of Confucius and that of Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu left no great successors to carry on the work of the founders. But the Ch'an Buddhists can always find their own successors, and that is due to the fact that they are prepared to run the risk of explaining nothing in plain language, so that others may be left to do their own pondering and puzzling, out of which a real threshing-out may result.' One of the great Ch'an masters often said: 'I owe everything to my teacher because he never explained anything plainly to me.'

"Secondly, in order to carry out the principle of 'never tell too plainly', the Ch'an teachers of the ninth and tenth centuries devised a great variety of eccentric methods of answering questions. If a novice should ask some such question as 'What is truth?' or 'What is Buddhism?' the master would almost surely box him on the ear, or give him a beating with a cane, or retire into a stern silence. Some less rude teacher would tell the questioner to go back to the kitchen and wash the dishes. Others

because he fails to understand what Zen is. I must strongly insist that Zen must first be comprehended as it is in itself; only then can one proceed to the study of its historical objectifications, as Hu Shih does.

I will discuss the second point first.

Hu Shih does not seem to understand the real significance of "sudden awakening or enlightenment" in its historical setting. He makes a great deal of Tao-sheng's allusion to this term and thinks that here is the beginning of Zen thought. But "sudden enlightenment" is the very essence of Buddhist teaching, and all the schools of Buddhism, Hinayana and Mahayana, Yogacara and Madhyamika, even, in my opinion, the Pure Land sect, owe their origin to Buddha's enlightenment-experience which he had under the Bodhi tree by the River Nairanjana so many centuries ago. Buddha's enlightenment was no other than a "sudden enlightenment". Among the *sutras* in which this experience is emphasized, I may mention the *Vimalakirti*, the *Lankavatara*, and the *Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment*. Though the last-mentioned is a disputed *sutra*, it is one of the most important works on Zen.

In the history of Zen, Yeno (Hui-neng or Wei-lang in Chinese) comes foremost, and it may be better in more than one sense to consider him the first Patriarch of Zen in China. His message was really revolutionary. Though he is described as an illiterate son of a farmer, living in the Lingnan district far away from the centre of T'ang culture and civilization, he was a great pioneer spirit and opened up a new field in the study of Buddhism, upsetting all the traditions which preceded him. His message was: *dhyana* and *prajna* are one; where *dhyana* is, there is *prajna*, and where *prajna* is, there is *dhyana*; they are not to be separated one from the other.¹ Before Hui-neng the two were regarded as separate; at least their identity was not clearly affirmed, which resulted in the practice of emphasizing *dhyana* at the expense of *prajna*. Buddha's all-important enlightenment-experience

¹ Cf. *The Dhammahada*, verse 372.

came to be interpreted statically and not dynamically, and the doctrine of *sunyata* (emptiness), which is really the cornerstone of Buddhist thought-structure, became a dead thing. Hui-neng revived the enlightenment-experience.

According to *The Records of the Lanka Teachers and Disciples*, Tao-hsin (Doshin), popularly known as the fourth Patriarch of Zen in China, was a great master of Zen, and under his successor, Hung-jen (Gunin), the fifth Patriarch, there were ten or eleven great masters, one of whom was Hui-neng (Yeno). Tao-hsin and Hung-jen, however, did not make the distinction and the identity of *dhyana* and *prajna* quite clear. Perhaps there were yet no impelling circumstances to do so. But under Hung-jen this changed, for among the rivals of Hui-neng there was Shen-hsiu (Jinshu), who was an outstanding figure almost overshadowing Hui-neng. Shen-hsiu was a contrast to Hui-neng in every way—in learning, monkish training, and personality. Hui-neng stayed in the South, while Shen-hsiu went to the capital under imperial patronage. It was natural that Shen-hsiu and his teaching were more esteemed. Hui-neng, however, did not make any special effort to compete with Shen-hsiu, doing his own preaching in his own way in the remote provincial towns. It was due to Shen-hui, one of the youngest disciples of Hui-neng, that the differences between Hui-neng's school and Shen-hsiu's were brought to the surface and the great struggle started for ascendance and supremacy, as described so well by Hu Shih.

Shen-hui's emphasis, however, on the doctrine of sudden enlightenment does not exactly reflect the true spirit of Hui-neng. It is rather a side-issue from the doctrine of the identity of *dhyana* and *prajna*. According to my "historical understanding", the identity-doctrine comes first and when this is grasped sudden enlightenment naturally follows. Shen-hui probably had to emphasize sudden enlightenment because of strong opposition from Shen-hsiu's followers. Shen-hui's position

is better understood from Tsung-mi's comment on Shen-hui in which Tsung-mi characterizes Shen-hui's teaching as "The one character *chih* is the gateway to all secrets". Here *chih* means *prajna*-intuition and not "knowledge" in its ordinary sense. When *chih* is rendered—as it is by Hu Shih—as "knowledge", all is lost, not only Shen-hui and Hui-neng but also Zen itself. *Chih* here is the key-term which unlocks all the secrets of Zen. I will return to this later.

That *dhyana* is no other than *prajna* was Hui-neng's intuition, which was really revolutionary in the history of Buddhist thought in China. Chih-i was a great Buddhist philosopher, and Fa-tsang was a still greater one. The latter marks the climax of Buddhist thought as it developed in China. Fa-tsang's systematization of ideas expounded in the Buddhist *sutra*-group known as the *Gandavyuha* or *Avatamsaka* (Kegon in Japanese and Hua-yen in Chinese) is one of the wonderful intellectual achievements performed by the Chinese mind and is of the highest importance to the history of world thought. Hui-neng's accomplishment in the way of Zen intuition equals, indeed, in its cultural value that of Chih-i and Fa-tsang, both of whom are minds of the highest order, not only in China but in the whole world.

What, then, is the identity-doctrine of Hui-neng? How did it contribute to the later development of the various schools of Zen Buddhism? To answer these is more than I can manage in this paper.¹ Let me just refer to Shen-hui. While Shen-hui was engaged in discussion with Ch'eng, the Zen master, on the subject of identity, Shen-hui remarked to Wang Wei, who was the host: "When I am thus talking with you I am the identity of *dhyana* and *prajna*."² This gives the doctrine in a nutshell, or it may be better to say that Shen-hui himself stands here as the practical demonstrator of it. From this identity doctrine naturally follows Ma-tsu's famous dictum:

¹ I have treated these problems in the third volume of my "History of Zen Thought". The book is in Japanese and is still in MS.

² Suzuki's edition of *Shen-Hui-Sayings* [or *Discourses*], pp. 31-2.

"My everyday thought is the *Tao*" (*heijo-shin kore michi*; in Chinese, *p'ing ch'ang hsin shih tao*). This is explained by him thus: "Everyday thought means to be doing nothing special; it means to be free from right and wrong, to be free from taking and giving up, to be free from nihilism as well as eternalism, to be neither a saintly nor an ordinary man, neither a wise man nor a *bodhisattva*. My going-about, standing, sitting, or lying-down; my meeting situations as they arise; my dealing with things as they come and go—all this is the *Tao*."¹

To give a few more examples of the identity-doctrine as it developed later:

A monk asked Kei-shin of Chosha (Changsha Ching-ts'en), who was a disciple of Nansen Fugwan (Nanch'uan Pu-yuan, died 834): "What is meant by 'everyday thought'?" Kei-shin answered: "If you want to sleep, sleep; if you want to sit, sit." The monk said: "I do not understand." Kei-shin answered: "When hot, we try to get cool; when cold, we turn toward a fire."

A monk asked Kei-shin: "According to Nansen, the cat and the ox have a better knowledge of it than all the Buddhas of the past, the present, and the future. How is it that all the Buddhas do not know it?"

Kei-shin answered: "They knew a little better before they entered the Deer Park."

The monk: "How is it that the cat and ox have a knowledge of it?"

Kei-shin: "You cannot suspect them."²

This *mondo* will be understood better when I try later to distinguish two kinds of knowledge, relative and transcendental. Hu Shih may think this is a "crazy" kind of Zen methodology to make the monk realize the truth by himself in a most straightforward way.

In one sense, this way of looking at life may be judged to be a kind of naturalism, even of animalistic libertinism.

¹ Tao Yuan, *Ching Te Ch'uan Teng Lu* (*The Record of the Transmission of the Lamp*), Fas. XXVIII.

² Ibid, Fas. X.

But we must remember that man is human, and the animal is animal. There must be a distinction between human naturalism and animal naturalism. We ask questions and wait and decide and act, but animals do not ask questions, they just act. This is where they have one advantage over us, and yet this is where they are animals. Human naturalism is not quite the same as animal naturalism. We are hungry. Sometimes we decide not to eat; sometimes we even decide to starve to death, and here is human naturalism; too. It may be called unnaturalism.

There is, however, through all these naturalistic affirmations or unnaturalistic negations, something that is in every one of us which leads to what I call a transcendental "yes" attitude or frame of mind. This can be seen in the Zen master when he asserts: "Just so", or "So it is", or "You are right", or "Thus things go", or "Such is the way", etc. In the Chinese the assertion runs: *shih mo*, or *chih mo*, or *ju shih*, or *ju tz'u*, or *chih che shih*. These do not exhaust all the statements a Zen master makes in the expression of his "yes" frame of mind, or in his acceptance of the Buddhist doctrine of suchness or thusness (*tathata*) or of emptiness (*sunyata*).¹

Strictly speaking, there cannot be a philosophy of suchness, because suchness defies a clear-cut definition as an idea. When it is presented as an idea it is lost; it turns into a shadow, and any philosophy built on it will be a castle on the sand. Suchness or *chih che shih* is something one has to experience in oneself. Therefore, we might say that it is only by those who have this experience that any provisional system of thought can be produced on the basis of it. In many cases such minds prefer silence to

¹ As regards the idea of "suchness" (*sono mama* in Japanese, *shih mo* in Chinese, and *tathata* in Sanskrit), which I hold to be the basis of all religious experience, the reader is referred to Exodus iv, 14, where God reveals his name to Moses as "I am that I am"; and also to Jacques Maritain's *A Preface to Metaphysics*, p. 93, where he expounds "the principle of identity" as "being is being". My article on "Japanese Thought", which is my contribution to *History of Philosophy Eastern and Western* (Allen and Unwin, 1952), Vol. I, pp. 597 ff., will also shed light on the idea of *sono mama* or *kannagara* in Shinto terminology.

verbalism or what we may call symbolism to intellectualization. They do not like to risk any form of misunderstanding, for they know that the finger is quite liable to be taken for the moon. The Zen master, generally speaking, despises those who indulge in word- or ideamongering, and in this respect Hu Shih and myself are great sinners, murderers of Buddhas and patriarchs; we are both destined for hell.

But it is not a bad thing to go to hell, if it does some good to somebody. So, let us go on our way and I, for my part, quote the following from *The Transmission of the Lamp* (Fas. XIV) under Yakusan Igen (Yaoshan Wei-yen, 751-834), and hope to help readers understand what I mean by the experience of suchness, or the *chih che shih* frame of mind:

One day Yakusan was found quietly sitting in meditation. Sekito (Shih-t'ou, 700-790), seeing this, asked: "What are you doing here?"

Yakusan answered: "I am not doing anything at all."

Sekito said: "In that case you are just sitting idly."

Yakusan: "If I am sitting idly, I am then doing something."

Sekito: "You say you are not doing anything. What is this 'anything' you are not doing?"

Yakusan: "You may get a thousand wise men together and even they cannot tell."

Sekito then composed a stanza:

Since of old we have been living together without
knowing the name;
Hand in hand, as the wheel turns, we thus go.¹

¹ "Thus" in the original Chinese is *chih mo* (*shimo* in Japanese). This term coupled with *jen-yun* is the essence of this *gatha*. "*Jen-yun*", here translated "as the wheel turns" or "as the wind blows", has nothing to do with fatalism. "*Jen-yun*" frequently goes with "*t'eng-t'eng*" (sometimes *teng-teng*). This combination "*jen-yun t'eng-t'eng*" is full of significance, but it is very difficult to give the idea in a few English words. In short, it is "Let thy will be done" without the accompaniment of "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" "*T'eng-t'eng*" is going around almost jubilantly, at least in a fully relaxed state of mind, with no fear, no anxiety, no anguish.

Since ancient times even wise men of the highest grade
failed to know what it is;

How then can ordinary people expect to have a clear
understanding of it in a casual way?

Sometime later, Sekito remarked: "Words and actions are
of no avail."

To this Yakusan said: "Even when there are no words, no
actions, they are of no avail."

Sekito said: "Here is no room even for a pinhead."

Yakusan then said: "Here it is like planting a flower on
the rock."

And Sekito expressed his full approval.

When Beirei Osho (Mi-ling, the teacher)¹ was about to
pass away, he left this in part for his disciples: "O my pupils,
carefully think of the matter. Ultimately, it is 'just this and
nothing more,' *chih che shih!*"

A monk asked Risan Osho² (Li-shan, the teacher):
"What is the idea of Daruma (*Tamo*) coming from the West?"

Risan answered: "I do not see any 'What'."

The monk: "Why so?"

Risan said: "Just so and nothing more" (*chih wei ju tz'u*).

Chih ju tz'u, *shih mo*, and *chih che shih*—all these are the
Zen masters' attempts to express what goes beyond
words or what cannot be mediated by ideas. When they
wish to be more expressive, they say: "It is like planting
a flower on the rock", or "A silly old man is filling the
well with snow", or "It is like piling vegetables into a
bottomless basket". The more they try to express them-
selves, the more enigmatic they become. They are not
doing this with any special pedagogic purpose. They
are just trying to give expression to what they have in
mind. Nor are they exponents of agnosticism. They are
just plain Zen masters who have something to say to
the rest of their fellow-beings.

Into whatever historical setting Zen may fit, and in
whatever way the historian may deal with it, as revolution-
ary or iconoclastic or anti-traditional, we must remember

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. VIII, under "Beirei".

² *Ibid.*, under "Risan".

that this kind of treatment of Zen never does clarify the self-nature (*svabhava* or *svalaksana*) of Zen. The historical handling of Zen cannot go any further than the objective relationships with other so-called historical factors. When this is done, however skilfully and ingeniously, the historian cannot expect to have done with Zen in every possible way. The fact is that if one is to understand *what* Zen is *in itself* it has to be grasped from within. Unfortunately, Hu Shih seems to neglect this side of the study of Zen.

3

This neglect on the part of Hu Shih is shown in his dealing with Tsung-mi's characterization of Shen-hui. Tsung-mi (Shu-mitsu) sums up Shen-hui's teaching as being centred in one Chinese character "*chih*", which is regarded as "the gateway to all mysteries (or secrets)". Hu Shih translates *chih* as "knowledge" and takes it as best characterizing Shen-hui's intellectualistic approach. This statement proves that Hu Shih does not understand Zen as it is in itself, apart from its "historical setting".

Shen-hui's *chih* does not mean intellectual knowledge, but is rather what I have called "*prajna*-intuition".¹ It may take many pages to explain my position in regard to *chih*, but I have to do it because it is the central notion of Zen. And when one knows what *chih* is, one knows something of Zen.

When Buddhist philosophers talk much about suchness or thusness, and when the Zen master raises his eyebrows, or swings his stick, or coughs, or rubs his hands, or utters the "*Ho!*" cry (*kwatz* in Japanese), or just says "Yes, yes", or "You are right", or "Thus we go", almost

¹ See my paper on this in *Essays in East-West Philosophy: An Attempt at World Philosophical Synthesis*, Charles A Moore, ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1951), pp. 17-48.

[This is the preceding article in this Volume.—Ed.]

ad infinitum, we must remember that they all point to something in us which may be called pure self-consciousness, or pure experience, or pure awakening, or intuition (rather, *prajna*-intuition). This is the very foundation of all our experiences, all our knowledge, and defies being defined, for definition means ideation and objectification. The "something" is the ultimate reality or "*subjectum*" or "emptiness" (*sunyata*). And what is most important here is that it is self-conscious, though not in the relative sense. This self-consciousness is *chih*, and Tsung-mi and Shen-hui quite rightly make it the gateway to all Zen secrets.

I should like to have Hu Shih remember that knowledge, as the term is generally used, is the relationship between subject and object. Where there is no such dichotomous distinction, knowledge is impossible. If we have something of noetic quality here, we must not designate it as knowledge, for by doing so we get into confusion and find ourselves involved in contradictions. When the self becomes conscious of itself at the end of an ever-receding process of consciousness, this last is what we must call self-consciousness in its deepest sense. This is truly the consciousness of the self, where there is no subject-object separation, but where subject is object and object is subject. If we still find here the bifurcation of subject and object, that will not yet be the limit of consciousness. We have now gone beyond that limit and are conscious of this fact of transcendence. Here can be no trace of selfhood, only unconscious consciousness of no-self, because we are now beyond the realm of the subject-object relationship.

Shen-hui calls this *chih*, which is no other than *prajna*-intuition, or simply *prajna* in contradistinction to *vijñana*, "discriminatory knowledge". Here is the irrationality of Zen beyond the comprehension of human understanding. *Chih* is the absolute object of *prajna* and at the same time is *prajna* itself. The Chinese Buddhist philosophers frequently call it, tautologically, *pan-ju chih chih-hui* (*hannya no chiye* in Japanese), for they want to have

chih-hui, as it is ordinarily understood, sharply distinguished from *prajna* (*pan-ju*).

The professional philosopher or historian may reject the existence and reality of *chih* as we have it here, because he, especially the historian, finds it rather disturbing in his objective and "historical" treatment of Zen. The historian here resorts to strange tactics. He summarily puts aside as "fabrication" or fiction or invention everything that does not conveniently fit into his scheme of historical setting. I would not call this kind of history objective but strongly coloured with subjectivism.

I am now ready to present a piece of Zen epistemology. There are two kinds of information we can have of reality; one is knowledge *about* it and the other is that which comes out of reality itself. Using "knowledge" in its broadest sense, the first is what I would describe as knowable knowledge and the second as unknowable knowledge.

Knowledge is knowable when it is the relationship between subject and object. Here are the subject as knower and the object as the known. As long as this dichotomy holds, all knowledge based on it is knowable because it is public property and accessible to everybody. On the contrary, knowledge becomes unknown or unknowable when it is not public but strictly private in the sense that it is not sharable by others.¹ Unknown knowledge is the result of an inner experience; therefore, it is wholly individual and subjective. But the strange thing about this kind of knowledge is that the one who has it is absolutely convinced of its universality in spite of its privacy. He knows that everybody has it, but everybody is not conscious of it.

Knowable knowledge is relative, while unknown knowledge is absolute and transcendental and is not communicable through the medium of ideas. Absolute

¹ In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding on the part of the reader, I add this: The experience is altogether private inasmuch as it is a form of feeling, but at the same time there is in it an element of universality. It is at once unsharable and sharable. It has in itself no paradox, but as soon as it expresses itself we encounter a paradox.

knowledge is the knowledge which the subject has of himself directly without any medium between him and his knowledge. He does not divide himself into factors such as subject and object in order to know himself. We may say that it is a state of inner awareness. And this awareness is singularly contributive to keeping one's mind free of fears and anxieties. (11) *

Unknown knowledge is intuitive knowledge. We must remember, however, that *prajna*-intuition is altogether different from perceptual intuitions. In the latter case there is the seer and the object which he sees, and they are separable and separate, one standing over against the other. They belong to the realm of relativity and discrimination. *Prajna*-intuition obtains where there is oneness and sameness. It is also different from ethical intuitions and from mathematical intuitions.

For a general characterization of *prajna*-intuition we can state something like this: *Prajna*-intuition is not derivative but primitive; not inferential, not rationalistic, nor mediational, but direct, immediate; not analytical but integrating; not cognitive, nor symbolical; not intending but merely expressive; not abstract, but concrete; not processional, not purposive, but factual and ultimate, final and irreducible; not eternally receding, but infinitely inclusive; etc. If we go on like this, there may be many more predicates which could be ascribed to *prajna*-intuition as its characteristics. But there is one quality we must not forget to mention in this connection; the uniqueness of *prajna*-intuition consists in its authoritativeness, utterly convincing and contributive to the feeling that "I am the ultimate reality itself", that "I am absolute knower", that "I am free and know no fear of any kind".¹ In one sense *prajna*-intuition may be said to correspond to Spinoza's *scientia intuitiva*. According to him, this kind of intuition is absolutely certain and infallible and, in contrast to *ratio*, produces the highest peace and virtue of the mind.

Let us see how these characterizations of *prajna*-

¹ Cf. *Dhammapada*, 153-4, 179.

Monk: "How about those who are right inside?"

Dai-ten: "They do not ask such questions."¹

One can readily see that this kind of *chih* is not knowledge that is transmissible to others, that it is subjective in the sense that it grows within oneself and is exclusively the possession of this particular person. We may call it "inside knowledge". But as soon as we say it is inside, it gets outside and ceases to be itself. You can neither affirm nor negate it. It is above both, but can be either as you choose.

Therefore, Yakusan² announced: "I have a word (*i chu tzu*) of which I have never told anybody."

Dogo said: "You are already giving yourself up to it."

Later a monk asked Yakusan: "What is the one word you do not tell anybody?"

Yakusan replied: "It is beyond talking."

Dogo remarked again: "You are already talking."

Yakusan's *i chu tzu* is no other than *chih*, "unknown and unknowable". It is the ultimate reality, the Godhead, in which there are no distinctions whatever and to which, therefore, the intellect cannot give any predicate, this or that, good or bad, right or wrong. To talk about it is to negate it. When Yakusan begins to talk about it either negatively or positively, his *i chu tzu* is no longer present. Dogo is right, therefore, in accusing his master of contradicting himself. But we can also say that Dogo has to share the same accusation he is throwing against the other. As far as human intellect is concerned, we can never escape this contradiction. Yakusan fully realizes this, but he cannot help himself inasmuch as he is also a human individual. The following records we have of him in *The Transmission of the Lamp* (Fas. XIV) show clearly where he stands:

A monk once asked him: "I have yet no clear knowledge of myself and may I ask you to indicate the way to it?"

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XIV, under "Ta-tien".

² Yaoshan Wei-yen, 754-834, *ibid.*, Fas. XIV, under "Dogo" (Tao-un).

Yakusan remained silent for a while and then said: "It is not difficult for me to give you a word (*i chu*) about it. But what is needed of you is to see it instantly as the word is uttered. Then you may have something of it. But when you are given up to reflection or intellection (*ssu liang*) to any degree I shall be committing a fault myself and shall be blamed for it. It is better, therefore, to keep one's mouth tightly closed and let no trouble come out that way."

His is an honest confession.

The *i chu tzu* is an inner experience and defies expression in words, for words are mere symbols and cannot be the thing in itself. But as words are a convenient medium we have invented for mutual communication, we are apt to take them for realities. Money represents a good which is of real value, but we are so used to money that we manipulate it as if it were the value itself. Words are like money. The Zen masters know that; hence their persistent and often violent opposition to words and to the intellect which deals exclusively in words. This is the reason they appeal to the stick, the *hossu* (*fu-tzu*), the "Ho!" and to various forms of gesture. Even these are far from being the ultimate itself; the masters have faced a very difficult task in trying to convey what they have within themselves. Strictly speaking, however, there is no conveying at all. It is the awakening of the same experience in others by means of words, gestures, and anything the master finds suitable at the moment. There are no prescribed methods; there is no methodology set down in formulas.

To get further acquainted with the nature of *chih*, or *prajna*-intuition, let me quote more from *The Transmission of the Lamp*, which is the mine of the *mondo* and other Zen materials necessary for understanding Zen as far as such records are concerned.

A monk came to Dogo Yenchì (Tao-wu Yen-chih, 779-835) and asked: "How is it that the *Bodhisattva* of No-miracles leaves no traceable footsteps?"¹

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*. Fas. XIV.

"Leaving no footsteps" has a specific meaning in Zen. This is what is expected of a highly trained Zen master. We ordinary people leave all kinds of footmarks by which our inner life can be detected and assessed. And this inner life is always found to be tainted with selfishness and motives arising from it and also with intellectual calculations designed for their execution. To leave no traces thus means in Christian terms to be above creaturely mindedness. It is, metaphysically speaking, to transcend both affirmation and negation, to be moving in the realm of oneness and sameness, and, therefore, to be leading a life of purposelessness (*anabhogacarya*) or of unattainability (*anupalabdha*). This is one of the most important notions in the philosophy of Zen. To trace the tracelessness of the Zen master's life is to have an "unknown knowledge" of the ultimate reality. Now let us see what answer was given by Dogo Yenchi (Tao-wu Yen-chih). It was simply this:

"One who goes with him knows it." ("Him" means the "*Bodhisattva* of No-miracles".)

The monk asked: "Do you know, O master?"

Dogo said: "I do not know."

The monk wanted to know the reason for his ignorance.

"Why do you not, master?"

The master gave up the case. "You do not understand what I mean."

Now Dogo is no agnostic. He knows everything. He knows the monk through and through. His no-knowledge (*pu-chih*) is not to be "approached intellectually". It is of the same category as his *pu shih* when he answered Goho's (Wu-feng's) question: "Do you know Yakusan, the old master?" Goho wanted to know the reason, asking: "Why do you not know him?" Dogo said: "I do not, I do not." His answer was quite emphatic, as we see from his repetition of negation. This is a most flagrant repudiation of the "historical" fact, because Dogo was one of the chief disciples of Yakusan. This was well known among

into existence, or that "To say that God created the world yesterday or tomorrow would be foolishness, for God created the world and everything in it in the one present Now."¹

Mathematics has this: $0=0$, $1=1$, $1+1=2$, and so on. Zen has these too, but it has no objection to the following either: $0=1$, $0=2$, $1+1=3$, etc. Why? Because zero is infinity and infinity is zero. Is this not irrational and beyond our comprehension?

A geometrical circle has a circumference and just one centre, and no more or less. But Zen admits the existence of a circle that has no circumference nor centre and, therefore, has an infinite number of centres. As this circle has no centre and, therefore, a centre everywhere, every radius from such a centre is of equal length—that is, all are equally infinitely long. According to the Zen point of view, the universe is a circle without a circumference, and every one of us is the centre of the universe. To put it more concretely: I am the centre, I am the universe, I am the creator. I raise the hand and lo! there is space, there is time, there is causation. Every logical law and every metaphysical principle rushes in to confirm the reality of my hand.

4

History deals with time and so does Zen, but with this difference: While history knows nothing of timelessness, perhaps disposing of it as "fabrication", Zen takes time along with timelessness—that is to say, time in timelessness and timelessness in time. Zen lives in this contradiction. I say, "Zen lives." History shuns anything living, for the living man does not like to be grouped with the past, with the dead. He is altogether too much alive for the historian, who is used to digging up old, decayed

¹ *Meister Eckhart: A Modern Translation*. Raymond Bernard Blakney (New York and London: Harper & Brothers, 1941), p. 214.

positive and affirmative about it. To find this, I may have to be a kind of historian myself.

Zen is really a great revolutionary movement in the world history of thought. It originated in China and, in my opinion, could not arise anywhere else. China has many things she can well be proud of. This I mean not in the sense of cultural nationalism but on the world level of the development of human consciousness. Until about the time of Hui-neng (died 713) Buddhism was still highly coloured with the Indian tint of abstract thinking. The Chinese achievements along this line were remarkable indeed, and I think such Buddhist philosophers as Chih-i and Fa-tsang are some of the greatest thinkers of the world. They were Chinese products, no doubt, but we may say that their way of thinking was stimulated by their Indian predecessors and that they were the direct descendants of Asvaghosa, Nagarjuna, Asanga, and others. But it was in Zen that the Chinese mind completely asserted itself, in a sense, in opposition to the Indian mind. Zen could not rise and flourish in any other land or among any other people. See how it swept over the Middle Kingdom throughout the T'ang and the Sung dynasties. This was quite a noteworthy phenomenon in the history of Chinese thought. What made Zen wield such a powerful moral, intellectual, and spiritual influence in China?

If any people or race is to be characterized in a word, I would say that the Chinese mind is eminently practical, in contrast to the Indian mind, which is speculative and tends toward abstraction and unworldliness and non-historical-mindedness. When the Buddhist monks first came to China the people objected to their not working and to their being celibate. The Chinese people reasoned: If those monks do not work, who will feed them? No other than those who are not monks or priests. The laymen will naturally have to work for non-working parasites. If the monks do not marry, who are going to look after their ancestral spirits? Indians took it for granted that the spiritual teachers would not engage in manual labour,

Around this absolute present all Zen study is carried on. The moral value of anything or any work comes afterwards, and is the later development when the work already accomplished comes out as an object of study detached from the worker himself. The evaluation is secondary and not essential to the work itself while it is going on. Zen's daily life is to live and not to look at life from the outside —which would alienate life from the actual living of it. Then there will be words, ideas, concepts, etc., which do not belong in Zen's sphere of interest.

The question of profanity or sacredness, of decorum or indecency, is the result of abstraction and alienation. When a question comes up, Zen is no longer there but ten thousand miles away. The masters are not to be detained with idle discussions as to whether a thing is conventionally tabooed or not. Their objective is not iconoclasm, but their way of judging values comes out automatically as such from their inner life. The judgment which we, as outsiders, give them is concerned only with the bygone traces of the Zen life, with the corpse whose life has departed a long time ago. Zen thus keeps up its intimate contact with life. I would not say that the Indian mind is not like this, but rather that the Chinese mind is more earth-conscious and hates to be lifted up too high from the ground. The Chinese people are practical in this sense, and Zen is deeply infused with this spirit. Hui-neng never stopped pounding rice and chopping wood, and Pai-chang (Hyakujo)¹ was a great genius in organizing the Zen monastery on this principle of work.

5

Hu Shih is no doubt a brilliant writer and an astute thinker, but his logic of deducing the Zen methodology or irrationalism and "seeming craziness" out of the economic necessity of getting support from the powerful

¹ Ibid., Fas. VI, under "Pai-chang Hui-hai".

crazy" method. It goes without saying that the "Ho!" and "the stick" do not always mean the same thing. They have a variety of uses, and it will take a deep Zen insight to comprehend what they mean in different situations. Rinzai (Lin-chi I-hsuan), for example, distinguishes four kinds of "Ho!"

Now let me ask who are the "earlier masters" referred to by Hu Shih? Rinzai spoke outspokenly, and so did Tokusan (Te-shan Hsuan-chien), as is confirmed by Hu Shih himself. And it was they who used the stick and uttered "Ho!". Historically, in this they are preceded by Baso (Ma-tsu), who used the fist too. The history of the "crazy" pedagogic methodology of Zen may be said to start with Baso. Sekito (Shih-t'ou), his contemporary, also noted for his Zen insight and understanding, was not as "mad" as Baso, but the spread of Zen all over China, especially in the South, dates from Baso "in the west of the River" and Sekito "in the south of the Lake". Hu Shih's "earlier masters" must be those earlier than Baso and Sekito, which means Jinne (Shen-hui) and Yeno (Hui-neng), Nangaku Yejo (Nan-yueh Hui-jiang), Seigen Gyoshi (Ch'ing-yuan), etc. But Hu Shih evidently classes Rinzai, Tokusan, and Baso among those Zen masters who expounded Zen in plain outspoken language.

Hu Shih does not understand what *pu shuo po* (in translation, "do not tell outwardly") really means. It is not just not to speak plainly. I wish he would remember that there is something in the nature of *prajna*-intuition which eludes every attempt at intellectualization and rejects all plain speaking, so called. It is not purposely shunning this way of expression. As *prajna*-intuition goes beyond the two horns of a dilemma, it grudges committing itself to either side. This is what I mean when I say that Zen is beyond the ken of human understanding; by understanding, I mean conceptualization. When the Zen-experience—or *prajna*-intuition, which is the same thing—is brought to conceptualization, it is no more the experience itself; it turns into something else. *Pu shuo po* is not a pedagogical method; it is inherent in the consti-

tution of the experience, and even the Zen master cannot do anything with it.

To illustrate my point, I will quote two *mondo*. The subject of both is the ancient mirror, but one appears to be diametrically opposed to the other in its statement.

A monk asked: "When the ancient mirror is not yet polished, what statement can we make about it?"

The master answered: "The ancient mirror."

The monk: "What do we have after it is polished?"

The master: "The ancient mirror."

When the same question was brought to another master, he answered to the first: "Heaven and earth are universally illumined." To the second, "Pitch dark" was given as the answer.

The ancient mirror is the ultimate reality, the God-head, the mind, the undifferentiated totality. "When it is polished" means the differentiation, the world created by God, the universe of the ten thousand things. In the first *mondo* the mirror remains the same whether it is polished or not. In the second *mondo*, when it is not polished or differentiated, it illumines the whole universe, but when it is polished it loses its ancient brilliance and the light is hidden behind the multitudinousness of things. We may say that the second *mondo* directly contradicts the first, or that the first ignores the fact of differentiation, which is not rational. We can raise more questions concerning each singly and the two in their relationship. But *pu shuo po*; it takes too long to discuss the point fully in order to satisfy our understanding. When all is done, the original intuition from which we started is lost sight of; in fact, we do not know exactly where we are, so thickly covered are we with the dust of argument. The use of "plain language" which we aimed at in the beginning puts us now in the maze of intellection and gives us nothing solid; we are all vaporized.

Chu Hsi was a great Confucian thinker—there is no doubt about that. But he had no *prajna*-intuition into the

constitution of the ancient mirror. Therefore, what he says about *pu shuo po* and also about "the golden needle" working underneath the embroidery is off the track. There is nothing pedagogical here. As to *pu shuo po* (unexplainable), I have *shuo po liao* (explained away) as above.

Now as regards the golden needle. It is not that the needle is designedly held back from the sight of the outsider. It cannot be delivered to him even when you want that done. It is something each of us has to get by himself. It is not that "I'll not pass it on to you", but "I can't pass it on to you". For we are all in possession of a golden needle which, however, becomes our own only when we discover it in the unconscious. What can be passed on from one person to another is not native to him who gets it.

Hsing-yen's (Kyogen's) story may be illuminating in this connection.¹

Hsing-yen Chih-hsian was a disciple of I-san (Kweishan Ling-yu, 771-834). Recognizing his aptitude for Zen, I-san once asked Kyogen (Hsing-yen): "I am not going to find out how much you know from book-learning and other sources. What I want you to tell me is this: Can you let me have a word (*i chu*) from you before you came out of your mother's body, before you came to discriminate things?"

"A word" (*i chu*) is something one cannot *shuo po* (explain fully) however much one may try; nor is it a thing which one can pass on to another. Zen wants us to grasp this, each in his own way, out of the depths of consciousness, even before this becomes psychologically or biologically possible. It is therefore beyond the scope of our relative understanding. How can we do it? Yet this is what I-san, as a good Zen master, demanded of his disciple.

Kyogen did not know how to answer or what to say. After being absorbed in deep meditation for some time, he presented his views. But they were all rejected by the master. He then

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XI.

asked I-san to let him have the right answer. I-san said: "What I can tell you is my understanding and is of no profit to you." Kyogen returned to his room and went over all his notes, in which he had many entries, but he could not find anything suitable for his answer. He was in a state of utter despondency. "A painted piece of cake does not appease the hungry man." So saying, he committed all his note-books to the fire. He decided not to do anything with Zen, which he now thought to be above his abilities. He left I-san and settled down at a temple where there was the tomb of Chu Kokushi (Chung, the National Teacher). One day while sweeping the ground, his broom made a stone strike a bamboo, which made a noise; and this awoke his unconscious consciousness, which he had even before he was born. He was delighted and grateful to his teacher I-san for not having *shuo chueh* (explained) what the *i chu* (word) was. The first lines of the *gatha* he then composed run as follows:

"One blow has made me forget all my learning;
There was no need for specific training and cultivation."

When I-san did not explain the *i chu* for Kyogen he had no thought of educating him by any specific device. He could not do anything, even if he wished, for his favourite disciple. As he then told him, whatever he would say was his own and not anybody else's. Knowledge can be transmitted from one person to another, for it is a common possession of the human community, but Zen does not deal in such wares. In this respect Zen is absolutely individualistic.

There is one thing I would like to add which will help to clarify Hu Shih's idea of Chinese Zen.

Hu Shih must have noticed in his historical study of Zen in China that Zen has almost nothing to do with the Indian Buddhist practice of *dhyana*, though the term Zen or Ch'an is originally derived from the Sanskrit. The meaning of Zen as meditation or quiet thinking or contemplation no longer holds good after Hui-neng (Yeno), the sixth Patriarch. As I have said, it was Hui-neng's revolutionary movement that achieved this severance.

Hui-neng's message to Chinese Buddhism was the identity of *prajna* and *dhyana*. Shen-hui (Jinne) was most expressive in giving voice to this theme. He was more intellectual in his understanding of Zen than Baso, Sekito, and others, and this was one of the reasons why Shen-hui's school lost its hold on the Chinese mind. The Chinese mind does not tend to be intellectual or metaphysical, and Zen, as the native product of the Chinese mentality, abhors this strain of intellectuality in its study. The Rinzai way of handling Zen is in better accord with the spirit of Zen and goes well with the Chinese liking for practicality and going direct to the objective. At all events, the essential character of Zen, which is based on the identity of *prajna* and *dhyana*, was pointed out in quite an intelligible manner by Shen-hui, as described in the preceding pages.

Before Hui-neng, this problem of the relationship between *dhyana* and *prajna* was not so sharply brought to a focus in China. The Indian mind naturally tended to emphasize *dhyana* more than *prajna*, and Chinese Buddhists followed their Indian predecessors without paying much attention to the subject. But when Hui-neng came on the scene he at once perceived that *prajna* was the most essential thing in the study of Buddhism, and that as long as *dhyana* practice was brought forward at the expense of *prajna* the real issue was likely to be neglected. Moreover, *dhyana* came to be mixed up with *samatha* and *vipasyana*, tranquillization and contemplation, which were a great concern of followers of the Tendai (T'ien-t'ai) school. I do not think Hui-neng was historically conscious of these things; he simply wanted to proclaim his *prajna*-intuition. The situation was accentuated when Shen-hsiu, or, rather, his followers, loudly protested against the Hui-neng movement, which was headed by Shen-hui (Jinne). There are still many Buddhist scholars who are confused about Chinese Zen and the Indian Buddhist practice of *dhyana*.

called intention behind it—may not this asking itself come out of God's will? Is it not God himself who prompts us to ask about his intention or will? If this be the case, the one who can answer the question must be God himself. When we ask such a question as if it came out of ourselves and not from the Creator, are we not putting ourselves on the wrong track? The answer and the question come out of the same root. Therefore, when the root of the question is taken hold of, the answer is already in our hands without our being conscious of the fact.

When the questioner questions himself, he has already answered himself, for the questioning is no other than the answering. God by creating a world answers his own question. Chosui understood his question when he saw it echoed back in the form of his own question. This echoing is the answer. If there were no echoing, there would be no answering the question. The knocking at the door is answered by its being opened. In fact, the knocking is the opening. John calls out to Harry, and Harry responds. The calling is the responding. When this is understood there is Zen.

Mondo, then, means mutuality, or co-responding. As long as the Originally Pure remains pure, that is, remains with itself and in itself and does not ask any question, there is no splitting, hence no answering, no mutuality, no "participation". When any question comes out at all, it sees itself reflected in the form of "the ten thousand things", in the form of "the mountains and the rivers and the great earth". Here is neither coming-out nor coming-in. The Originally Pure is no other than "the mountains and the rivers and the great earth". When the Pure calls out, the echo responds; the mountains rise, the rivers flow, and the great earth moves. God now sees himself in the mirror of "the ten thousand things". The questioning is setting up the mirror.

When Tozan (Tung-shan) came to Shozan Yecho (Shu-shan Hui-ch'ao),¹ Yecho said: "What makes you come here when you are already a recognized leader?"

¹ *Zoku Dentoroku*, Fas. IX.

Tozan: "I still have my doubt which I am unable to solve. Hence my appearance here."

Yecho then called out to Tozan: "O Ryokai!" (Ryokai was Tozan's name). Tozan responded: "Yes, Sir."

Yecho: "What is that?"

Tozan gave no answer.

Thereupon Yecho remarked: "A fine Buddha has no halo!"

Buddha with a halo or with no halo is standing before Yecho. But there is one thing it is better for us to remember. When we become conscious of the halo, the halo vanishes. Not only does it vanish, but it is apt to harm us in one way or another. The halo shines most when we are unconscious of it. But as human beings endowed with all the functions of consciousness, we must at least once become conscious of it. Becoming conscious of it, however, the best thing we can do with it is to forget it altogether. To be always remembering it is to cling to it and the clinging does us a great deal of harm. Let us, therefore, remember it as if not remembering—that is, be unconsciously conscious of it.

Joshu (Ch'ao-chou Ts'ung-shen),¹ a grand old master of the T'ang dynasty, once gave this warning to his pupils: "Do not linger where there is Buddha. Pass quickly by where there is no Buddha." Why is he so antagonistic to Buddha as he apparently is? Another time he said: "Wash your mouth thoroughly if you say 'Buddha'." Is the word "Buddha" so defiling and infectious? When you are conscious of a halo, this is what happens. The old masters are kind-hearted if they appear so forbidding.

When Daizui (Tai-shui Fa-chen)² was staying with Isan, he distinguished himself in various ways, in discipline, industry, and daily behaviour. The master Isan thought a great deal of him. One day Isan called him in and asked: "You have been here for some time, but you have never approached me with a question. How is that?"

¹ *Goto Regen*, Fas. IV. The title means "Essentials of the Five Lamps".

² *Ibid.*

Daizui: "But where do you want me to insert a word?"

Isan: "Why do you not ask what 'Buddha is'?"

Daizui lost no time in vigorously applying his hand over Isan's mouth.

Isan: "You have really attained the marrow."

Isan is somewhat too "grandmotherly", as the Zen man would remark. Why not give a hearty blow of a stick to Daizui, who behaves as if he knew a thing or two? But he might have given to Isan a similar treatment even before Isan told him what to ask.

A monk asked: "What is my mind?" The master answered: "Who is asking?" When you utter a word, "it" is no more there. But if you do not, how could you ever come to a realization? The asking is important indeed, but let us remember that the asking is really putting another head over the one you already have. God would not be God if he had not created the world with all its joys and woes—this would be my answer if I were a Christian and were asked why God created the world. Indeed, he is a fool who asks such a question. For he would have to go from one master to another till the end of his life if he once started asking these questions: What is the Mind? What is the Self? What is God? What is Buddha?

The following *mondo* took place between Shoshu (Shao-hsiu of Lung-chi-shan),¹ the master, and a monk.

Monk: "What is my eternal Mind?" Master: "Did you ever ask Kagyoku?" The monk: "I do not understand." Master: "If you do not understand, go to Sozan at the end of the summer and ask him."

I will now initiate you into another type of *mondo* where the question of affirmation and negation is treated. Here is a kind of Zen-dialectic. But there is no trace here of the dialectical argument which we generally see in a treatise of Western philosophy. As you know, Zen is not logic nor is it given up to metaphysical discourse. That is why *mondo* is a characteristic of Zen.

A company of monks came, and Daizui asked: "What would those who have mastered Zen call East?"

¹ *Zoku Dentoroku*, Fas. XXIV.

The monks' leader answered: "It is not to be called East."

Daizui shouted: "O you dirty-smelling ass! If you do not call it East, what do you call it?" There was no answer.¹

The monks' leader is all right when he answers: "It is not to be called East." Daizui is also right when he abuses him by calling him an ill-smelling ass when the leader answers: "East is not East." For what else could East be called? According to us ordinary-minded people, East is East and West is West. This is the agreement we have reached since the beginning of civilization. If East ceases to be East and West West there will surely be all kinds of topsyturvydom, and it will be impossible for any one of us to walk or drive safely in the streets of London or elsewhere. Perhaps even our living will be endangered, because the sun will not rise any longer from the East and set in the West. Night will be day and day will be night. My pen will slip out of my hand and turn into yours. Either I am thus stealing your property, or you are losing your sense of identity—and this is no exaggeration. For when East is not East, not only our system of spatial references but also that of temporal fixations comes to an end. When we cannot even move a finger, we cannot go on living for a moment, and for this same reason we can never die. For there is no such thing as death. Is it not wonderful to see that this innocent-sounding little *mondo* can contain in it such a ruinous logical consequence, involving a problem of life and death?

We now can fully realize that a most unexpectedly consequential thought is concealed under a most trifling matter-of-fact kind of statement. Zen *mondo* cannot be set aside as of no meaning. We are indeed to weigh every word or gesture that comes from a Zen master.

Probably a few words are necessary to make clear what I mean here.

When the Godhead asserted himself, he became a

¹ *Zoku Dentoroku*, Fas. XI.

God, which was the negation of himself. The Godhead ceased to be the Godhead in order to be himself. An affirmation always implies a negation, and a negation an affirmation; they are interrelated. One cannot be had without the other. "A" is to be "not-A" when "A" wills to be "A". The willing is possible only by negating itself. The Godhead cannot help being a creator. But as soon as he creates he is no more himself; there is the creator and the created.

The Zen master produces a rosary and asks his disciples: "If you call it a rosary you touch, and if you do not, you 'go against'. Without committing yourself to either, what do you call it?"

"To touch" is to assert, and "to go against" is to negate. What the master wants us to say here is "the one word" which is in the beginning, that is, in the beginningless beginning, and which, therefore, never vanishes away at the end of the world which is really no end. This "one word" is beyond yes and no, beyond East and West, beyond rosary and no-rosary, beyond "touching" and "going against". When Daizui rebuked the monk who denied "East" as "an ill-smelling ass", Daizui meant that the monk had not yet realized what is beyond affirmation and negation, that the monk was yet far from grasping "the one word".

You will naturally ask now what is this "one word". Indeed, when one has it, one has all the secrets of being and of creation. The following *mondo* is what you want to solve.

Shobi (Ch'u-wei of Ch'ien-chou)¹ asked Kyozan: "What is your name?"

Kyozan: "Ye-jaku."

Shobi: "What is 'ye'? what is 'jaku'?"

Kyozan: "Right before you."

Shobi: "Still there is a before-and-after (relation)."

Kyozan: "Let us for a while put aside the question of a before-and-after (relation). O master, what do you see?"

Shobi: "Have a cup of tea."

¹ *Zoku Dentoroku*, Fas. IX.

English way of saying it. In the original Chinese there is no reference to any particular object or subject. Literally translated it simply reads: "Only-is-eye's before." In English this does not make sense, for we shall demand before whose eye or eyes it is, and who is before whom. All these references are to be definitely stated. In Chinese or Japanese the pronouns or the objects represented by them are omitted, which frequently leads to obscurity. But, as in the present case, this obscurity is the description of a precise situation in which they, Shobi and Kyozan, are finding themselves. "The Originally Pure" is there without its being specifically located here or there and timed now or then. It is before somebody's eye, which means anybody's and everybody's eye—that is, wherever there is an eye to see. "It is just before the eye" is quite expressive of the actuality which both, Shobi and Kyozan, were facing at the time of the *mondo*.

But as soon as language intrudes itself in one form or another, the question of time and space and causal sequence comes in. Hence Shobi's charge about the relationship of before and after. Kyozan Yejaku was, however, quick enough to catch Shobi's way of looking at the matter. Kyozan immediately demanded: "O master, what do you see?" This counter-questioning is characteristic of Zen. Instead of directly answering the question, Kyozan wanted to know what Shobi saw before and after him. There is a subtle point in it. For as long as there is any seeing the question arises as to who sees and what is seen and consequently the question of before-and-after.

When a *mondo* comes to this pass, there must be a turning point which puts an end to the whole procedure. When intellectualization develops, Zen turns into philosophy. It was natural for Shobi to avoid this pitfall. He concluded the *mondo* in a dramatic and yet an appropriate way: "Have a cup of tea."

As long as we stay at the level of relativity or intellectualization, we shall have all kinds of disagreement and have to keep up a series of hot discussions. This is inevitable. Zen fully realizes it and wants us all to go back

to living itself, where there will be no more arguments, no more controversies. But here is a most important matter we must not forget to mention in this connection. Zen does not just demand living without involving ourselves in logical complications. Zen demands that we have a certain experience of awareness as we go on living, for this awareness is what makes us humans qualitatively different from all other forms of living being. And it is here indeed that we humans, regardless of all sorts of differentiation which are discernible among us, find our ultimate abode of peace, which is also our original home where we all come from and where we all long to be back. This is where we all can happily "take a cup of tea" with no "before-after", with no "whence-whither", with no "I am-thou art".

In passing I wish to remind my readers that our sitting quietly and sipping tea together on the common ultimate ground of living realities does not by any means hinder our being infinitely differentiated from one another, and also our possibly being engaged in a never-ending series of arguments.

There is a famous story which it may be interesting to quote in connection with Shobi's "Have a cup of tea". Joshu Jushin¹ was a great master of Zen in the middle period of the T'ang dynasty. One day a new monk arrived at his monastery. He asked: "Have you ever been here before?" When the monk answered: "No, master, this is my first visit," Joshu said: "Have a cup of tea." Later, there was another monk who came to see Joshu. Joshu asked: "Have you been here before?" The monk said: "Yes, master." Joshu said: "Have a cup of tea."

The Inju (the manager of the monastery) approached Joshu and asked: "How is it that you ask the two monks in the same way to take a cup of tea regardless of their different ways of answering? One says that he has never been here before, and you tell him to have a cup of tea; while the other says that he has been here and you tell

¹ Goto Tegen, Fas. IV.

him just as before to have a cup of tea. I fail to understand you, O master."

When Joshu was thus asked by the Inju, Joshu called out: "O Inju!" And the Inju at once responded: "Yes, master." Joshu lost no time in saying: "Have a cup of tea, O Inju."

"Have a cup of tea" is thus uniformly given to all who approach the master, no matter what attitude they assume toward him. Affirmation or negation, yes or no, a spade or not a spade, they are all no more than verbal differentiation. As long as we remain in the realm of verbalism, a dialogue is needed. But once out of it, *mondo* is the only way the Zen masters can make use of the expression of their experience.

Let me conclude this with a few more examples of *mondo* by Daido.

Question: "I am told that one reality universally moistens all beings. What is one reality?" Answer: "It is raining."

"Moistening" is an allusion to a story in the *Saddharma-pundarika Sutra* where Buddha explains how one rain uniformly moistens all plants and makes them grow each in accordance with its nature, the pine as pine, the chrysanthemum as chrysanthemum. Hence the master's answer: "It is raining."

Question: "It is said that one particle of dust contains all the worlds. How is this?"

Answer: "The one has already turned into several particles."

Question: "How about the golden chain when it has not yet been broken up?"

Answer: "It is broken up."

part of Man the tendency to exploit and abuse it for his selfish ends.

The Nature-Man dichotomy issues, as I think, from the Biblical account in which the Creator is said to have given mankind the power to dominate all creation. It is fundamentally due to this story that Western people talk so much about conquering Nature. When they invent a flying machine they say they have conquered the air; when they climb to the top of Mt. Everest they loudly announce that they have succeeded in conquering the mountain. This idea of conquest comes from the relationship between Nature and Man being regarded as that of power, and this relationship involves a state of mutual opposition and destruction.

This power-relationship also brings out the problem of rationality. Man is rational, whereas Nature is brutal, and Man strives to make Nature amenable to his idea of rationality. Rationality is born with the rising of consciousness out of the primordial Unconscious. Consciousness makes it possible for the human being to reflect upon his own doings and the events around him. This reflection gives him the power to rise above mere naturalness and to bring it under his control.

There is no discipline in Nature because it operates blindly. Discipline, which is something human and artificial, and to that extent works for bad as well as for good, belongs entirely to humankind. As long as he is capable of it, Man trains himself for a definite purpose.

Nature, on the other hand, is purposeless, and it is because of this purposelessness that Nature in one sense is "conquered" by Man and in another sense conquers Man. For however purposeful Man may be, he does not know ultimately whither he is going, and his pride has after all no substance whatever.

In this paper, then, let us understand Nature as something antithetical to what is ordinarily known as divine;

as something irrational yet amenable to our mechanical, economic, utilitarian treatment; as something not human, not in possession of human feelings, and devoid of moral significance; as something which finally overpowers Man in spite of Man's partial and temporary success. In short, Nature is brutally factual, with no history objectively set before us and to be regarded as commercially exploitable, but finally swallowing us all in the purposelessness of the Unknown.

Concretely speaking, Nature consists of mountains and rivers, grass and trees, stones and earth, suns, moons and stars, birds and animals. Nature is all that constitutes what is commonly known as Man's objective world.

2

When Nature is seen in this light it may seem well defined, but Nature has a great deal more to say to us. Nature is indeed an eternal problem, and when it is solved, we know not only Nature but ourselves; the problem of Nature is the problem of human life.

From the human point of view, anything that is not of human origin may be said to be of Nature. But Man is, after all, part of Nature itself. First of all, Man himself is not Man-made but Nature-made, as much as anything we regard as of Nature. If so, what is Man-made? There is nothing in Man that does not belong in Nature. All things Man-made must be considered Nature-made and not Man-made. If God created the world, he created Man as part of it. God did not create Man as something separate from Nature so that Man can stand outside Nature as a controlling power and have things "Man-made" put against things "Nature-made".

But as far as the Biblical account is concerned, Man was made in God's image and Nature was to be dominated by Man.¹ And this idea is the real beginning of human tragedy. I wish to ask if it is the right way of

¹ Genesis i, 27-8.

thinking—this idea of domination. For when the idea of power, which is domination, comes in, all kinds of struggles arise, and as this struggle is always ego-centred its outcome is tragic.

Nature, as we have seen, includes all “created” things. To think that these are all under human control is altogether illogical and cannot be consistently maintained. But Western people unconsciously follow this idea and their moral attitude towards Nature is thereby determined. Man, though made in God’s image, has his own way of doing things, which is by no means God’s way. For this reason he was expelled from Eden. He is now partly God’s and partly Satan’s child, and what he does quite frequently contradicts the divine commands and also sometimes his own self-interest. As to Nature, it also acts against God, though it cannot be anything else but God’s creation.

Man is against God, Nature is against God, and Man and Nature are against each other. If so, God’s own likeness (Man), God’s own creation (Nature), and God himself—all three are at war. But with our human way of thinking, God did not create the world just to see it revolt against himself and make it fight within itself.

From another point of view, however, it is in the nature of things that as soon as there is a world of the many there is conflict. When the world is once out of God’s hand, he cannot control it; it is sure to revolt and fight in every possible way. So we have now Nature against God and Man against Nature and God.

In Biblical terms Nature is the “flesh”, “lust of the flesh”, “sinful flesh”, etc. This brings the fight between Nature and Man to a more concrete and sensuous level. The human body, which is a mixture of God and Nature, becomes a most bloody fighting arena for these two forces.

From these considerations we can summarize the Western attitude towards Nature thus:

(1) Nature is something hostile to Man and drags him down when he is struggling to reach God. The temptations of Nature symbolized as “the flesh” are often

irresistible and make Man exclaim: "The spirit is willing but the flesh is weak."¹

(2) While Nature and God are warring against each other, Nature and Man are also at war. Or rather, as commanded by God, Man is always striving to exercise his dominating power over Nature.

(3) There is no way for Man to approach Nature in a conciliatory, friendly spirit. One works to destroy the other. There is nothing in Nature that will help Man in his spiritual advancement.

(4) Nature is a material world and the material world is meant for exploration and exploitation.

(5) In another sense the material world is brute fact, stands as the *pour-soi* against the *en-soi*. Intellect cannot do anything with it, but has to take it as it is and make the best of it.

(6) The dichotomy of Nature-and-Man implies hostility, even an utter irreconcilability, and is, therefore, mutually destructive.

(7) No idea seems to be present here which indicates or even suggests human participation in, or identification with, Nature. To the Western mind Nature and Man are separate.

3

Man relies on Nature for food and cannot help being influenced by Nature. He finds himself engaged in farming, hunting, fishing, etc., and each of these engagements contributes to his character, for Nature cannot be conceived as a merely passive substance upon which Man works. Nature is also power and energy; Nature reacts to human calls. When Man is agreeable and in conformity with Nature's way, it will co-operate with Man and reveal to him all its secrets and even help him to understand himself. Each of us as a farmer or hunter or carpenter gets from Nature what he looks for in it and

¹ Matthew xxvi, 41.

assimilates it in his own field. To this extent, Nature remoulds human character.

To treat Nature as something irrational and in opposition to human "rationality" is a purely Western idea, and sometimes we feel the proposition ought to be reversed. It is irrational of Man to try to make Nature obey his will, because Nature has its own way of carrying on its work which is not always Man's way, and Man has no right to impose his way upon Nature.

Nature, it is true, lacks consciousness. It is just the reed and not "a thinking reed". Because of this lack of consciousness it is regarded by Man as brute fact, as something with no will and intelligence of its own. It knows of nothing but an absolute "must", and permits no human interference except in its "must" way. It knows no favouritism and refuses to deviate from its course of inevitability. It is not accommodating; it is Man who must accommodate himself to Nature. Nature's "must" is absolute, and Man must accept it. In this respect Nature has something of the divine will.

This is the reason, I think, why being natural or spontaneous has an alluring quality in it. When a child performs deeds which polite society would condemn as undignified or improper or even immoral, the offences are not only condoned but accepted as acts of innocent childlikeness. There is something divine in being spontaneous and not being hampered by human conventionalities and their artificial hypocrisies. There is something direct and fresh in this lack of restraint by anything human, which suggests a divine freedom and creativity. Nature never deliberates; it acts directly out of its own heart, whatever this may mean. In this respect Nature is divine. Its "irrationality" transcends human doubts or ambiguities, and in our submitting to it, or rather accepting it, we transcend ourselves.

This acceptance or transcendence is a human prerogative. We accept Nature's "irrationality" or its "must" deliberately, quietly, and whole-heartedly. It is not a deed of blind and slavish submission to the inevitable.

It is an active acceptance, a personal willingness with no thought of resistance. In this there is no force implied, no resignation, but rather participation, assimilation, and perhaps in some cases even identification.

4

Nature is sometimes treated by Western people as something already "there" into which Man comes, and which he finds himself confronting, with hostility, because he feels he does not belong in it. He is conscious of a situation in which he is surrounded by all kinds of inert matter and brute fact. He does not know why he is there, nor does he realize what is coming to him. Endowed with consciousness, however, he thinks he can decide his future course, and he feels entirely responsible for his decision. He is lonely and helpless because Nature is threatening and ready to swallow him down into its own maw. He is overawed and trembles, not knowing what is best to do. This is the position, according to some modern thinkers, when Man encounters Nature. Here is no room for God to enter, but the dichotomy of Man and Nature is still maintained and in a more acutely oppressive relationship. Nature is brute fact and has nothing in common with Man. Man makes use of it economically with no sense of kinship with it, hence with no sense of gratitude or sympathetic affiliation.

Nature is here an unknown quantity, unfriendly and ready to frustrate Man's attempt to dominate it. Nature promises nothing but sheer emptiness. Whatever Man may build upon it is doomed to destruction. It is for this reason that modern men are constantly assailed with feelings of fear, insecurity, and anxiety.

There is, however, another way of considering Nature and Man. Inasmuch as Nature stands before Man as an unknown quantity and Man comes to it with his consciousness from somewhere else than Nature, Nature and Man cannot be friendly and sociable, for they

have no way to communicate. They are strangers. But the very fact that Man finds himself encountering Nature demonstrates that the two are not unknown to each other. To this extent, then, Nature is already telling Man something of itself and Man is to that extent understanding Nature. Then Man cannot be said to be entirely an outsider but somehow stands in relation to Nature; perhaps comes out of Nature itself. Man must be after all an insider.

5

Here there is room for Zen Buddhism to enter, and to give its own views on the relationship of Nature and Man.

While separating himself from Nature, Man is still a part of Nature, for the fact of separation itself shows that Man is dependent on Nature. We can therefore say this: Nature produces Man out of itself; Man cannot be outside of Nature, he still has his being rooted in Nature. Therefore there cannot be any hostility between them. On the contrary, there must always be a friendly understanding between Man and Nature. Man came from Nature in order to see Nature in himself; that is, Nature came to itself in order to see itself in Man.

This is objective thinking, to say that Man comes from Nature and that Man sees himself through Nature, or that Nature sees itself through Man. There is another way of seeing into the situation, by shifting our position from objectivity to subjectivity. This probing into subjectivity is probing into the very basis of Nature as it is in itself.

To turn to subjectivity means to turn from Nature to Man himself. Instead of considering Man objectively in opposition to Nature, our task is now to make Man retreat, as it were, into himself and see what he finds in the depths of his being. The probing of Nature thus becomes the problem of Man: Who or what is Man?

all Christians or "God-fearing" minds. They are too dualistically minded and unable to think of going beyond tradition and history.

The master's answer is also significant. He ignores time-sequence in which birth-and-death takes place with all other events which make up human history. He pays no attention to the serialism of time. When the monk asks about his "nose" before his coming into this world of sense and intellect, the master retorts by referring to the monk's actual presence, to his "as-he-is-ness". From the relative point of view this answer is no answer; it does not locate the monk's "nose", but asks the counter-question regarding himself as he stands before the master, perhaps in a shabby monkish robe and with a not very smoothly shaven face and a not very shapely nose.

The point that I am trying to make is that Zen starts where time has not come to itself; that is to say, where timelessness has not negated itself so as to have a dichotomy of subject-object, Man-Nature, God-world. This is the abode of what I call "pure subjectivity". Zen is here and wants us to be here too. In terms of Nature, Zen is where one of the masters remarked: "When I began to study Zen, mountains were mountains; when I thought I understood Zen, mountains were not mountains; but when I came to full knowledge of Zen, mountains were again mountains."

When the mountains are seen as not standing against me, when they are dissolved into the oneness of things, they are not mountains, they cease to exist as objects of Nature. When they are seen as standing against me, as separate from me, as something unfriendly to me, they are not mountains either. The mountains are really mountains when they are assimilated into my being and I am absorbed in them. As long as Nature is something differentiated from me and is displayed before me as if it were an unknown quantity and a mere brute fact, Nature cannot be said even to be unfriendly or actively hostile.

On the other hand, Nature becomes part of my being

Nature is observed. Nature may, for all we know, be more than that, but we have no more than the five senses, beyond which we have no means to differentiate Nature. In a physical world of senses more than five (or six) we should perceive something more in Nature, and our life would be richer to that extent. Seven windows would surely give us more of Nature. This is, however, a mere possibility worked out by looking through the sense-windows as we have them, which are aided by the intellect or the *mano-vijnana*, according to Buddhist psychology. From this, we can think of a world of four or more dimensions, indeed of any number. Mathematicians have all kinds of numbers, imaginary, negative, complex, etc., which are of no sensuous demonstration. Our actual physical world is limited. We can think of an infinitely extending space, but specialists tell us that space is limited and that it is mathematically calculable.

What concerns Zen is the problem of the self which plays with the "six lions" or looks out through the "six windows"—the subjectum, or what I call pure subjectivity. This is what interests Zen and Zen wants us to get acquainted with it. But the Zen way of acquaintance is unique, for it does not proceed with the dichotomy of Man-Nature or subject-object. Zen takes us at once to the realm of non-dichotomy, which is the beginningless beginning of all things. Time has not yet come to its own consciousness. Zen is where this consciousness is about to rise. Or it may be better to say that consciousness is caught at the very moment of rising from the unconscious. This moment is an absolute present, the crossing point of time and timelessness, of the conscious and unconscious. This crossing moment, which is the rising moment of an *ekacittakshana*, that is, the moment of no-mind or no-thought, refuses to be expressed in language, in words of the mouth. It is a matter of personal determination.

While Ungan was sweeping the ground, Isan asked: "You are busily employed, are you not?"

Ugan: "There is one who is not at all busily employed."

Isan: "In that case you mean to say that there is a second moon?"

Ungan set up the broom and said: "What number is this moon?"

Isan nodded and went away.

Gensha (Hsuan-sha Shih-pei, 834-908), hearing of this, remarked: "This is no other than a second moon!"¹

"A second moon" refers to a dualistic conception of the self. There is one who is busily engaged in work and there is another who is not working and quietly unmoved observes all that goes before him. This way of thinking is not Zen. In Zen there is no such separation between worker and observer, movement and mover, seer and the seen, subject and object. In the case of Ungan, the sweeping and the sweeper and the broom are all one, even including the ground which is being swept. There is no second moon, no third moon, no first moon either. This is beyond verbalism. But Man is no Man unless he knows how to communicate. Hence Ungan's setting up the broom. The language of Zen has characteristics of its own.

To give another example: When Ungan was making tea, Dogo (Tao-wu Yuan-chih, 779-835) came in and asked: "To whom are you serving tea?"

Ungan: "There is one who wants it."

Dogo: "Why don't you make him serve himself?"

Ungan: "Fortunately, I am here."²

"I" is the one who wants tea and also the one who makes tea; "I" is the server and the served.

Ungan once asked a nun: "Is your father still alive?"

The nun answered: "Yes, master."

Ungan: "How old is he?"

Nun: "Eighty."

Ungan: "You have a father whose age is not eighty, do you know him?"

Nun: "Is he not the one who thus comes?"

Ungan: "He is still a child [of his]."³

The problem of the self evaporates into sheer ab-

¹ *The Transmission of the Lamp*, Fas. XIV.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.