

***AN INTRODUCTION
TO
HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI'S
RELIGIOUS THOUGHT***

F.A.S. SOCIETY
KYOTO 2012

AN INTRODUCTION TO
HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI'S RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Translations edited by TOKIWA Gishin
in collaboration with TSUKUI Akemi

Published by The F.A..S. Society
Kyoto, JAPAN, October 2012

CONTENTS

Greetings from the Editor with Contributors' list	5
A. I. The Author's own Prefaces or Introductions to His Five Separate Books with Their Contents, translated	
(1) Preface to <i>ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS</i>	7
(2) A Prefatory Note to <i>THE WAY OF ABSOLUTE SUBJECTIVITY</i>	9
(3) A Prefatory Note to <i>PROBLEMS POSED IN THE QIXIN-LUN</i>	11
(4) Preface to <i>CHAN AND THE FINE ARTS</i>	12
(5) The Introductory Case for <i>SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA-JING</i>	14
A. II. Contents of the Author's Collected Writings	
A.II-1. Contents of the Original Collected Writings	
vol. 1: <i>ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS</i>	20
vol. 2: <i>THE WAY OF ABSOLUTE SUBJECTIVITY</i>	21
vol. 3: <i>AWAKENING AND CREATION</i>	25
vol. 4: <i>THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WAY OF TEA</i>	28
vol. 5: <i>CHAN AND ARTS</i>	32
vol. 6: <i>EXCERPTS FROM BUDDHIST SCRIPTURES AND CHAN RECORDS</i>	35
vol. 7: <i>A COLLECTION OF VERSES WITH THE AUTHOR'S PREFATORY NOTE</i>	37
vol. 8: <i>BROKEN SANDALS</i>	39
A. II-2. Additional Contents of the Enlarged Collected Writings in Nine Volumes: In Volumes 1, 4, 7 plus 9	
	47
A. II-3. Contents of the Four-Volume Lectures on Buddhism	
vol. 1. <i>THE EXISTENCE THAT IS NOTHING</i>	50
vol. 2. <i>THE BUDDHISTIC WORLD</i>	51

vol. 3. <i>THE LOGIC OF THE RETURN ASPECT</i>	52
vol. 4. <i>IN EVERYTHING WITHOUT HINDRANCE</i>	53
 B. Ten Works by the Author in Translation	
1. <i>Chan</i> and <i>Chan</i> Culture	54
2. On <i>Chan</i> Art	77
3. The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness	87
4. <i>Chan</i> : Its Meaning for Modern Civilization	119
5. Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection	140
6. True Sitting and the Fundamental <i>Koan</i>	178
7. On Mutually Going Into the Matter of Self	187
8. Memoirs of His Academic Life	192
9. After the Academic Life	208
10. Selected Verses	211
 C. A Brief Chronological Record	219
Publishing Page	225

Greetings from the Editor
TOKIWA Gishin

To the English readers throughout the world I would like to introduce a series of public lectures, four treatises, two talks, two autobiographical essays, and some verses, in order, of a Japanese religio-philosopher and man of *Chan* (*Zen*), the late Dr. HISAMATSU (surname, meaning Eternal Pine) Shin'ichi (personal name meaning True One), 1889–1980, selected and prepared from the collection of his writings, together with his brief chronological record, in English translation. Titles of the ten works and a record prepared are as follows:

1. *Chan* and *Chan* Culture
(four public lectures at Harvard, 1957, vol. V)
 2. On *Chan* Art (a treatise, 1939, vol. V)
 3. The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness (a treatise, 1948, vol. I)
 4. *Chan*: Its Meaning for Modern Civilization (a treatise, 1962, vol. III)
 5. Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection (a treatise on F.A.S., 1969, vol. II)
 6. True Sitting and the Fundamental *Koan* (talks, 1965, vol. III)
 7. On Mutually Going Into the Matter of Self (talks, 1968, vol. III)
 8. Memoirs of His Academic Life
(an autobiographical essay, 1955, vol. I)
 9. After the Academic Life (an essay after the above, 1966, vol. I)
 10. Selected Verses (mostly after Harvard, vol. VII)
 11. A Brief Chronological Record (vol. IX)
- (The volume numbers are those of the author's collected writings; I to VIII are common to the old and new editions, published by Risosha and then by Hozo-kan, IX being the new volume.)

Except for 1 and 10, the rest have already been introduced through the FAS Society website for free access. This time all are newly arranged (as B. 1 ~ 10 and C. See below.) for the same website. Certainly, besides the above, some of the author's other writings have been translated into English by others as well as by me. But reflection upon my own ability has resulted in the above selection. Now, this kind of selection and preparation inevitably demands me to provide readers with a kind of map whereby they can not only locate a particular work but also grasp the outline of the author's thought. The following A. I. & II. have been prepared especially for this purpose.

- A. I. The Author's own Prefaces or Introductions to His Five Separate Books & Contents;
A. II-1. Contents of the Author's Collected Writings in Eight Volumes, with A Prefatory Note by the Author to the Seventh Volume;

- A. II-2. Additional Contents of the Enlarged Collected Writings in Nine Volumes;
- A. II-3. Contents of the Lectures on Buddhism in Four Volumes.
- B. Ten Works by the Author
- C. A Brief Chronological Record

This introduction to Dr. Hisamatsu's religio-philosophical thought is being conducted by me in collaboration with Ms. TSUKUI Akemi, not as our personal achievements but on behalf of the F.A.S. Society, an association for the study and practice of *Chan* in a critical manner, originated by the author together with early members. It is expected that through this introduction readers will come to appreciate the author's message to all mankind.

Notes:

1. As for other translators' works, references are made in the introduction of the contents of the author's collected writings below.
2. For citing a Japanese person's full name, the surname is given first in capitals.
3. The italics used for emphasis in this INTRODUCTION follow the Japanese texts. The Chinese phonetic alphabet used here is without tone symbols; the Japanese Roman alphabet is often without marks for long vowels; the Roman alphabet used for Sanskrit terms also is often without tone marks.
4. As for the FAS Society Journal, it succeeded the Newsletter issued for non-Japanese members or sympathizers under the guidance of ABE Masao from 1976 through 1980, kept being issued from 1984 through 1999, and is now out of print. The journal, unlike the newsletter, was edited by a single person until 1995 while the number of readers kept increasing; thirteen numbers were issued on the basis of the editor's personal efforts and interests. Since 1996, so as to improve the situation, the Society had two persons join as co-editors, but after four numbers were issued the journal was closed. The total numbers issued included not a few translations of the author's writings; arrangement is on the way so that they can be read on the FAS Society website.

Contributors for Translation:

- ABE Masao (collaborator for B2, 3)
- Richard DeMartino (translator of B2, 3, 4)
- FUJIYOSHI Jikai (collaborator for B2, 3)
- Christopher Ives (collaborator for B1, 10)
- Jeff Shore (translator of B6, with Fusako Shore as collaborator)
- TAKAHASHI Nobumichi (collaborator for B6)
- TOKIWA Gishin (editor; translator of B1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)
- TSUKUI Akemi (collaborator for editing & translation work)

A. I. The Author's own Prefaces or Introductions to His Five Separate Books
with their Contents, translated:

(1) Preface to *ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS*

(*TOUYOU TEKI MU*)

HISAMATSU Shin'ichi

A so-called genuine scholar would pursue learning for learning's sake to become a learned person, which is a natural matter. But I have never followed my studies or intended to do so with such an idea. Not only that. Pursuing learning is far from my ultimate objective or a matter of my original concern. For me there is a problem to be solved for my life. This is no mere subject of learning. Instead, it is a question that presses me for death or life. This is neither the totality of innumerable possible individual issues nor any one of them with emphasis put on it; it is a singular, all-covering matter, a totally singular problem which my whole life desperately faces in one body. For me this is a truly concrete, basic problem of being. Not merely an intellectual problem of learning that constitutes part of my life, this is a live problem to be solved by my whole life.

Here the very being of what I am comes to be a serious problem. What I am, here, is not anything to be objectified as a subject of the so-called scholastic investigation; it is a being that totally suffers itself. By a living problem I mean nothing other than the very being that suffers thus. One may compare this to a medical doctor who is so seriously ill that his life is at stake. Illness in this case is not a subject for objective investigation. It is his own suffering that scares him with the thought that his death is expected at any moment. The concrete nature of illness is seen by the medical doctor when he suffers rather than when he treats it as an object of investigation.

The same is true of the concrete nature of the problem; it is seen when I myself suffer. My having a problem means my being distressed. Since my being constitutes suffering, it goes beyond any objective treatment. My being is what solely intends to get rid of and be freed from distress. What I am is the very problem to be solved. Since such a being, a being as it is, is the being that constitutes a problem, it is a being not deserving of the name "being." The problem that is solved is my established true being. I sought after the way for solving this problem in the fragrant footprints of ancient sages and saints. After all, however, I could find the point of its settlement through the guiding hand of Sunshin [NISHIDA Kitarou] the old man and the lively devise of [IKEGAMI] Shouzan, the late *Chan* master. *ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS (Touyouteki Mu)*, which I entitle the present book, stands for this point of settlement.

The articles collected in this book show nothing but my efforts from the beginning on conditions and occasions to clarify this Oriental Nothingness. I used the term for the first time in July last year (1938) in a paper which I read at a [summer] meeting on

philosophy, Tetsugakukai, sponsored by the Nihon Shogaku-Shinkou linkai (committee for the promotion of divers sciences in Japan, Department of Educational Affairs, Ministry of Education). My viewpoint there was this: What is called in that way has in all history been rare in the West, being unique in the East, and it constitutes the basic Moment of what can specifically be called Oriental. (Confer the article "Oriental Nothingness" in Part One of this book.)

It is what consistently flows at the bottom of every article from the oldest paper, "Predicate and Subject Still Undivided (*Hin-Shu Mi-bun*)," to the newest one, "What is Orientally Metaphysical (*Touyou-teki ni Keijijou-teki naru Mono*)." Articles not only on *Chan* but generally on the philosophy of religion and Western philosophy show my efforts whereby to clarify this Oriental Nothingness. At one time I sympathized with Western mysticism; at another, turning against rationalism, I sided with irrationalism. At one time, refuting human-centric standpoint, I sympathized with theo-centricism. But I did so always from the viewpoint of Oriental Nothingness. Thereby I simply meant to get a clue to the elucidation of Oriental Nothingness; I never meant to share the same view with mysticism, irrationalism, or the theology of crisis, of the West.

Originally, however, the articles have never been written with any systematic intention; they have occasionally been formed during a long period of time, and, lacking in unity, they are diverse. Besides, on reading them over, I find not a few expressions which need to be corrected or supplemented. This makes me feel so much ashamed that I would rather lock away the papers, leaving them moth-eaten. Nevertheless, since it is very hard to avoid the manuscript creditor's hot pursuit, and I cannot afford to spend time for preparing papers of systematic construction, I have no other choice but to tap at the bottom of my broken bag of wit in vain, and dare to leave them in their original forms, arrange them so as to date them backward from the newest to the oldest, making a show of myself as a help for self-examination. I shall be happy only if this would not offend my honoured mentor-masters.

December 8, 1939.

CONTENTS

Part I

- 1 What is Orientally Metaphysical (published in the magazine *RISOU*, January 1939)
- 2 Oriental Nothingness (a paper read, July 1938)
- 3 The Whereabouts of the True Buddha (in the *ZENGAKU KENKYUU*, July 1937)
- 4 *Chan* as the Negation of Holiness (in the *RISOU*, July 1937)
- 5 *Chan* (in the magazine *SHISOU*, April 1935)
- 6 On Understanding *Chan* Art (in the magazine *TOKUUN*, August 1930)
- 7 On Demonstrating *Chan* (in the *ZENGAKU KENKYUU*, April 1928)
- 8 Plotinus (in the Iwanami Kouza *SEKAI SHICHO*, September 1928)
- 9 God and Creation (in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, January 1920)

10 Predicate and Subject Still Undivided (in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, March 1919)

Part II

1 The Basic Significance of Religious Criticism (in the *SHUUKYOU KENKYUU*, March 1935)

2 Religiosity and Anthropology (in the *RISOU*, December 1933)

3 Religion Without the Limits of Human Nature

(in the *SHUUKYOUGAKU KIYOU*, September 1931)

4 Moral Law and Religious Law (in the *ZENGAKU KENKYUU*, December 1929)

5 Religious Functioning (in the *SHUUKYOU KENKYUU*, November 1926)

6 The Logic of Redemption (in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, October 1921)

(In the newly compiled *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU*, published by the Risosha in Tokyo and later by the Hozokan in Kyoto, the above article 6, Part I, is included in Volume Five. All the other fifteen articles are in Volume One.)

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI: **TOUYOUTEKI MU**, first published by the Kobundo-shobo, Tokyo, December 1939, 299 pp. with six illustrations (of five *Chan* paintings and a tea bowl)

(2) A Prefatory Note to *THE WAY OF ABSOLUTE SUBJECTIVITY*
(**ZETTAI-SHUTAI-DOU**)

To use an illustration which is fundamentally subjective, it goes like this: People who enter a deep place in a river are classified into five.

The first are those who, though not knowing how to swim, enter the pool, now drift on the waves, now sink beneath, in alternation of hope and fear; they don't know all that will finally lead them to death; without self-examination they blindly believe in their own self-powers, and, having the waves large and small, their bodies, and their minds, namely, everything, as negative factors which hinder their movements, endlessly get drowned in the pool.

The second are those who know that they will no longer be saved from drowning, shudder for fear of inescapable death, get panic-stricken, and are utterly absent-minded.

The third are those who, while ready for the unavoidable fate of drowning, want to exhaust their self-powers in the midst of anxiety.

The fourth are those who know that their potential self-powers are nothing but despair after all, trust all to the heavenly and miraculous, absolutely other saviour, and are saved from the despair of death; being saved by the absolutely other power, they always praise that, and trustingly commit themselves to the waves, drifting and sinking.

The fifth are those who, following their own situation, suddenly surface out of the deep bottom of drowning-despair, naturally produce the work of swimming, no longer afraid of drowning, and feeling no necessity of any other power. They take their minds,

bodies, and waves as affirmative factors indispensable for their movements, in the manner of exercising powers absolutely their own, float up and down on waves, themselves being solitarily emancipated and free from dependence, and cause waves of great compassion for those who are drowned so as to incite them to swim for themselves according to their abilities.

As will quickly be inferred, the classified five in this illustration correspond to so many types in every and each person's own manner of being, and also types in one's view of life held accordingly. But they are not arranged just in a row; they are critically ranked. When people reflect upon their own ways of being at present, generally speaking, theirs belong to any of the five, or are further to be criticized by the succeeding type and raised to the fifth. It is this fifth type which I am going to mean by *the Way of Absolute, Fundamental Subjectivity*.

The first is the human-absolutism so easy and lacking in self-examination as being ignorant of the absolute death, which is the most critical matter of humanity; it is a noncritical and naïve self-power-ism. The second, though critical, is lacking in affirmation; absolutely negative, it is nihilism. The third, though affirmative and critical, is the existentialism that is unable to get free from absolute anxiety. The fourth is freed from absolute anxiety, but, because of its other-dependent nature, it is absolutely-other-power-ism, lacking in independent autonomy.

The fifth, in contrast to the above, is something like a *critical, absolutely-self-power-ism*. Here one is far from being absolutely powerless or absolutely passive as in the absolutely-other-power-ism; it is absolutely powerful, absolutely active. Since God or Buddha is usually characterized as absolutely other, religious life means a passive one, embraced in love by and depending on God or Buddha. Meanwhile, in Buddhism, since the true Buddha is characterized as absolutely self-like, the true, ultimate Buddhist life ought to be so active as to embrace others in love, and have oneself depended upon. In terms of the Joudo Shin Sect, it ought to be practice of returning aspect in the present life, or, life of the "Ultimate Gate of Going Out" [of the Pure Land]. The working of not-abiding-in-nirvana by the fundamental subject not-abiding-in-birth-or-death is the true Buddhist life. My so-called Way of the Absolute Subjectivity is just such a bodhisattva path, the Buddha's way.

All the articles, except one, collected in this book stand for my efforts to elucidate this Way of Absolute Subjectivity from different aspects. The final article, "The Central Problem Immediately Now of the Philosophy of Religion," though not directly related to that, has been included here just as retrospect of the line of my thinking in those days on the philosophy of religion.

March 1948.

CONTENTS

- 1 Ordinary Mind (in Book Ten of the *Iwanami Ethics Course*, October 1931)

- 2 The Universal Profundity of Japanese Culture (written in September 1930)
- 3 The Way of Art (written in July 1943)
- 4 The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness (thesis for the Degree of Literature, Kyoto University, 1946)
- 5 Criticism of Modern Japan from the *Chan* Viewpoint
(a lecture given in May 1947 at Daitokuji Temple, Kyoto, for a high mission class of the Rinzaï-Zen Sect)
- 6 The Absolute Mahayana
(a lecture given in November 1945, at Myoushinji Temple, Kyoto, for a high mission class of the Rinzaï-Zen Sect)
- 7 The Active Nothingness (a lecture given in July 1947 at a temple in Kobe)
- 8 The Central Problem Immediately Now of the Philosophy of Religion (written in 1928)
(The *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU*, Volume One, includes articles 4 and 7 above; Vol. Two, 1, 6, and 8; Vol. Three, 5; and Vol. Five, 2 and 3.)

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI: **ZETTAI SHUTAI DOU**, published by the Kobundo-shobo, Tokyo, April 1948, 207 pp.

(3) A Prefatory Note to *PROBLEMS POSED IN THE [DASHENG] QIXIN [LUN]*
(**KISHIN NO KADAI**)

It was in 1936 and 1937 when I took up the *DASHENG QIXIN LUN* under the title, "Philosophical Problems in the *QIXIN LUN*," for the special lectures of Buddhism course, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University. After I finished the lectures, upon the request of the Kobundo-shobo, I decided to publish them with the title "*KISHIN NO KADAI* (Problems posed in the *Qixin-lun*)" as one of the series, *KYOUYOU BUNKO (GENERAL EDUCATION LIBRARY)*. Meanwhile, as I had only memoranda of my lectures at hand, it was arranged that I would borrow notebooks from Mr. FUJIYOSHI Jikai and Mr. YAMADA Chikyoku, the then students who attended my lectures, for me to prepare a manuscript from them.

But the editing work was so troublesome that it made little progress and I was too lazy to promote it. In spite of frequent requests from the publisher and reader-expectants, it was put off from day to day. In the days when I was giving those lectures, I had the intention of elucidating the *QIXIN LUN* in connection with the existential philosophy and the theology of crisis, which were philosophical-religious concerns of those days. However, concerns in philosophy have changed with the times, and my philosophical ideas and wording also have come to differ. Naturally the work of arranging notes has become harder and harder. A decade later, today, it would suit my present idea to have re-written it from the beginning. But as I could not afford to do so, I had what had

been arranged put into printing, on the occasion of the revived publication of the *KYOUYOU BUNKO*.

Seen from the whole lectures, most of this book corresponds to its introduction. As the main issue, only its first chapter on the subject of reality is included. The remaining parts, Chapter Two on phenomenon, Chapter Three on epistemology, and Chapter Four on practice, are left for the future.

For the present publication of my lectures, though partial, I am largely indebted to Mr. Fujiyoshi and Mr. Yamada for their notes. And to people of the publishing company Kobundo I feel greatly obliged for their taking much trouble. To them all I would like to express my hearty gratitude.

June 1947.

CONTENTS

Introduction

The System of the *Qixin Lun*

The Writer's Attitude to Formulate the Treatise

The Writer's Objective of Framing the Treatise

The Target of the Treatise

The Form of the *Qixin Lun*

The Philosophical Task of the *Qixin Lun*

Chapter One On Reality

HISAMATSU Shin'ichi * ***KISHIN NO KADAI***, published by the Kobundo-shobo, *KYOUYOU BUNKO*, Tokyo, July 1947, 123 pp. This is included in the Risosha version of the author's collected writings, Volume Six, published in 1973.

In April 1983, three years after the author's death, the Risosha, Tokyo, published the *KISHIN NO KADAI* anew, with the supplementation of the final three chapters, on phenomenon, epistemology, and practice, from the notebooks of the above mentioned two persons, through the voluntary work of HIGASHI Sen'ichirou and TOKIWA Gishin. It also includes the author's own memoranda, which turned out to be much detailed and as inspiring as the text, 302 pp.

The new, enlarged *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU*, volume nine, published in 1996, by the Hozokan, Kyoto, includes this supplemented version.

(4) Preface to *CHAN AND THE FINE ARTS* (***ZEN TO BIJUTSU***)

In the Orient, in China a unique complex of cultural forms, which has not been observed in Europe and America, sprang up at about the beginning of the sixth century (Liang

period), gradually took root and flourished towards the end of the seventh century (early Tang period), extending for about nine centuries until the beginning of the fifteenth century (early Ming period), equivalent to the entire span of the European Middle Ages. In full flourish during this time, this complex of expressions was transplanted both to Korea and Japan. Especially in Japan for the first time in the thirteenth century (Kamakura period) it was vigorously transplanted from China; it blossomed remarkably through the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries. Though in decline thereafter, this cultural complex still remains rooted alive today.

In the following pages, I should like to examine this unitary cultural complex, presenting as many examples of its creative expressions as possible in photographs, so that its uniqueness may be grasped easily and concretely. Then I should like, analytically, to explain what the unique features of this culture are; and, finally, to make clear why the source from which these characteristics derive is nothing but *Chan*.

August 1957.

CONTENTS

Survey of the *Chan* Fine Arts:

I. China: *Chan* with Language, Action, Prose and Poetry, Calligraphy and Painting

II. Japan: The Life-System formed by the Laity's *Chan*

The Understanding of *Chan* Aesthetics:

I. Characteristics of the *Chan* Fine Arts

Seven Characteristics: Asymmetry, Simplicity, Wizen Austerity, Naturalness, Deep Seclusion, Freedom from Convention, and Tranquility.

II. The *Chan* Basis for the Seven Characteristics

1. The Subject of Expression, Its Operational Sphere, Area, and Period.

2. Periods and Areas.

--- Historical Basis ---

Chan itself as the Subject of Expression of the *Chan* Fine Arts:

I. What is *Chan*

(1) The formlessness of Self Awakening

(2) The fundamentally subjective nature of Self Awakening

(3) The active nature of Self Awakening and its operational sphere

II. *Chan* and the Seven Characteristics:

The Rule of No-rule, Non-complexity, No-rank, No-mind, Bottomlessness, No Hindrance, and Being Unmoved.

Conclusive Words (70 pp.)

Appreciations of Selected Plates (pp. 71 ~ 106)

Plates (290 pieces); Notes to the Plates (3 pp.); Biographical Notes (4 pp.);

List of Plates (5 pp.; 6 pp. in English)

HOUSEKI HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI: **ZEN TO BIJUTSU**, published by the Bokubi-sha, Kyoto, 1958; the English version, **ZEN AND THE FINE ARTS**, was published by the Kodansha International, Tokyo & New York, in 1971, tr. by Tokiwa.

(5) The Introductory Case for *SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA-JING*
(**YUIMA-SHICHISOKU**)

1

Instead of going on reading the text of *Weima-jing* [*Yuima-kyou*; *Vimalakîrti-nirdesa sutra*, in Kumarajîva's Chinese version,] from the beginning, from among the text I choose seven items which I consider most important as *SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA-JING*, I am going to take up one case each time to bring out essentials (*tigang*; *teikou*), seven times in all.

This *Weima-jing*, as you may have already read it, is a Buddhist scripture composed around what was expounded by a lay buddha named Weima, a great, model layman of long-time celebration for having attained to the root of the Buddhist truth. Certainly the scripture includes not just Layman Weima's own exposition; it also includes sermons by Shâkyamuni Buddha and words by other Buddhist disciples and bodhisattvas (Buddha-candidates). Since, however, the core of this scripture lies in Weima's preaching, it has the title, "Scripture Expounded by Weimajie."

Weima or Weimajie is a Chinese way of phonetic representation of the Sanskrit name, Vimalakîrti. The term "*vimala*" means spotless (*wugou*), or clean (*jing*). More positively, it is translated as wiping out dirt (*miegou*). Then "*kîrti*" means praise (*cheng*) or ring (*ming*), or fame (*ming*). Thus, Weimajie is freely translated as "Clean Name" (*Jing ming*) or "Spotless Fame" (*Wugoucheng*), or even "Wiping-Out-Ringing" (*Miegouming*). The most common translation is "Clean Name."

"Clean Name" always refers to Weimajie, and the *Weima-jing* is at times freely translated as *Clean Name Scripture* (*Jingming-jing*; *Joumyou-kyou*) or *Spotless Fame Scripture* (*Wugoucheng-jing*; *Mukushou-kyou*). The name Weimajie, thus, means a person who has removed all dirt, or one celebrated for having wiped out dirt. In other words, being clean and pure is Weima's basic character, and in connection with such a naming, this Buddhist scripture has "emancipation" (*moksha*; *jietuo*; *gedatsu*) as its very important content. "Having extinguished all dirt" in its deepest meaning turns out to be "a human being emancipated from whatever that is."

2

The historical development of Buddhism recently has gradually come to be a subject of scientific inquiry, and from the viewpoint of text-critique the formation of Buddhist scriptures (sutras) has become a controversial problem. Since ancient days it has been believed that sutras were all formed in the days of Shâkyamuni, but scholars these days assert about the history of sutras that most of them came into existence far later. As for

this *Weima-jing*, it is said to have been formed around six hundred years after Shâkyamuni's death, which corresponds to the early second century A.D.

Concerning the contents of the *Weima-jing*, whether Shâkyamuni really declared them or not, whether Weima made the exposition or not, all this, historically speaking, actually goes beyond confirmation. As for us, rather than the problem of historical facts on whether Shâkyamuni or Weima really made their remarks, we would like to make much of what the written contents mean.

I consider myself a Buddhist, but I don't think, or actually don't like to think, that I must approve of something as true only because it was Shâkyamuni's remark. No matter whether Shâkyamuni's remark or not, if its content convinces me of its truth, I can approve of it, whereas if it does not, I will keep doubting it.

In that case, however, I never mean I would cling to my selfish view and assert that what I think is always right. I believe I also have the flexibility of wishing to draw instruction from scriptures so that they teach me rightly in what I have been wrong or have not thought of.

In that sense, no matter whether the *Weima-jing* was Shâkyamuni's teaching having come out of his so-called golden mouth, or whether it was a later composition, my present attitude is that I would like to find out a path to truly live by, through understanding the written content, opening myself to that teaching.

3

Now, the reason I take up the *Weima-jing* for my talk to bring out essentials is that it has offered me attractions in that what is written here is extremely excellent as the Buddhist teaching for us lay people. Hitherto there has not been lacking a way of thinking that unless one is a priest, no one can understand what is true, or that unless one lives a monastic life, no one can become a thoroughgoing Buddhist in the least. Meanwhile, that very idea that a lay Buddhist after all must yield one step to a priest is completely defeated by this scripture. Here it is clarified that, even being a lay person, one can be such a Buddhist as no monk can be a match for.

For example, when Weima got sick in bed, and Shâkyamuni wanted to have a bodhi-sattva or any of his disciples to visit him to ask for his health, eminent priests including Kâshyapa, who ranked first among the Buddha's disciples, and others like Shâlîputra and Ananda also, -- indeed, everyone, as it is written, was struck with awe. They excused themselves from the call. But in what sense were they struck with awe? They knew Weima's Buddhist way of mental attitude was so penetrating and excellent that, when they visited him, they would certainly meet Weima's sharp criticism, to which they could make no response at all. Upon reflection they were so sure of themselves not qualified to inquire after his health. That was how they each mentioned their own excuses for declining the Buddha's offer to visit Weima. Even in this respect the scripture shows that there could be a lay Buddhist with wife and children, who surpassed priests. For us non-priests

this is really a meaningful matter; it makes us feel quite intimate with this personage.

Once Japan's Prince Shoutoku (574–622) wrote a commentary (*yishu; gisho*) on the *Weima-jing*. Being an excellent Buddhist himself, the prince as a lay person, may well have felt great interest in this scripture.

4

At this point it is necessary, concerning the significance of lay Buddhism, to think of its present state and future prospects. That is a matter I have given thought to for many years. It is, in short, the problem of whether what is basic is monastic Buddhism or lay Buddhism.

I am afraid I may not have myself well understood unless I go into details, but after all my idea is that as the true Buddhism lay Buddhism is basic, while monastic Buddhism is a special case inside lay Buddhism. To speak from the point of universality, the particular, monastic Buddhism can find its possibility to establish itself only on the universality of lay Buddhism. Therefore, I think there should be such lay people newly to come out, instead of the priests of the existing Buddhism.

In terms of the times also, I wonder if monastic Buddhism as it has been could continue to exist. Considering its future prospects, monastic Buddhism should naturally be dissolved; in fact it is thought to be on the way of dissolution.

By saying such a thing I may be blamed and denounced by people of Buddhist temples and priests, but the fact is that monastic Buddhism has almost been dissolved. Whatever exists, if it should, is only what deserves the name of monastic Buddhism, in an extremely special corner. While today in Japan there may be hundreds of thousands of so-called Buddhist priests, one cannot help admitting that in the present state of affairs those who preserve traditional priestly demeanour are far to seek. For their having failed to preserve priestly demeanour further, no one can say that priests alone are totally responsible. There are inevitable causes for that; accusing priests alone won't do. Anyway, however, seen from the result, that is the present situation.

Then, if they take it seriously, today's priests must live on, feeling inferior for life. That means they must always feel anxious with the thought that they are not real monks, which is quite a miserable matter. Among Japanese *Chan* people today, only those who are called *Shijia* (J. *shike*, master practiser) or *Laoshi* (J. *roushi*, experienced master) are expected to be real monks. But one needs to check to what extent they are real ones. Supposing most of them are real monks, that means most of the others are false ones, or at least in the present situation those others have been ranked as secondary or tertiary.

I don't think monks themselves are ever satisfied with such hopeless feelings. That might suggest they should practise heart and soul to become *Laoshi* or *Shijia*, but that would not be possible with most of them. In the future, actually, that would be so with fewer and fewer people. Besides, according to a person who returned from traveling through India and Sri Lanka a few years ago, even those who are called *Roushi* or *Shike* in

Japan would find themselves in Sri Lanka viewed as serious transgressors. That means, seen from the traditional Theravada precepts, they are completely disqualified as monks.

Unless, however, there is any way for monastic Buddhism to recover themselves from such a state of affairs, that would mean lay people have no way to be saved. In that case, however, more than anything, monks would have no way to be saved, which is really what today's monks suffer from. Where then is there any way by which they are to be emancipated from such sufferings? When monks cannot get along as monks, they will be compelled to come down to a secondary or tertiary rank to be exactly the same as lay people. Since the original state from which they come down is not quite clear, that would mean they cannot help being satisfied with the Buddhism doubly or triply lower. Will there be no problem, as a matter of fact, if that is the case with Buddhism through and through?

5

As I have already mentioned, in principle lay Buddhism should be established as the original form of Buddhism, and herein lies the reason why lay Buddhism should actually be realized as what is original. Unless this is first established, Buddhism of the original significance after all cannot but cease to exist. In my opinion, there must come up the kind of Buddhism in which today's monks also are saved -- and which in the future will be admitted to be the true Buddhism. I mean one must have the lay Buddhism of that sense be established, for that is the way by which to save today's Buddhism and is the way of being of future Buddhism. In that case what has a very important meaning as a scripture is this *Weima-jing*.

What I am always reminded of in this scripture as the most condensed, simple words are [from the third chapter on Buddha's Disciples]:

"While not quitting your Attainment, you may manifest yourself in the characteristics of an ordinary being."

That expresses the basic principle penetrating the whole *Weima-jing*; I think it is an expression which directly shows the true way of Buddhism.

The positively actual life of Buddhism consists rather in "manifesting oneself in the characteristics of an ordinary being," without which there does not emerge the true working of Buddhism in the actual realities.

But it is not just in manifesting oneself in the characteristics of an ordinary being but in "not quitting the Attainment" that there is a deep, Buddhistic basis which goes beyond actual realities. In the close connection of these two lies the basic principle where there is established a flexible and unhindered life which creates actualities while transcending actual realities. The true Attainment is something like the womb or fundamental subject which can positively manifest the characteristics of an ordinary being. When through our practice this Attainment as the fundamental subject is established, thereby can we realize positive life of an ordinary being.

Traditionally there has been a tendency to emphasize only the direction of attain-

ing to the Pure-land rebirth. However, the ultimate objective of Buddhism never lies there. It lies in the very unity and non-duality between the "Attainment" and the "characteristics of an ordinary being." In the *Weima-jing* that is called the "*dharma*-gate (truth) of entering non-duality" [in Chapter Nine of the Chinese version]. That shows the true way of being of Buddhism. Not being what aims at living a special life in another world different from the actualities, the way of life in which the actualities and what goes beyond the actualities are completely one is the *dharma*-gate of entering non-duality.

I would like to take up such a *dharma*-gate as the true way of being of future Buddhism. I think this should be advocated not only as the true way of being of Buddhism but that of humans. In a sense this can be called a new humanism. The "Vow of Mankind" of our F.A.S. Society shows such a way of being of humans. Seeking the Vow of Mankind in past classics, we find it in the *Weima-jing*, while putting the *Weima-jing* in the simplest modern expression, it comes to be crystallized in the "Vow of Mankind," which goes as follows:

Let us be well composed to get awakened to our true self
and become compassionate humans;
Following our respective missions, Making full use of our nature,
Searching for the sources of distress individual and social,
Discerning the right direction in which history should proceed,
Making no distinctions of race, nation, or class,
All taking hand in hand as brethren,
Having ourselves committed by the vow of compassion
to emancipate mankind,
Let us construct a true and happy world.

(F.A.S. Society "The Vow of Mankind")

CONTENTS

Part I. Seven Cases from the *Weima[-jing]*

Introductory Case

Case 1: Composing Oneself

Case 2: *Dharma* (the Awakened Truth)

Case 3: The Buddha-land

Case 4: The Seat of Awakening

Case 5: Illness

Case 6: The Path for Practice

Case 7: Silence

Part II. The Problem of Religious Method

Introduction

The F-A-S Method of Awakening

FUKAN-ZAZEN-GI (The Universally Recommended Manner of the Sitting *Chan*)

Practice)

Postscript

(Published by the FAS Society, Kyoto, 1960, 207 + 6 pp. with six plates concerning Vimalakîrti -- three figures and three works of calligraphy.

Part I and "Postscript" are included in the author's Collected Writings, Volume 6.

"Introduction" of Part II is included in Volume 3 (27).

"The F-A-S Method of Awakening" of Part II is the source of the latter two-thirds of Part II -- 4 of the eighth article, "Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection," in Volume 2.

"*FUKAN-ZAZEN-GI*" of Part II is included in Volume 3 (31).)

A. II. Contents of the Collected Writings
A. II-1. Contents of the Original Collected Writings

(The author's collected writings, *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU*, in eight volumes, were published by the Risosha, Tokyo, 1969 ~ 1980, edited by members of the FAS Society. The title of each volume had been prepared by the author beforehand. For the first two volumes, the same titles as the old ones were adopted with the author's original introductions, and the seventh volume has a new prefatory note by the author, but the remaining five volumes have none. Volume Seven, a copy of the final distribution, before publication, reached the author's deathbed.)

Volume One: *ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS*
(*TOUYOUTEKI MU*)

(Edited by TSUJIMURA Kouichi, 1969, 438 pp. + Postscript pp. 439 ~ 461, with ten plates of *Chan* artistic works)

CONTENTS

A. Oriental Nothingness:

1. Introduction to the old edition
2. What is Orientally Metaphysical (1939)
3. Oriental Nothingness (1938)
4. **The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness** (1948)

(see Tokiwa's revised translation included in the present INTRODUCTION TO HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI'S RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.)

5. The Active Nothingness (1947)

B. *Chan* as the Negation of Holiness:

6. The Whereabouts of the True Buddha (1937)
7. *Chan* as the Negation of Holiness (1937)

(tr. by Sally Merrill, "Zen as the Negation of Holiness, *The Eastern Buddhist*, 10-1, 1977)

8. *Chan* (1935)

9. On Demonstrating *Chan* (1928)

10. Predicate and Subject Still Undivided (1919)

C. Religion Without the Limits of Humanity:

11. God and Creation (1920)
12. Religion Without the Limits of Humanity (1931)
13. Religiosity and Anthropology (1933)
14. Moral Law and Religious Law (1929)
15. Religious Working (1926)
16. The Logic of Redemption (1921)

17. The Basic Significance of Religious Criticism (1935)
 18. The Discarding and Developing of Humanity
(in the magazine *ZENSHUU*, November 1931, from the magazine-editor's note
of the lecture given on October 24 that year at Keika Hall in Kyoto)
 - D. Religion and Philosophy:
 19. The Central Problem Immediately Now of the Philosophy of Religion (1928)
 20. A Study of the Methodology of Theology
(in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, April 1923)
 21. Establishing a basis of a common-sense realism
(in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, January 1923)
 22. On Reality (in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, May 1924)
 23. Plotinus (1928)
 24. On the Absolute of Plotinus (in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, April 1926)
 25. Time and Space
(written in 1915, graduation thesis for Philosophy Course, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto
Imperial University, heretofore unpublished)
 26. Reviewing a book by KIHARA Masami, *An Interpretation of the Wumenguan*
(in the *TETSUGAKU KENKYUU*, March 1918)
 - E. Dialogues:
 27. With Emil Brunner on Nothingness (in the magazine *TOUHOU*, April 1950)
 28. With Carl Jung on the unconscious and No-mind (in the magazine *FAS*, July 1959)
 29. With Rudolf Bultmann (in the *FAS*, October 1959)
 30. With Martin Heidegger: "Two Mirrors Reflect on Each Other" (May 1958)
 - F. In the Midst of Nothingness is A Road (autobiographical notes):
 - 31. Memoirs of His Academic Life** (in the magazine *SHISOU*, October 1955;
see Tokiwa's translation included in the present INTRODUCTION)
 - 32. After the Academic Life** (in the Asahi Newspaper July 1966; see Tokiwa's
translation included in the present INTRODUCTION)
- Postscript by the Editor.

Volume Two; *THE WAY OF ABSOLUTE SUBJECTIVITY*
(**ZETTAI-SHUTAI-DOU**)

(Edited by ABE Masao, 1972, 602 pp. + Postscript pp. 603 ~ 624, with six
plates of *Chan* artistic works, including the author's two pieces)

CONTENTS

- A. The Way of Absolute Subjectivity:
 1. An Introductory Remark to the old edition
 2. Elucidating Linji's *Chan*

(a lecture for a party of The International Congress for the History of Religion, at the Myoushinji Temple, Kyoto; in the FAS newsletter *FUUSHIN*, No. 36, October 1958; in the magazine *ZENBUNKA*, No. 38, September 1965; tr. by TSUJIMURA Kouichi into German, for *Nachrichten* 85/86--1959, Der Gesellschaft für Natur und Völkerkunde Ostasiens, Hamburg)

3. Getting Awakened to the True Self

(a lecture for Bukkyou-kai, Mino Town, Gifu Prefecture, July 1949; in the *HANAZONO BUNKO*, No. 4, March 1951, taken from the note of YOKOI-YANAGIDA Seizan)

4. Atheism

(five special lectures, between April and June, 1949, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, in the *TOUHOU*, No. 12, December 1949, from the note taken and arranged by ABE Masao; in the *DAIJOU-ZEN*, No. 417, November 1958.

The seventh of the eight sections of this article has its translation in the *FAS Society Journal* 1998 by TAKAHASHI Nobuyuki, alias Asa Kukumo, as "What is the True Buddha?"

The whole article was translated into German by TAKIZAWA Katsumi: in *Shinichi Hisamatsu: PHILOSOPHIE DES ERWACHENS; Satori und Atheismus*, Theseus-Verlag 1990 Zürich München,)

5. The Absolute Mahayana (1945)

6. Ordinary Mind (1931)

(tr. by Tokiwa & Howard Curtis, *The Eastern Buddhist*, 12-1, 1979)

B. Death and Sin:

7. Birth and Death

(in the magazine FAS, No. 44, May 1960 with the title "*Shoubougenzou Shouji*," then in the *RISOU*, No. 366, November 1963)

8. Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection

(1969: see Tokiwa's revised translation in the present INTRODUCTION)

9. Awakening as the raison d'être of Religion

(two of all the five or six lectures at the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, between April and July, 1949 under the title, the "Religion of Awakening," noted down on June 2 and 16 by YANAGIDA Seizan, and edited by Abe)

10. A Thesis on No-mind

(a lecture at Kyoto University for Sunshin-kai, November 1, 1958, in the FAS, 63/64, September 19 68, from the note edited by Abe)

11. The Buddhistic Structure of Humans

(an intensive course at the graduate school, Faculty of Letters, Kyushu University, in November 1954, noted down by HASHIMOTO Hayao and edited by Abe)

12. An Affirmative View on Impermanence

(the major part of a lecture, the "Significance of Japan in the Cultural History of

the World," commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Buddhist Youth Association of Ehime University, on November 16, 1963)

C. *Chan* Human Image:

13. The True Existence of Humans

(a lecture for the Buddhist Association of Ehime Prefecture, September 1949, noted down by Yanagida and edited by Abe, later included in a book with the same title *NINGEN NO SHIN-JITSUZON, THE TRUE EXISTENCE OF HUMANS*, Hozo-shinsho 8, May 1951, together with a brief initial remark and two other articles)

14. The Awakened Self

(edited by Abe from two lectures: a public lecture for the Kyoto Association of Philosophy, Kyoto University, on November 6, 1948, and a commemorative lecture at the one thousandth anniversary of founding the Toudaiji Temple, Nara, with the title, the "Philosophy of Having the Huge Buddha Statue Open the Eyes," on October 15, 1952, which later was included in the first number of *NANTO BUKKYOU*, November 1954, with the title, "The Awakened Self -- the Anthropological Elucidation of the Buddha")

15. *Chan* Human Image

(a lecture in a lecture meeting held in memory of the one thousand two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of the Sixth Patriarch Huineng in the conference hall of Kyoto Kaikan on November 11th, 1962, recorded and published in the *ZEN-BUNKA*, 27/28, January 1963)

16. Attainment -- the Postmodernist Human Image

(in the first volume of *KOUZA* (a course of lectures) *ZEN (CHAN)*, published by Chikuma-shobo, August 1967; tr. by Jeff Shore, the *FAS Society Journal* 1999, "Satori and Postmodern Man." German translation by Nobert Klein: "Shinichi HISAMATSU: SATORI (Selbsterwachen) Zum postmodernen Menschenbild," in *S.H. PHILOSOPHIE DES ERWACHENS Satori & Atheismus*, THESEUS-VERLAG 1990)

D. Faith and Awakening:

17. An Initial Remark to the former work, *THE TRUE EXISTENCE OF HUMANS*

See the above C. 13.

18. The Wondrous Working of the Nature of Absolute Being by the Fundamental Subject of Absolute Nothingness

(a lecture at the Kichijouji Temple of the Shingon Sect in Kawanoye, sponsored by the Buddhist Association of Ehime Prefecture, September 1949, noted by Yanagida and edited by Abe, included in the *TRUE EXISTENCE OF HUMANS*; its final sixth chapter was tr. by Wayne Yokoyama, *FAS Society Journal*, 1999)

19. Practice in the Return Aspect as the Ultimate Buddhistic Life

(a lecture on the anniversary of the founding of Ohtani University, Kyoto, October 1949, noted down by Yanagida and edited by Abe, to be included in the *TRUE EXISTENCE OF*

HUMANS)

20. The Human Images of Christianity and Buddhism

(in the December issue of *SEKAIJIN*, 1949)

E. The World of Awakening:

21. Teaching, Faith, Practice, and Awakening

(talks to bring out essentials during the special retreat of the FAS Society in April 1960, for the purpose of systematizing the theory and practice of the Society on the occasion of adopting the new name in place of the former one, "Gakudou Doujou, A Seat of Awakening for Learning the Way," noted down by KITAHARA Ryuutarou; tr. by Jeff Shore, the *FAS Society Journal*, 1985)

22. The Fivefold Buddha:

(1) Knowing the Buddha, (2) Believing in the Buddha, (3) Contemplating on the Buddha, (4) Getting Awakened to the Buddha, and (5) Practising the Buddha

(talks to bring out essentials during the periods of special retreat of the FAS Society between April 1961 and April 1962; (1) was talked about on April 3 & 5, 1961;

(2) on December 18, 1961; (3) on December 20, 1962; (4) on April 3 & 5 (former half), 1962; (5) on April 5 (latter half), 1962)

F. Modern Religious Educations Criticized:

23. On the Way of Being of Religious Education

(a lecture for a course in cultivating religious sentiments, sponsored by Konkou Kyougakuin Institute, Okayama, in August 1951, its outline being noted down by a member of the institute and included in the *KONKOU KYOUGAKU*, No. 9, October 1951)

24. The Present State of Religious Education Hardly Convincing

(an article published in the Ryukoku University Newspaper in three times: December 10, 1928, January 10, and February 10, 1929)

25. The Methodology of the Study of Buddhist History

(a lecture in a meeting of the Association of Studies of Buddhist History held at the Shunkouin in the compound of Myoushinji Temple, Kyoto, June 15, 1946, noted down by Yanagida and edited by Abe)

G. Dialogues:

26. Theonomy and *Chan* Autonomy

(talks with Paul Tillich in three times in the fall of 1957, when the author was invited to give lectures as a visiting professor at the Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, U.S.A., tr. into Japanese from the recorded tapes by FUJIYOSHI Jikai, who accompanied the author all through his travel as interpreter, published in the *FAS*, No. 37, January 1959, and No. 38, April 1959. The whole conversation was transcribed from tape-recordings with Japanese translated into English by Tokiwa, edited by Richard DeMartino, and published in *The Eastern Buddhist* with the title, "A Dialogue with Paul Tillich"; Part One, vol. 4-2, October 1971; Part Two, vol. 5-2, Oct. 1972; Part Three, vol. 6-2, Oct. 1973.)

27. "The Art of Ambiguity: A Conversation with *Chan* Man Hisamatsu,"

Psychologia Vol. II, No. 2, 1959

(a talk with Jerome Bruner, professor of social psychology, Harvard University, January 29, 1958, at Prof. Bruner's House, recorded in English. Tr. into Japanese by Tokiwa)

Postscript by the Editor.

Volume Three: *AWAKENING AND CREATION*

(**KAKU TO SOUZOU**)

(Edited by UEDA Taiji and HIGASHI Sen'ichirou, 1971, 681 pp. + Postscript pp. 683 -- 704, with twelve plates including the author's handwriting "The Vow of Mankind")

CONTENTS

A. The Significance of *Chan* in the Modern Civilization:

1. ***Chan* -- the Significance of *Chan* in the Modern Civilization --**

(in the fourth volume *CULTURE*, of The Course *MODERN BUDDHISM*, published by Hozokan, November 1962; see Tokiwa's revised translation included in the present INTRODUCTION)

2. *Chan's* Significance for Modern Times

(in the first volume of *GENDAI-ZEN KOUZA (A Course on Modern Times Chan)*, published by Kadokawa-shoten, June 1956)

B. A Buddhist Idea for a New World:

3. *Chan's* Missions for the World

(a lecture commemorating the six hundredth anniversary of the death of Musou Daishi, founder of the Myoushinji Temple, Kyoto, held in Osaka, October 12, 1958, published in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 17, September 1959)

4. Two Basic Problems in the Formation of Character in Modern Times

(the date of writing unknown)

5. The Two Crises of Modern Times

(a lecture for a meeting by those who wanted to learn from Jiun *sonja*, held in Osaka on June 25, 1960)

6. Criticism of Modern Japan from the *Chan* Viewpoint

(a lecture in May 1947, included in the author's second book *ZETTAI SHUTAI DOU*, 5)

7. Religious Feudalism and Religious Democracy

(a lecture for a high mission class of the Rinzai-Zen Joint Sects, held on November 20, 1949)

8. *Chan* for the Masses

(published in the *HANAZONO DAIGAKU TSUUSHIN*, H. UNIVERSITY NEWS, October 15, 1954; its translation by TAKAHASHI Nobumichi is "Zen for the Masses" in the *FAS Society Journal* 1999.)

9. A Buddhist Idea for a New World

(a public lecture given for the second time at the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, sponsored by the Institute of Religion, Kyoto University, October 26, 1949; published in

the *RISOU* No. 443, April 1970)

C. The Vow of Mankind:

10. The Vow of Mankind (1) -- the History of its Formation --
(an address made in the general meeting to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the FAS Society, April 8, 1964, at the Shunkouin, Myoushinji Temple)
11. The Vow of Mankind (2) -- toward an open Doujou --
(a lecture at the Labour Hall, Kyoto, July 1, 1951; published in the *FUUSHIN* No. 3, August 1951, No. 4, October 1951)
12. The Vow of Mankind (3) -- the Self of *Prajñā* Insight Working in *Karunā* Compassion -- "A Preliminary Address"
(a talk to bring out essentials for ordinary Way-learning meetings, at the Senbutsuji Temple, Kitano, Kyoto, October 1, 1951)
 - (1) "Let us be well composed to get awakened to our true self":
(talks for special retreat, at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, April 1, 5, 7, December 11, 14, 15, 17, 1951; tr. by Christopher Ives in the *FAS Society Journal* 1986 & 1987)
 - (2) "and become compassionate humans":
(talks for ordinary Way-learning meetings at the Senbutsuji Temple, January 27, February 11; tr. by Ch. Ives, *FAS Society Journal* 1988-89 & 1989-90)
 - (3) "Following respective missions, Making full use of our nature":
(talks for ordinary Way-learning meetings, at the Senbutsuji Temple, dates in 1952 unknown; tr. by Ch. Ives, *FAS Society Journal* 1997)
 - (4) "Searching for the sources of distress individual and social,":
(talks for ordinary Way-learning meetings, at the Senbutsuji Temple, June 16, July 7, 1952; tr. by Ch. Ives, *FAS Society Journal* 1998)
 - (5) "Discerning the right direction in which history should proceed":
(talks for ordinary Way-learning meetings, at the Senbutsuji Temple, dates in 1952 unknown; tr. by Ch. Ives, *FAS Society Journal* 1999)
 - (6) "Making no distinctions of race, nation, or class, All taking hand in hand as brethren":
(talks for ordinary Way-learning meetings, at the Senbutsuji Temple, dates in 1952 unknown)
 - (7) "Having ourselves committed by the vow of compassion to emancipate mankind, and,"
(in the *FUUSHIN* No. 14, issued in June 1953)
 - (8) "Let us construct a true and happy world.":
(at the Senbutsuji Temple, February 2, 1953)
13. The Way of Living in a True Life
(on the air through the NHK program, "An Hour for Religion," November 1952; published in the *FUUSHIN*, No.6, January 1952)

14. The One who Getting Beyond History Lives in History
(a talk for a special Way-learning retreat at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, July 1952; *FUUSHIN*, No. 17, issued March 1954)
15. How a Future Religion Ought to Be?
(a lecture for a summer university course sponsored by the Section for Social Education, Nishinomiya City, July 1951; published in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 8, March 1952; No. 12, December 1952)
16. The Idea of a Peaceful World
(a lecture at Seikokuji Temple, Uji, May 6, 1952; *FUUSHIN*, No. 2, July 1951)
17. The Logic of Mankind's Peace Front
(a lecture at the Tenjuan Temple in the compound of Nanzenji, Kyoto, May 1950; *FUUSHIN*, No. 15, August 1953; No. 16, October 1953)
18. Religion's Actual Vow of Compassion for the Immediate Now
(an article published in the newspaper *CHUGAI-NIPPOH*, October 1954)
19. Five Oaths at Buddh Gaya
(in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 36, October 1958)
20. An Ethical Appeal to All Mankind -- Upon Facing the World Crisis --
(June 9, 1960, issued by the FAS Society)
21. Nation-States on the Verge of Bankruptcy -- Return to the Source of Mankind
-- (written in 1914)
- D. FAS as the New Basic Line of the *DOUJOU* (SEAT OF AWAKENING):
22. On the FAS (an address at a general meeting of the Gakudou Doujou, October 5, 1958, at the Toukaian, Myoushinji Temple)
23. Tasks of Modern Times and the FAS *Chan*
(a public lecture of the FAS Society, November 25, 1963, at the Rakuyuu Assembly Hall, Kyoto University)
24. Unmoved from the True Edge, One Constructs Things
(a talk for the special retreat, December 21, 1958 at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple; in the *FAS*, No. 38, April 1959)
25. Directed Toward Nirvana and Directed From Nirvana
(a talk for an ordinary Doujou meeting, July 6 1963 at the Senbutsuji Temple, Kyoto)
26. Religious Tasks
(in the *SHUUKYUGAKU ANNUAL REPORT*, No. 2, published by Ohtani University, April 1951)
27. Problems of Religious Method
(in the *ZENGAKE KENKYUU*, No. 42, March 1951; *SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA*, issued by the FAS Society October 1960; tr. by Jeff Shore, the *FAS Society Journal* 1987)
28. The Method of Awakening in *Chan*
(a talk for an ordinary Doujou meeting, November 24, 1962; in the *FAS*, No. 54,

February 1964)

29. On Composing the Mind

(a talk for a special Way-learning retreat, April 1 1962, at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple)

30. On a Talk to Bring Out Essentials (*tigang; teikou*)

(a talk for a special Way-learning retreat at the Toukaian, Myoushinji Temple, April 1, 1950; in the *GAKUDOU*, No. 2, August 1950)

31. On *Chan* Sitting -- A Talk On Dougen's *FUKAN ZAZEN-GI*

(for a special Way-learning retreat, April 8, 1955, at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple; *FUUSHIN*, No. 27, June 1956; included in *SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA*, published by the FAS Society, October 1960)

32. On Mutually Going into the Matter of Self

(a talk to bring out essentials, at the author's dwelling, Houseki-an, Myoushinji Temple, December 15, 1968; see Tokiwa's revised translation in the present INTRODUCTION.)

33. The Basic *Gong'an*

(a talk for a special Way-learning retreat, at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, August 1955; in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 28, August 1956)

34. Managing to Solve a *Gong'an*

(a talk for an ordinary Way-learning meeting, at the Senbutsuji Temple, February 18, June 23, 1962)

35. The *Wumenguan* the First Case

(a talk for special Way-learning retreat, July 19, 1952, at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple)

E. Dialogues:

36. Around the Subject of *Chan* Sitting -- An Exhaustive Discussion in an Ordinary Way-Learning Meeting --

(January 25 1964 at the Senbutsuji Temple; *FAS*, No. 57, May 1965; see the revised translation, **True Sitting and the Fundamental Koan**, in the present INTRODUCTION.)

37. Reminiscences of Shouzan the roushi

(contributed on February 22 1952, an anniversary of Master IKEGAMI Shouzan's death, September 22, 1928, to the *KINMOUKUTSU IHOU*, published by the Myoushinji Soudou)

Volume Four: *THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WAY OF TEA*
(**SADOU NO TETSUGAKU**)

(Edited by MIMURA Tsutomu and KURASAWA Yukihiro, published in 1973, with plates 1~97 + 1~47, and 11 illustrations. Text, 392 pp. + Postscript, pp. 393 ~ 434. Below, the Japanese phonetic alphabet precedes the Chinese because the vocabulary in this field is original to Japan.)

CONTENTS

I. The Way of Tea (*sadou; cha-dao*) as a Comprehensive Life System:

1. The Cultural Missions of Japan and the Way of Tea

(a lecture commemorating the tenth anniversary of the foundation of Kyoto University Shincha-kai (Xincha Hui; Mind-Tea Association), May 24, 1952; published in the *TANKOU*, 6-7, Tankou-sha, July 1952; *SHINCHA*, No. 8, Shincha-kai, May 1959)

2. The Human Formation in the Way of Tea

(a lecture commemorating the fifteenth anniversary of Kyoto University Shincha-kai, April 21, 1956; published in *SHINCHA*, No 1, August 1956)

3. The Way of Tea as the Basis of Life

(a talk for a regular meeting of Kyoto Shincha-kai, at the Koutou-in, Daitokuji Temple, Kyoto, July 14, 1957; published in the *SHINCHA*, No. 7, November 1958)

II. The Spirit of Tea:

4. Characteristics of the Tea-Way Culture

(a lecture for the International Association of the Tea-Way Culture, supposed to have been given in 1947, published as the former half of the author's book *CHA NO SEISHIN*, The Spirit of Tea, March 1948; tr. by Patrick Macgill James in collaboration with ABE Masao, with the title, "The Nature of Sado Culture," in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 4-1, 1970.)

5. The *wabi* (*tuo*, Recluse) Way of Tea

(a discourse delivered at the tea room, Kinmou-kutsu, of the Hounen-in Temple, Shishigatani, Kyoto, January 16, 1948, and published as the latter half of the book *CHA NO SEISHIN*, March 1948)

6. *chaji no wa-bi* (*chashi de he-mei*, The Joint Beauty of the Tea Affair)

(an article included in the *CHA NO BIGAKU*, Aesthetics of Tea, published by the Kadokawa-shoten, October 1963)

III. *SADOU SHIN* (*CHADAO ZHEN*; Admonition on the Way of Tea):

(This refers to a passage which consists of two parts, written for the Kyoto University Shincha-kai by the author in Chinese characters, 140 and 28, of which the smaller is called *SADOU SHOUSHIN* (*CHADAO XIAOZHEN*), both to be cited by the members of Shincha-kai on the occasion of a *sesshin* (*shexin*)-retreat. It was adopted together with the rules for practice of the Association, and was made public on January 16, 1941, the date of foundation of the Association, at the Jukou-in, Daitokuji Temple, Kyoto. Later, the author took up fifteen terms from the passage, and gave elucidatory talks on them one after another (7 ~ 21), but not necessarily in this order. The talks were given for a few members and other interested persons around 1950.)

7. *roji-souan* (*loudi-caoran*; A Grass Hut on the Ground where the Original Mind is Revealed)

(an article included in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 1, published by the Institute for Zen Studies, Hanazono University, June 1955; *SHINCHA*, No. 4, July 1957; Shincha-kai Special Number, *DAIJOUZEN*, Chuuou-bukkyousha, August 1963)

8. *sadou no genshi* (*chadao de xuanzhi*; The Profound Aim of the Way of Tea)

(an article edited by Mimura, one of the two editors, based on three sources: (1) the

author's article in the *TANKOU*, 6–1, January 1952, (2) a talk for the first meeting of Chuuou Shincha-kai, at the Houshun-in, Daitokuji Temple, June 19 1960, and (3) a talk for the second meeting of the Chuuou Shincha-kai, at the Jishi-in, Nanzenji Temple, September 11, 1960)

9. *wa-kei-sei-jaku* (*he-jing-jing-ji*; Peaceful – Respectful – Clear – Quiet)
(published in the *SHINCHA*, No. 5, April 1958)
10. *houtaku* (or, *houchoku*, *houjoku*) (*fang-zhu*; Fragrant Footprints)
(in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 29, June 1963)
11. *ryuugi* (*liuyi*; Individual Modes)
(in the *SHINCHA*, No. 28, December 1968)
12. *konomi* (*shi*; Liking)
(in the *TANKOU*, 7–8, August 1953; in the *SHINCHA*, NO. 13, JUNE 1960)
13. *wabi-suki* (*tuo-shihao*; A Recluse's Liking)
(its former half in the *SHINCHA*, No. 26, December 1966; its latter half in the *SHINCHA*, No. 27, September 1967)
14. *shingo* (*xinwu*; The Mind Awakened to Itself)
(an illustration of a circle drawn with brush and *sumi*-ink on p. 219, with a short passage on p. 220, quoted from an article, "Attainment -- The Postmodernist Human Image," which was included in the *KOUZA ZEN*, Vol. 1, Chikuma-shobo, August 1967, and later included in the second volume of the author's *CHOSAKUSHUU* (16).
15. *ichigo-ichiye* (*yiqi-yihui*; Take Every Occasion for Meeting as Not to be Expected to Recur)
(in the *SHINCHA*, No. 20, February 1963)
16. *ji-ri* (*shi-li*; Matter and Reason [To Be Practised Together])
(in the *SHINCHA*, No. 22, May 1964)
17. *michi* (*dao*; The Way [as the Ordinary Mind])
(in the *SHINCHA*, No. 28, December 1968)
18. *dateki* (*dazhi*; Cast Away [the Whole as One Whole])
(first made public here)
19. *byaku-roji* (*bai-loudi*; the Revealed White Ground)
(first made public here)
20. *cha no jittoku* (*cha de shide*; The Ten Virtues of Tea)
(in the *SHINCHA*, No. 11, November 1959; in the *SHINCHA*, No. 28, December 1968)
21. *kissa-ko* (*chicha-qu*; Go to Take Tea.)
(in the *TANKOU*, 10–2, February, 1956; in the *SHINCHA*, No. 16, January 1961)

IV. The Way of Tea in Japan Established:

22. The Way of Tea and Buddhism

(an article included in the fourth volume "On Literature and Art," of the *GENDAI BUKKYOU*

KOUZA, published by Kadokawa-shoten, June 1955; tr. and adapted by Robert Rhodes, in the *CHANOYU Quarterly*, Urasenke Chanoyu Center, No. 74, 1993)

23. On the *Nanbou-roku* (Nanbou's Record of Rikyuu's Tea)

(an article written as explanatory notes of the *NANBOU-ROKU*, the fourth volume of *SADOU KOTEN ZENSHUU*, published by Tankou-sha, December 1956. The article's final, fourth chapter, The Significance of the Nanbouroku, was translated by Mr. Dennis Hirota, and included in the *Chanoyu Quarterly*, No. 52, as "The Significance of *Nampo Roku*." By reading the text as he did, the translator meant a "Record on the Drinking of Tea, which Comes from the South, alluding to a statement from the *Cha Jing* of Luyu that tea is a plant native to the southern quarter." But that does not seem to be well-founded. In the second chapter, our author quotes Soukei's words which the latter uttered when he was told by Rikyuu, his teacher of Tea, to commit the sixth volume of his record to the flames; he could not find it in his heart to follow the teacher's words. He left it safe together with the teacher's words and his own justification written down. He wrote: "This [Nan-]Bou always forgets things; It's a shame to completely forget what has been taught for many years!" There is no doubt that the record was named *Nanbou-roku* after the recorder Nanbou Soukei, though the character "*bou*" (*fang*; temple, priest) was altered into a simpler one, "*hou*" (*fang*; square, direction). The latter is pronounced "*pou*," "*hou*," or "*bou*" in a compound (*ippou*, *nihou*, *houbou*).)

24. The Criticism of Modern Tea Cult by the *Nanbou-roku*

(a lecture for the first Geijutsu-Chayen (*yishu-chayuan*; Art Tea Garden) Seminar at the Ura Sen-ke Sadou-kaikann (Hall), June 1957; in the *SHINCHA*, No. 6, July 1958)

25. Patriarchs and Buddhas Both to be Killed

(in the *TANKOU*, 6–12, December 1952; in the *SHINCHA*, No. 9/10, October 1959)

26. Shouan, Rikyuu's Successor, who Stood on the Verge of Collapse

(an article in a booklet, *SHOUAN SOUJUN KOJI* (LAYMAN), compiled by the Konnichii-an on the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the death of Shouan Soujun, published by the Tankousha, September 1963)

27. Up to the Birth of Rikyuu's Tea

(a tripartite talk among SHINMURA Izuru, NISHIDA Naojiro, and the author, in September 1963; in the *TANKOU*, 6–9, September 1952)

V. Other Records:

28. The Aims and Guiding Principles of the Kyoto University Shinchai-kai

(the second item of the rules for practice of the Association, which consist of six items, adopted on the date of foundation)

29. The Mind-Mirror, the Mind-Bath

(an article in the *SHINCHA*, No. 3, February 1957, based on the author's talk on January 15, 1957, on the occasion of re-organization of the Association as part of the nation-wide Shinchai-kai)

30. Living the Life of *Shincha* (Mind-Tea)

(an address at the general meeting of Shincha-kai, at the Rakuyuu-kaikan, Kyoto University, November 29, 1959; in the *SHINCHA*, No. 12, January 1960)

31. Dreaming and Laughing in the Way of Tea

(in the *TANKOU*, 8-1, January 1954)

Postscript by the Editors

Volume Five: *CHAN AND ARTS*

(**ZEN TO GEIJUTSU**)

(Edited by KITAYAMA Masamichi and HYOUDOU Masanosuke, published in 1970. Text, 534 pp. + Postscript pp. 535 ~ 565, with 68 plates.)

CONTENTS

I *Chan* and Culture:

1. ***Chan* and *Chan* Culture**

(transcribed from the tapes which recorded the four public lectures at Harvard Divinity School, 1957; see Tokiwa's translation included in the present INTRODUCTION.)

2. Buddhist Culture

(a lecture, re-arranged by the compiler, given at the Yakushiji Temple, Nara, around 1955)

3. *Chan* and Oriental Culture

(an article in the *ZENGAKU KENKYUU*, No. 34, November 1940)

4. *Chan* and Various Accomplishments

(an article in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 14, 1959; "Zen and the Various Acts" tr. by Hung Woong Pak, *Chicago Review* 12-1, 1958)

5. The Way of Art

(an article included in the author's second book, *ZETTAI SHUTAI DOU*. April 1948)

6. On Understanding *Chan* Art

(an article included in the author's first book, *TOUYOUTEKI MU*, February 1939; Tokiwa's revised translation, **On *Chan* Art**, is included in the present INTRODUCTION.)

7. On *yuugen* (*youxuan*; Deep Seclusion)

(an article included in the *ZEN NO RONKOU*, a collection of articles discussing and inquiring into *Chan*, to celebrate Dr. D.T. Suzuki's 77th birthday, published by Iwanami shoten, August 1949)

8. *Chan* and Fine Arts

(a lecture noted down and included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 41, January 1955)

9. Characteristics of *Chan* Fine Arts

(a lecture for a regular meeting of dilettanti, "Tomo no Kai," sponsored by the National Kyoto Museum, after returning home from the travels through the U.S.A., Europe, and India, December 1958)

10. The Modern Nature of *Chan* Culture

("impressions" addressed to the program of the exhibition, "*Chan* Fine Arts," held at the National Kyoto Museum of Modern Arts, December 1964; later included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 146, April 1965)

11. *Chan* and Culture -- the Formless Self and its Creation --

(an article included in the *KOUZA ZEN*, Vol. 5, Chikuma-shobo, January 1968. Its translation by Jeff Shore is in the *FAS Society Journal* 1984-85.)

II – 1: The Peculiarity of Japanese Culture:

12. The Universal Profundity of Japanese Culture

(included in the author's second book, *ZETTAI SHUTAI DOU*, April 1948)

13. The Spiritual Formation of the Japanese and Buddhism

(an article included in the fifth volume, "Religious Lives of the Japanese," of *GENDAI SHUUKYOU KOUZA*, Sobunsha, May 1955)

14. Creating the World Culture and Japan

(a lecture for the Shinchai-kai, April 1963)

II – 2:

15. Free and Unhindered Shaping with the Well-Trained Use of the Brush

(an essay on *Chan* painting, written in association with the private exhibition of Mr. HIROSE Soan's calligraphic works, February 1962)

16. My Revered Teacher Sunshin's Calligraphy

(an essay addressed to the monthly report of the ninth volume of *NISHIDA KITAROU ZENSHUU*, Iwanami shoten, October 1965)

17. Calligraphy and Oriental Spirit

(an essay addressed to the program of itinerant exhibitions at home and in Europe of the "Art Exhibition of Calligraphy and sumi-ink of Modern Japan," recorded in the *BOKUBI*, No. 48, September 1955)

18. Addressed to MORITA SHIRYUU's Private Calligraphy Exhibition in New York

(May 1963)

19. *KOSHOU* (*jixiang*, one's own shape)

(an essay addressed to the publication of a collection of calligraphic works by the members of Bokujin-kai on the tenth anniversary of foundation, 1962)

II – 3:

20. The Essence of *Chan* Paintings

(included in the *BUKKYOU-BIJUTSU*, No. 26, 1955)

21. Religion and Flowers

(a lecture in the summer of 1952, noted down and included in the magazine *OMURO*, 5/6, October in the same year)

22. The *Chan* Style of Sengai's Works

(a talk noted down and included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 110, August 1961)

23. Dr. D.T. Suzuki's Portraits in Abstract
(included in the *FAS*, 59/60, December 1966)
 24. Daisetsu *sensei*'s Profile
(an essay included in the monthly report attached to the eighth volume of *SUZUKI DAISETSU ZENSHUU*, Iwanami-shoten, July 1968)
 25. Nishida Kitarou *sensei*'s Calligraphy and Personality
(included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 8, January 1952)
 26. Modern Calligraphy
(a talk noted down and included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 82, January 1959)
 27. Calligraphy and Humans
(a lecture given for a mass meeting of All Japan Society for the Study of Calligraphy Education, September 1962, and included in the *SHO KYOUIKU*, No. 79, published by the Bokubi-sha, May the next year with the title "Calligraphy and Human Formation")
- III Dialogues:
28. *Renga*, Verse-Linking, and *Chan*
(part of the dialogue of the Art Group in the *FAS* All-Out Research, January 1963, and included in the *FAS*, No. 57, May 1965. The group included university-professors: KITAYAMA Masamichi (Wakayama), TANAKA Yutaka (Osaka), FUJIYOSHI Jikai (Hanazono), ABE Masao (Nara U. of Education), besides Dr. NISHITANI Keiji and the author.)
 29. Calligraphy and Ages
(included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 45, June 1955. Attendants included SUDA Kunitarou, Professor of Kyoto University of Fine Arts, member of the Art Academy; KANDA Kiichirou, Kyoto National Museum Curator; and IJIMA Tsutomu, Professor of Kyoto University.)
 30. Talking about the Calligraphy of Jion *sonja*, priest of high virtue
(a round-table talk conducted in May 1953, taken up in the *BOKUBI*, No. 25, the next month)
 31. Talking about "Religion and Arts"
(among the author, KITAYAMA Masamichi, NAKAMURA Nihei, professor of Osaka University of Education, and MORITA Shiryuu, calligrapher and editor-publisher of the *BOKUBI*, taken up in the *BOKUBI*, No. 146, April 1964)
 32. The Essence of Arts
(some of the conversations which were passed between attendants of a meeting for familiar talks on May 18, 1958, co-sponsored by the University of Freiburg and Freiburg Art Association, noted down by Dr. Alfredo Guzzoni, translated from German and contributed to the *DAIJOU ZEN*, No. 420, December 1958, by TSUJIMURA Kouichi, professor of Kyoto University; the meeting was attended by more than thirty people, including poets, painters, and scholars, from places of Germany, Switzerland, and Britain, presided over by Professor Martin Heidegger. Dr. Guzzoni was a friend of Prof. Tsujimura.)
 33. Humans

(talks among the author, NISHITANI Keiji, and IJIMA Tsutomu, included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 108, June 1961, on the tenth anniversary of the publication of the magazine)

Postscript by the Editors

Volume Six: *EXCERPTS FROM BUDDHIST SCRIPTURES AND CHAN RECORDS*
(*KYOUROKU-SHOU*)

(Made up of five texts, edited by FUJIYOSHI Jikai and KITAHARA Ryuutarou, published in 1973, Text 520 pp. + Postscript pp. 521 ~ 548, with 21 plates.)

CONTENTS

I. *PROBLEMS POSED IN THE [DASHENG] QIXIN [LUN] (KISIN NO KADA)*

Prefatory Note

(See the author's explanation in I (3) above.)

Introduction

The System of the *Qixin Lun*

The Attitude to Formulate the Treatise

The Objective of Framing the Treatise

The Target of the Treatise; the Form of the *Qixin Lun*

The Philosophical Task of the *Qixin Lun*

Chapter One On Reality

II. *SEVEN CASES FROM THE WEIMA-JING (YUIMA-SHICHISOKU)*

(See the author's own explanation in I (5) "Introductory Case" above. Here Part II is excluded.)

Introductory Case

Case 1: Composing Oneself

Case 2: *Dharma* (Awakened Truth)

Case 3: Buddha-land

Case 4: The Seat of Awakening

Case 5: Illness

Case 6: The Path for Practice

Case 7: Silence

Postscript

(The first six cases, 1 ~ 6, have their translations in the *FAS Society Journal*: "Talks on the *Vimalakirti Sutra* Part I: "[Case 1] Sitting in Complete Repose" in the *Journal* 1992, by TAKAHASHI Nobumichi; Part II: "[Case 2] *Dharma* is Beyond Form" in 1996 by Takahashi, with Jeff Shore and Tokiwa; Part III: "[Case 3] As Mind is Pure, the Buddhaland is Pure" in 1997 by Takahashi with Shore and Tokiwa; Part IV: "[Case 4] The Locus of Awakening" in 1998 by Takahashi with Shore and Tokiwa; Part V: "[Case 5] Sickness" and Part VI: "Case 6] "Practice of the Way" in 1999 by Takahashi with Shore and Tokiwa.)

III. *TALKS TO BRING OUT ESSENTIALS ON EXCERPTS OF THE LINJI- RECORD,*

RINZAIROKU SHOUKOU

(made up of twenty-two talks the author gave for the special sesshin-retreat of the F.A.S. Society at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, three times a year during the period between 1962 and 1964, transcribed from tapes. The whole talks with part of the compiler Kitahara's postscript as "Foreword" were translated and edited by Christopher Ives and Tokiwa, together with YANAGIDA Seizan's "Introduction" specially prepared, and published, with ABE Masao's "Preface," by Palgrave Macmillan in 2002, with the title, ***Critical***

Sermons of the Zen Tradition: Hisamatsu's Talks on Linji.

1. I Simply Couldn't Open My Mouth
2. Who is Pure and Direct in His Behaviour?
3. There 's Nothing Special in the Buddha-*Dharma*
4. After Realizing the Great Block of Awakening
5. Leaving after the Summer Retreat
6. The One True Person without Rank
7. Speak, Speak!
8. The Mind-*Dharma* is without Form and Pervades the Ten Directions
9. You, the Follower of the Way Right Now before My Eyes Listening to the *Dharma*
10. Independent of All Things
11. Not at all Thus
12. I Do Not Pay Homage to the Buddha or the Founding Teacher
13. True Insight
14. The Meaning of the Founder's Coming from the West
15. The Three Vehicles' Twelve Divisions of Teachings
16. The Instant You Open Your Mouth You're Already Way Off
17. No Dividing into Categories
18. The Four Classifications: A General Outline
19. The Four Classifications: First Half
20. The Four Classifications: Second Half
21. On the Way and at Home
22. The Buddha-*Dharma* is Deep and Mysterious

IV. *TALKS TO BRING OUT ESSENTIALS ON MASTER DONGSHAN'S FIVE RANKS, TOUZAN GOI TEIKOU*

(Eight talks were given by the author in 1960: four times in September and three times in December for the F.A.S. Society's special sesshin-retreat at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, and one time in October for the ordinary practice at the Senbutsuji Temple; transcribed from the recorded tape.)

1. Introductory Talk
2. The Five Ranks and the No-Rank, *wuwei*, as their Source-Origin
3. (1) The Rank of the Straight with the Leaning Inside, *zheng-zhong-pian*
4. (2) The Rank of the Leaning with the Straight Inside, *pian-zhong-zheng*

5. (3) The Rank of Coming from Inside the Straight, *zheng-zhong-lai*
6. (4) The Rank of Arriving at [the] Concurrence [of the Straight and the Leaning],
jian-zhong-zhi *
7. (5-1) The Rank of Having Arrived at Concurrence, *jian-zhong-dao*
8. (5-2) The Rank of Having Arrived at Concurrence, *jian-zhong-dao*
(* For the fourth rank the author adopted this form, derived from Fenyang Shanzhao (947-1024), while the other form, introduced by Juefan Huihong (1071-1128), on the same Linji-line with Fenyang, was: "The Rank of Arriving at the Inside of the Leaning, *pian-zhong-zhi*." Traditionally, according to the *Wuwei Xianjue*, ascribed to Caoshan Benji, 840-901, "Coming from the Inside of the Rank of Leaning, *pian-wei-zhong-lai* [zhe]" was interpreted as "Getting Concurrent as Conditions [to the Straight], [ze] *jian yuan*." This means there is no difference between the two expressions for the fourth rank: *jian-zhong-zhi* and *pian-zhong-zhi*.)

V. *TALKS TO BRING OUT ESSENTIALS ON THE TEN PICTURES OF A BULL,*
JUUGYUU-ZU TEIKOU

(Talks for a special sesshin-retreat of the F.A.S Society in early April, 1952, formed into a manuscript, and included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 30, May 1957)

Volume Seven: *A COLLECTION OF VERSES (NINNUN-SHUU)*
WITH THE AUTHOR'S PREFATORY NOTE

(made up of eleven sections, including Chinese and Japanese style of poetry, pictures and calligraphic works in sumi-ink, chosen by the author, part of them shown with 348 plates, the book was edited by KURASAWA Yukihiro, and published in 1980, 435 pp. **SELECTED VERSES** were taken from this volume and translated by Tokiwa for the present INTRODUCTION.)

The Author's Prefatory Note to the *NINNUN-SHUU*, *renyun-ji*:

The poetry both Chinese and Japanese, and pictures and calligraphic works in sumi-ink, which follow, are nothing but my thoughts and feelings expressed freely on occasion, with chance trusted to (*ninnun*; *renyun*), regardless of tonal patterns in classical Chinese poetry or rhyme, irrespective of the rules of the eight strokes the character "*ei*; *yong* (forever)" has.

As far as it goes, their style is not the so-called realism or impressionism, not even symbolism, of mere description or lyricism; I wonder if it is not, if anything, expressionism.

Frankly speaking, however, they are only the ruleless strains sung by a down-and-out rascal. Veteran poets of the world, please laugh them off !

For having taken his trouble to arrange all the plates in the collection of my writ-

ings I thank the elegant artisan, Mr. KURASAWA Yukihiro.

CONTENTS

Preparatory Note

1. *Grass Soft and Thick (kusa joujou; cao rongrong)* :
(This section includes forty-nine works: seventeen between the author's ages 25 and 37; thirty-two between 54 and 56.)
2. *Without a Track (mosshouseki; mei zongji)* :
(seventy works: thirty between the ages 27 and 44; forty between the ages 68 and 86. At the age 68 the author gave lectures at Harvard; at 85 met the death of MURATA Kinue, who had kept doing household work for the author since the latter's age 61.)
3. *Stop Showing Off (shou-mairou; shao-mainong)* :
(sixty-three works: fifteen between the ages 26 and 52; forty-eight between the ages 71 and 81. At the age 73 the author shifted his dwelling from inside the Myoushinji Temple Compound, where he had lived since the age 29, to a place near west of the Kyoto Palace.)
4. *Also Strange a Lot (mata hanahada ki nari; ye taiqi)* :
(sixty-eight works: eighteen between 27 and 53; fifty between the ages 60 and 81. The author sings with wonder about a plant named *dokudami*, *Poison-counteractor* or *Hottuyinia cordata*, growing leaves of a bo tree and blossoming flowers of cruciform.)
5. *A Down-and-out Rascal (harakuko; poluohu)* :
(ninety-two works: thirty-two between the ages 26 and 54; sixty between 58 and 82. At the age 43 the author accepted a full-time lecturership at the Kyoto Imperial University, and in October 1949, at 80, had the Risosha begin to publish the collection of his writings.)
6. *Strains of Song (rarari; luoluoli)* :
(ninety-five works: twenty-three between the ages 26 and 50; seventy-two between 60 and 82)
7. *Talking Big (dai-datsukuu; da-tuokong)*:
(eighty-six works: twenty-eight between the ages 27 and 54; fifty-eight between 57 and 85. In September 1958, at the age 69, at Buddh Gaya, India, the author made five vows.)
8. *An Aged Awl (rou-kosui; laoguzhu)* :
(ninety-three works: twenty-eight between the ages 26 and 53; sixty-five between 58 and 83. Sang his memories of Paul Tillich, Martin Heidegger, and others; he introduced his last words.)
9. *A Bottomless Bowl (mutei no hachi; wudi-bo)* :
(sixty-four works: twenty-four between the ages 26 and 54; forty between 59 and 80. At the age 72 the author sang "The All-Bearing Empty Sea," in memory of Carl Jung.)
10. *(A Shout of Encouragement and/or a Yell of Scolding) (rikiiki; liweixi)*:
(sixty works; twenty-six between the ages 25 and 54; thirty-four between 60 and 80.)

During his ages 57 and 60 the author sang the "Fall of Modern Times," in ten stanzas, not yet translated).

11. *Postmodernist* :

(twenty-seven works since the age 71 until 86, beginning with the calligraphic work of "The Vow of Mankind.")

Impressions of the Author's 25 Seals

Contents of the 352 Plates

Postscript by the Editor

Volume Eight: *BROKEN SANDALS*
(*HASOUAI*)

(Edited by IKENAGA Kiyoshi, including character sketch, reports from trips abroad, comments upon current topics, and dialogues, published as the last volume, in 1974. Text, 672 pp. + Postscript pp. 673 ~ 698, with 26 plates and 22 illustrations.)

CONTENTS

I. Character-Sketch :

(The original headline: "*The Former being Three and Three, The Latter being Three and Three (zen san-san, go san-san; qian sansan, hou sansan)*", is a *Chan* term, which appeared in the 35th case of the *Biyān-lu*, whereby the editor -- possibly the author himself -- seems to have meant that in the ultimate there is no distinction between the unawakened and the awakened, like snakes and dragons. It seems to have derived from a scriptural expression, "The former three of the six pāramitā, i.e., giving, keeping precept, and being patient, benefit sentient beings, while the latter three, i.e., making efforts, being composed, and being insightful, free them from self-afflicting passions." Cf. the seventh chapter, on *bhūmi* and *pāramitā*, of the *Samdhinirmocana sūtra*, *Jieshenmi-jing*; *Gejinmitsu-kyō*. T16, 705b)

[Nishida's Philosophy and *Chan*]

1. Nishida's Philosophy and *Chan* (1)

(a lecture given at The Fourth High School in Kanazawa, June 8, 1947)

2. Nishida's Philosophy and *Chan* (2)

(a lecture for the Sunshin-kai at Kyoto Prefectural First Girls' High School, June 14, 1947)

3. A Comment on Nishida's Lectures on the Science of Religion

(a postscript to Additional Volume IV, of *NISHIDA KITAROU ZENSHUU*, published by Iwanami shoten on June 25, 1952)

4. A Comment on Nishida's Early Manuscripts, *Gasonkai Yuuyokusei Bunkou*

("Written by A Winged Man in the Club of the Self-Conceited") and *Fuseibun-kai yuuyokusei Genkou* ("Manuscripts by A Winged Man in the Uncodified Club")

(a postscript to Volume XVI of *NISHIDA KITAROU ZENSHUU*, published in August 1966)

[A Man of Great Death -- SUZUKI Daisetsu]

5. Postscript to the *ZEN NO RONKOU, STUDIES ON CHAN*
(published in celebration of Dr. Daisetsu Teitarou Suzuki's 77th birthday by the Iwanami shoten, August 15, 1949. To this book the author contributed an article "On *yuugen*," which is included in the fifth volume of the author's collected writings. See above.)
6. Upon Listening to Dr. D.T. Suzuki's Lecture
(a closing address after Dr. Suzuki's lecture for the Sunshin-kai, at Kyoto University, October 15, 1960, later included in the *FAS* Nos. 47~49, January, 1961)
7. Let Donkeys Cross, let Horses Cross, *du lu, du ma*
(a contribution to a volume, The Character and Learning of D.T. Suzuki, annexed to the *SUZUKI DAISETSU ZEN-SENSHUU (Selected Writings on Chan)*, Shunjuusha, June 5, 1962)
8. A Man of Great Death, D.T. Suzuki
(an address in the memorial service for Dr. Suzuki held by the F.A.S. Society on September 4, 1966, during its special sesshin-retreat at the Reiun-in, Myoushinji Temple, included in the *FAS*, Nos. 59/60, December that year. Its translation, "*Mondô*: At the Death of a "Great-Death-Man," by the *E.B.* editorial office, with the first part largely being adapted, appeared in *The Eastern Buddhist*, Vol. II No. 1, August 1967. It lacks the whole *mondô* between KITAHARA Ryuutarou and the author. It seems that the *E.B.* editorial office wanted Dr. Suzuki's last words to be accurately recorded.)
9. Daisetsu and Sunshin
(a contribution to the monthly report of Volume Thirty of the *SUZUKI DAISETSU ZENSHUU*, Iwanami shoten, December 1970)
10. Two Aspects of *Chan* Master Kankei
(a contribution to the *TOKUUN* 5-2, published by the Rinzaishuu Daigaku, later Hanazono University, July 1, 1934)
11. The Moonlight Three Bridges
(The Hiyoshi Three Stone Bridges over the stream in front of an archway to the Hiyoshi Shrine in Sakamoto, Ohtsu City, a scenic place at the foot of Mt. Hiei; written in memory of a former student at the Ryukoku University, Mr. SAIKI Koushou, an apprentice being trained in the Tendai school, who died at 27, included in a collection of writings published by the father of the deceased, June 62, 1943)
12. In Connection with the *Dâna Yoga* (Giving Practice) of Honshin the Aged Nun
(an introduction to a book by FUJIYOSHI Jikai, *Dâna-Yogin SATTA HONSHIN the Nun*, published January 15, 1951)
13. A Memorial Address to Dr. TOMONAGA SANJUUROU
(read at the funeral of Dr. Tomonaga, in September 1951, by the author on behalf of the deceased one's former students)
14. A Tribute to the Memory of Mr. OGUCHI
(words of condolence read at a Protestant church in Tokyo by KITAHARA Ryuutarou on

the author's behalf in the funeral service for Mr. OGUCHI Tokuji, full-time lecturer of German literature at Himeji School of Kobe University, who had attended special sesshin-retreats of the F.A.S. Society, and who died at the age of 29, April 19, 1958)

15. Cherishing the Memory of Mr. AOCHI SEICHO, Professor of the Ryukoku University (condolences extended on the death of Professor Aochi, on July 27, 1960)
16. Cherishing the Memory of MUGENSAI, SEKISOU, Tea Master of the Head Family (a memorial address included in the *SHINCHA*, No. 24, July 1965, on the death of the head of Konnichichi-an Tea-School, September 7, 1964)
17. Cherishing the Memory of Layman ISHII SEKISUI (a memorial address extended on the death of Mr. ISHII Mitsuo, on the day of spring equinox of 1966, as the representative of the F.A.S Society, and included in the *FAS*, No. 58)
18. Head of the ITTOUEN, A SINGLE-LIGHT GARDEN, A Man Who Possessed Nothing, *muichimotsu-tei, wu-yiwu-di* -- Invited to the Celebration of Master NISHIDA Tenkou's Ninetieth Birthhay -- (a passage included in the *SHINDOU*, June issue of 1968)
19. Master TENKOU, Head of the Garden, has Returned to Light (condolences extended to Master NISHIDA Tenkou who died on February 29, 1968, and included in the *HIKARI*, April issue of 1968)
20. Welcoming Professor Paul Tillich (written on the occasion of Professor Tillich's visit to Japan, who arrived on May 3, 1960, and included in the *RISOU*, No. 325, June 1, the same year. Between November 11, 1957 and March 25, 1958, the author met to have talks three times with him. Cf. The author's article, "Theonomy and *Chan* Autonomy," Vol. II.)
21. Elegies for Professor Paul Tillich (presented on the death of Prof. Tillich on October 22, 1965. See *SELETED VERSES* II.)
22. Extolling Prof. Martin Heidegger who Counts the Age of Eighty (made on Prof. Heidegger's eightieth birthday, September 24, 1969, and presented to Prof. Heidegger together with other persons' words of celebration in a book published by Klostermann bookstore)
23. A Verse in Memory of Dr. Wilhelm Gundert (written on the death of Dr. Gundert, August 3, 1971, mailed to Mrs. Gundert, included in the *FAS*, Nos. 69/70)

II. From a Pilgrimage through the World

(The author left Japan in the autumn of 1957 to give lectures at the Divinity School, Harvard University, U.S.A., and returned to Haneda Airport on July 1, 1958, after visiting countries in Europe and Near East, and then dropping in India.)

24. Greetings Before Travelling Abroad (greetings sent to the Gakudou Doujou and the Shincha-kai with the date of his

departure, September 1, 1957, included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 31, and *SHINCHA* No. 4, respectively, having almost the same contents, here taken from the *FUUSHIN*)

25. A Letter to the Gakudou Doujou

(correspondence between September 1 and 30, included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 32)

26. A Letter to the Shinchai-kai

(correspondence between the departure and February 11, 1958, whose excerpt included in the *SHINCHA*, Nos. 5 & 6)

27. A letter to the Gakudou Doujou

(despatched from Hotel Continental, Cambridge, U.S.A. on December 18, 1957)

28. A Letter from Harvard

(addressed to President YAMADA Mumon of Hanazono University, January 243, 1958, included in the *HANAZONO DAIGAKU TSUUSHIN*, December issue)

29. A Letter from Abroad

(despatched from Madrid, Spain, April 11, 1958, included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 34, June 22)

30. Correspondence from Places in Europe

(addressed to a member of the Shinchai-kai during the period between April 10 and June 21, 1958)

31. Greetings upon Returning Home

(addressed to the Gakudou Doujou and the Shinchai-kai, included respectively in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 36 and the *SHINCHA*, No. 7; here adopted is the greeting to the Gakudou Doujou, which includes "Vows.")

32. Travelling through the U.S.A. and Europe

(talks between the author and Professor IJIMA Tsutomu of Kyoto University in a meeting sponsored by the Bokubi-sha, included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 81, issued on December 1, 1958.)

III. Comments upon Current Topics

(through the author's permission, divided into seven small groups, with headlines provided by IKENAGA, the editor)

[The Existence that is Nothing]

(The following three articles belong to the pre-war days.)

33. Religion and Modern Times

(included in the *RINZAISHUU DAIGAKU GAKUHOU*, No. 4, issued on April 10, 1920, whose editor-publisher the author himself was.)

34. Advocating Faith

(included in the *RYUKOKU DAIGAKU JIHOU*, Ryukoku University Review, issued on February 10, 1928; the author taught at this university during the period between 1919 and 1937.)

35. The Existence that is Nothing

(a draft of the author's special lectures in 1935 at Kyoto Imperial University, of which KORETSUNE Takayasu made a fair copy)

[Is Buddhism all right as it has been?]

(The following nine are reviews and criticism of religions, contributed to newspapers and magazines as well as records of public lectures between the days of World War II and after the war, up to 1954.)

36. Get Rid First of All of Narrow-Mindedness !

37. Deeply Cultivate the Mind-Fields !

(drafts of articles contributed either to the *ZENGAKE KENKYUU*, Studies in Zen Buddhism, Hanazono University, or *RYUKOKU DAIGAKU GAKUHOU*, Ryukoku University Gazette, during the World War II)

38. Missions of the War-Defeated Races

(a contribution to the newspaper, *EVENING KYOTO*, on August 5, 1949)

39. Modern Philosophy and *Chan*

(a shorthand address for the *EHIME NEWSPAPER*, September 5, 1949)

40. The Right *Dharma* has no Miracle

(a contribution to the *CHUGAI NIPPOH* (Ch. Daily Newspaper), December 3, 1949)

41. An Introduction to *SHUTAITEKI MU*, Nothingness as the Fundamental Subjectivity

(an offprint of a lecture with the title *SHUTAITEKI MU*, without the notice of the place or date)

42. The KIYOZAWA Spirit and A Reformed Buddhism

(record of a lecture given at the Takakura Hall, Kyoto, in June 1952, in a meeting for lectures in memory of the fiftieth anniversary of the death of KIYOZAWA Manshi, included in the *KYOUKA*, No. 14, issued by Kyouka Institute of the Higashi Honganji Temple, November 15, 1952)

43. Is Buddhism All Right As It Has Been ?

(a handwritten draft with no notice of date or other information)

44. How Should Buddhism Live in the Modern Times and in the Future ?

(a shorthand record of a lecture for the first general meeting of the Kyoto Buddhists Assembly held on July 10, 1954, through the author's correction and YANAGIDA Seizan's adjustment, printed as a pamphlet with the same title)

[The Intention of the *Chan* Patriarch Coming From the West]

(six items, including studies, talks to bring out essentials, and lectures, not arranged in chronological order)

45. *DHARMA*

(a study on Bodhidharma, included in the *KOUZA ZEN*, Volume Three, The History of *Chan* in China, published by the Chikuma-shobo, October 30, 1967)

46. The Intention of the *Chan* Patriarch Coming From the West

(a recorded manuscript of a talk for a course of the Rinzaigakuin College, included in the *RINZAI JIHOU*, Rinza Review, October 15, 1947)

47. The Living LINJI

(a talk to bring out essentials for the 56th special *sesshin*-retreat of the F.A.S. Society,

- on April 10, 1966, the day which happened to be the one thousand and one hundredth anniversary of the death of *Chan* Master Linji Yixuan; included in the *FAS*, No. 58, issued on April 30, 1966)
48. Lao An Shows the Self Functioning
(a talk to bring out essentials for the special *sesshin*-retreat, July 1960, included in the *FAS*, Nos. 45/46, September 25, 1960)
49. With One Mind Unborn Tens of Thousands of *Dharmas* Get Faultless,
isshin fushou manpou mutai; yixin busheng wanfa wujiu
(a talk to bring out essentials for the F.A.S. Society *sesshin*-retreat, a mimeographed copy made by YANAGIDA Seizan, without information of date and others)
50. What is DOUGEN-like in humans
(a shorthand record of a lecture at Nakanoshima Public Hall, Osaka, on May 17, 1951, celebrating the seven hundredth anniversary of the death of Chan Master Dougen in the next year; included in a book with the title *HOUSAN DOUGEN ZENJI*, In Admiration of Master Dougen, March 10, 1952)
- [The Self of *Prajñā* Insight Works in *Karunā* Compassion]
(articles concerning the Gakudou Doujou)
51. Being a Slave
(the opening article of the *GAKUDOU*, Learning the Way, No. 1, issued in 1950 by the Gakudou Doujou, later named F.A.S. Society)
52. The Self of *Prajñā* Insight Works in *Karunā* Compassion
(a lecture at the Kaiseiji *Chan* Monastery, Nishinomiya, some time between the autumn of 1949 and May 1950; recorded by KAMATA Zenshou, and revised by the present editor)
53. Celebrating the anniversary of the Founding of Gakudou Doujou
(a greeting on April 8, 1950, included in the *GAKUDOU*, No. 2)
54. New Year's Words
(included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 29, January 1, 1957)
55. *NOTHINGNESS*, Pamphlet 1
(composed by a drafting committee, UEDA Taiji and others, with the author as the central figure, and made public in 1957 as a pamphlet of the Gakudou Doujou; its English version was prepared immediately thereafter by Ueda, Fujiyoshi, and some others.)
56. *What is Chan?* Pamphlet 2
(a draft composed by KITAHARA Ryuutarou, who re-arranged passages quoted from the author's writings so as to have a concrete guide to practice and the method for realization of the idea of the Association established in Pamphlet 1)
- [The Cardinal Point of *SHINCHA*, Mind Tea] (four items concerning the Shincha-kai)
57. Renaissance of the Way of Tea
(the opening passage of the *KYOTO DAIGAKU SHINCHAKAI KAIHOU*, bulletin of the association, No. 1, February 28, 1952, celebrating the tenth anniversary of the

founding of the Shinchai-kai)

58. A message to the General Meeting

(celebrating the fifteenth anniversary of the association, November 18, 1956, included in the *SHINCHA*, No. 3)

59. The Cardinal Point of *SHINCHA*, 1

(included in the "Guide to Shinchai-kai," in April 1956, on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of founding of the association)

60. The Cardinal Point of *SHINCHA*, 2

(included in the "Guide to Shinchai-kai" on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of founding of the association, in October 1961; later included in the *SHINCHA*, No. 22, May 5, 1964)

[The World of Quietude]

(contributions and lectures, on everyday practice of the Way)

61. To Read, To Have Oneself Read, and To Read Free from Reading

(contributed to the *SHOSOU*, A Study-Window, issued by the Kobundo-shobo, May 25, 1949)

62. A Classic City Kyoto

(included in the *RAKUMI*, The Taste of Kyoto, No. 44, issued by the Rakumi-sha, January 25, 1954)

63. A Black-Bean-Eater, *ankokutou*, *anheidou*

(written on February 15, 1955, and included in the *DOKUSHO SHUNJUU*, The Book-Reading Springs and Autumns; cf. III. 4, in the seventh volume above.)

64. One Day to Do Nothing; One Day to Eat Nothing

(included in the *HEIAN*, Peace and Security, issued by the Culture Section, Department of Police Affairs, Kyoto Prefectural Police Headquarters, June 5, 1957; tr. by Jeff Shore, *FAS Journal*, 1984-85, and in the *Young East* vol. 11-1, 3 pp. with the title "One Day Without Work, One Day Without Eating.")

65. The World of Quietude

(talks over the radio in the NHK program "*Jinsei-dokuhon* (Human Life Readers)", during the period between April 22 and 24, 1963, recorded and written out into a manuscript by KONTANI Kouji)

66. On Getting Through Severity

(three talks over the radio in the NHK program during the period between August 31 and September 2, 1964, included in the two numbers of *BUKKYOU TIMES* from September 15)

[Ecumenism]

(a group of writings to advocate a kind of ecumenism to see a new task for religion in establishing ethics for all mankind)

67. A Message to the President of the Buddhist Society, London

(sent from the Gakudou Doujou represented by the author, apparently written by

someone else than the author, included in the *FUUSHIN*, No. 20, January 1955)

68. Modern Times and *Chan*

(the substance of a lecture given at the Rakuyuu Hall, Kyoto University, included in the *CHUGAI NIPPOH*, Chuugai Daily Newspaper, as one of the series of the same title, July 25, 1956)

69. Establishing Ethics Beyond Nationhood

(included in the column "The World of 1961 and Its Tasks" of the *CHUGAI NIPPOH*, January 1, 1961)

70. A Greeting to the Gathering for Familiar Talk Between *Chan* and Christianity

(dated March 27, 1967, included in the *FAS* Nos. 61/62)

71. The World of the Awakened Existence

(a response to Mr. HARA Ichirou's review of the author's *Seven Cases from the Weima*, February 11, 1961, included in the *SOUZOU*, Creation, issued by the Japan Liberal Union of Religions, issued on April 1, the same year)

IV. Dialogues:

(divided into three sections: the first three were with advocates of materialism in the early period after the war; the next six are with three American scholars, two European scholars, and with Dr. D.T. Suzuki, during the author's travel abroad in 1957 and 1958; the last two were in Japan on creating artistic works, sponsored by the Bokubi-sha before and after the author's travel abroad)

72. Religion and Communism

(with IDE Takashi, professor of Tokyo University, sponsored by the newspaper, *EVENING KYOTO*, planned by HOSHINO Genpou, ABE Masao, and MORI Ryuukichi, held twice in April, 1949, made public in the *TOUHOU*, The East, No. 10, by Hozokan, June 1, 1949; its subtitle was "Appraisal of Philosophy from the Two Standpoints")

73. Matter or Mind ?

(a lecture in the "Big Forum of Thoughts" held at Kanazawa City Public Hall on April 1, 1949, in memory of the sixtieth anniversary of the founding of Kanazawa City; the record of the forum was made public as the first volume of *KOUMINKAN BUNKO*, Public Hall Library; besides the author, who represented Buddhism, MATSUMURA Katsumi talked for Christianity, and KURIHARA Yuu for materialism.)

74. The Actualities and Religion

(with YANAGIDA Kenjuurou, chief director of the Association Commemorative of the War-Dead Japanese Students, held on February 2, 1951, made public in the *BUDDHIST MAGAZINE* Vol. 2 No. 4, April 1951, Nishi-Honganji Temple)

75. A Dialogue with Dr. Linus Pauling

(a dialogue held with the Nobel Prize winner in chemistry, 1954, whom the author visited in his study at Southern California Institute of Technology on September 13, 1957, recorded by FUJIYOSHI Jikai, and included in the *FUUSHIN* No. 33; when Dr. Pauling together with his wife came to Japan two years later and attended the Fifth

World Conference Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs, it was made public in the *CHUGAI NIPPOH* on August 13, 1959, with the author's verbal modifications.)

76. A Dialogue with Professor Ralph Turner

77. A Dialogue with Professor F.S.C. Northrop

(during his stay in the U.S.A. the author visited Prof. Turner on February 21, and Prof. Northrop on February 22, 1958, in their studies at Yale University; these are records taken by Mr. Fujiyoshi, who accompanied the author all through.)

78. A Dialogue with Gabriel Marcel

(during his visit to Europe the author visited Mr. Marcel at his house on the evening of April 17, 1958; this is the record taken by SHIBATA Masumi, who accompanied the author and interpreted for him; included in the *FAS* Nos. 45/46.)

79. A Dialogue with French Orientalists

(on the next day after visiting Mr. Marcel the author visited Professor Paul Demiéville of the University of Sorbonne, with Mr. Renondeau and Mr. Holzman in company; recorded by Mr. Shibata who interpreted, and included in the *FAS*, No. 44)

80. Talking about *Chan* in the U.S.A.

(with Dr. D.T. Suzuki in his room at Hotel Continental, where the author lodged during his stay in the U.S.A., in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the location of Harvard University, in early spring 1958; recorded by Mr. Fujiyoshi who accompanied the author, and included in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 14, February 1, 1959)

81. Talking about the [self-awaking, creative] FIELD (*ba; chang*)

(a record of a round-table talk planned by MORITA Shiryuu of the Bokubi-sha, attended by YUKAWA Hideki, professor of Kyoto University, HIRAYAMA Ryoutarou, director of the Nomura Securities Firm, IJIMA Tsutomu, professor of Kyoto University, YOSHIKAWA Itsuji, assistant professor of Tokyo University, and the author; included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 41, January 1, 1955)

82. Talking about TIME

(planned by the Bokubi-sha after the previous round-table talk on the field, with the same attendants excluding Mr. Hirayama, included in the *BOKUBI*, No. 82, January 1, 1959)

Postscript by the Editor

A. II-2. Additional Contents of the Enlarged Writings in Nine Volumes:

In Volumes 1, 4, 7 plus 9

(The author's enlarged collected writings, *ZOUHO HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU*, nine volumes with a separate volume, *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI NO SEKAI*, the World of H. S., published during the period between 1994 and 1996 by the Hozokan, Kyoto, whose first eight volumes are principally the same in their contents with the Risosha edition, though revised by members of an editorial committee different from the previous ones.)

Volume One: *ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS*:

The supplemented articles:

G. (D. 25) Time and Space, continued, drafts (Chapter 3, drafts 1 ~ 3)

Postscript for the Enlarged Version (by ISHII Seiji)

Volume Four: *THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE WAY OF TEA*:

The supplemented article:

shingo (*xinwu*: The Mind Awakened to Itself)

(a lecture given at the author's abode at Muromachi, Kyoto, on October 14, 1968; included in the *SHINCHA*, No. 29, July 1970; a lecture given on October 12, 1968, the first of two days' lectures, failed to be put into printing; pp. 437~ 469.

Cf. The Risosha version IV. 14.)

Volume Seven: *A COLLECTION OF VERSES*:

Supplemented works:

161 poems and 48 photographs of calligraphy, taken from the *BUDDHIST*, Nos. 12 ~ 14.

Volume Nine: *PROBLEMS POSED IN THE QIXIN LUN & DIALOGUES*

(a new volume, which includes the enlarged version of *PROBLEMS POSED IN THE QIXIN LUN*, two groups of dialogues, and four literary remains, with a brief chronology, edited by KAWASAKI Yukio, published in 1996, 596 pp.)

A. *KISHIN NO KADAI, Problems Posed in the Qixin [lun]*

(pp. 9 ~ 302; for its explanation, see above, I. (3), Note below the Contents.)

B. Dialogues 1: For the Postmodernist World: (pp. 305 ~ 443)

1. The Postmodernist Analects

(talks with MURAKAMI Jikai, MATSUKURA Shouei, and KIMURA Jouyuu, October 2, 1974, included in the *ZENBUNKA*, No. 75, 1974)

2. Concerning Humanity

(with MIZOUYE Yasuko, on January 12, 1976, *BUDDHIST*, No. 8, 1981)

3. Free Talks by a Postmodernist

(with WATANABE Ryouji, March 26, 1976; *BUDDHIST*, Nos. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 1982 ~ 83; the author's words were summarized by Tokiwa in English in the *FAS SOCIETY JOURNAL*, 1997, "Dr. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's Postmodernist Age," pp. 18 ~ 32.)

4. A Cornerstone for Creation -- Postmodernists' Art and Society

(with ISHII Seishi, October 31, 1976; *BUDDHIST*, Nos. 25 & 26, 1985; the first part on art omitted, the second part on society was introduced in summary by Tokiwa in the *FAS SOCIETY JOURNAL*, 1997, "Dr. Shin'ichi Hisamatsu's Postmodernist Age," pp. 33 ~ 39.)

5. Talking on *Chan* and Philosophy -- For Postmodernists' Sake --

(interviewed by an editor of the Iwanami shoten, *SEKAI*, No. 375, February 1977; tr. by Jeff Shore, the *FAS SOCIETY JOURNAL*, Winter 1986-87, pp. 1 ~ 10)

6. Thirty-Three Years A Moment of Time

-- "Killing the Buddha Killing the Patriarch" and Nishida Philosophy --

(with TAKEUCHI Yoshinori, October 24, 1977; *RISOU*, No. 536, January 1978)

7. Not Depending on *Buddha-Dharma-Sangha* is the True Religion

-- Discussion on the Source of Religion --

(with OHYI Saidan, SENGOKU Masahiko, IKENAGA Tooru, OCHI Michiyo, and YAMAZAKI Haruhisa, March 21, 1978; *BUDDHIST*, Nos. 5 & 6, 1980)

8. Listening to This Person

(with HOUZUMI Genshou, January 8, 1979; *ZENBUNKA*, No. 97, June 1980)

C. Dialogues 2: *KAKU NO SHUUKYOU*, The Religion of Awakening

(with YAGI Seiichi, pp. 447 ~ 571, from the enlarged version of a separate book, edited by Mr. Yagi, published by the Shunjusha, Tokyo, 1986, with the exception of the final two articles; the original version was published in January 15, 1980, twelve days before Dr. Hisamatsu's death)

(1) Preface (by Mr. Yagi)

(2) "The Source of Value and the Creation of Value"

(at the author's house in Gifu, on May 26, 1978)

(3) "*Chan* and Christianity -- the Formless Self and Killing the Buddha Killing the Patriarch"

(at the author's house, June 22, 1978)

(4) "From the Middle Ages to the Postmodern Age"

(at the author's house, November 24, 1978)

(5) "Awakening and Faith"

(at the author's house, December 14, 1978)

(6) "Awakening and Words"

(at the author's house, My 11, 1979)

D. Literary Remains:

1. The Ruining of Modern Times and the Conception of the Postmodernist World

(tr. by ABE Masao and Robert Grous in the *F.A.S. Newsletter*, Vol. I, No. 1, July 1976, as "Post-modernist Manifesto, The Renovation of the World")

2. A New Task of Religion

(words in the initial number of the *BUDDHIST*, 1979; tr. by Jeff Shore, *FAS Society Journal*, 1986-87)

3. A Basic Bibliography of *Chan* Chinese, Korean, and Japanese

(introduced by the author for the participants in the FAS Comprehensive Study Meetings, 1961 ~ 69, who were not versed in *Chan* studies, included in the *BUDDHIST*, No. 36, July 1990)

4. Opening Up the Future

(a foreword to the Commentary on the *LINJI-LU*, Records of Master Linji, by Seo-ong, a Korean *Chan* master and former student of the author at Hanazono University, published by the Aoyama-shoin, Tokyo 1977)

E. A Brief Chronology of Hisamatsu Shin'ichi

(the one cited in the *BOKUKAI*, the Sea of Sumi-Ink -- *CALLYGRAPHY OF HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI*, Bokubi-sha, Kyoto 1982, revised by KURASAWA Yukihiro; see Tokiwa's translation of the author's **Brief Chronological Record Compiled by Kurasawa Yukihiro**, slightly corrected by conferring with the *Nenpu* by Kitahara Haruyo, *BUKKYOU KOUGI* Volume Four.)

A. II-3. Contents of the Four-Volume Lectures on Buddhism

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI BUKKYOU KOUGI

Lectures on Buddhism

(a supplementary collection of the author's writings, made up of lectures given at universities in Kyoto on Buddhism and religion, reproduced from students' notebooks, edited by members of the F.A.S. Society in four volumes, whose titles had been prepared as representing them, chosen by the author from among the titles of lectures divided in groups, published between January 1990 and January 1991 by the Hozokan, Kyoto)

Volume One: ***SOKUMUTEKI JITSUZON***

THE EXISTENCE THAT IS NOTHING

(divided into seven groups of lectures, the first four being edited by KAWASAKI Yukio and the remaining three by ISHII Seishi, published in January 20, 1990, 563 pp.)

1. The Existence that is Nothing

(special lectures for the course of Buddhist Studies, the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto Imperial University, in 1935, from the manuscript written clear by the then-student FUJIYOSHI Jikai)

2. A Historical Study of Nothingness

(special lectures at the Department of Literature, Ryuukoku University, Kyoto, in 1932-33, from the manuscript written clear by KUBO Sousei, the then-student; included in the *BUDDHIST*, No. 17 ~ 33)

3 Religious Irrationality

(special lectures at the Department of Literature, Ryuukoku University in 1934, from the manuscript prepared by HOSHINO Genpou, then in the research course, and included in the *BUDDHIST*, No. 15)

4. An Introduction to the Studies of Religion

(lectures at the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto Imperial University, in 1937-38, from the then auditor ABE Masao's notebook, cleanly copied by OKAMURA Keishin; lectures of almost the same contents given at the Rinzaigakuin College, later Hanazono

University, in 1930, recorded by IKUISHI Jundou, were not included here.)

5. *Chan* and Mysticism

(lectures given at the Rinzaigakuin College, from the then-student KOUNO Shigemi's notebook, cleanly copied by YONEDA Toshihide and SHINOHARA Mikiko, reconstructed by Ishii, the editor)

6. The Buddhistic Philosophy of Religion

(lectures at the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, in 1948, from the manuscript prepared by HYODOU Masanosuke from the notebooks, his own, and TANABE Shouei's and HONDA Gion's)

7. The Philosophy of Religion

(lectures at Hanazono University in the former half of 1962 school year, from the manuscript prepared by the then-student SANAE Kenshou from two notebooks including his own)

Volume Two: **BUKKYOUTEKI SEKAI**
THE BUDDHISTIC WORLD

(including six lectures, published in April 1990, of which five were at the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, between 1942 and 1948, and the sixth on Buddhist Philosophy was at Kyoto Municipal University of Fine Arts; the first two edited by Okamura, next three by Hyoudou, and the final Buddhist Philosophy by Ishii. 500 pp.)

1. The Absolute Practice

(twenty-four lectures given between October 14, 1942 and June 30, 1943; from the manuscript prepared by UEDA Taiji from the notebooks possessed by three persons, Abe, Ueda, and NAKAMAE Shirou)

2. The Root Wisdom

(special lectures for the course of Buddhist Studies, between April and September, 1944, from the manuscript prepared by Nakamae from the notebooks, his own and Abe's, rearranged by Okamura)

3. An Introduction to the Studies of Buddhism

(lectures between October 1945 and March 1946, from the manuscript prepared by KONGOU Yoshihisa from the notebooks, his own and TANIGUCHI Shoudou's)

4. The System of Buddhism

(sixteen lectures between May 30, 1946 and February 13, 1947, prepared by Tokiwa from the notebooks, his own, HONDA Gion's, Kondou's, TANABE Shouei's, and Hyoudou's)

5. The Buddhistic World

(twenty-two lectures between April 24, 1947 and February 12, 1948, prepared by Honda, from the notebooks, his own, Tanabe's, Kondou's, and Hyoudou's)

6. The Buddhist Philosophy

(lectures at Kyoto Municipal University of Fine Arts in 1962, from the manuscript prepared by INABA Minoru from YANAGIDA Shizuye's notebook, included in the *BUDDHIST*, Nos. 30 ~ 34)

Volume Three: ***GENSOU NO RONRI***
THE LOGIC OF THE RETURN ASPECT

(including two public lectures and four university lectures, edited by SHIRAI Shigemichi, with the help of YAMAZAKI Haruhisa who checked all the quotations from Buddhist scriptures by comparing them with the source texts at Osaka Prefectural Library, divided into two parts, published in May 20, 1990. 478 pp.)

A. The Truly Mahayana World:

1. *BONNOU, klesha*, Self-Afflicting Passions

(three lectures, May 10, 17, and 24, 1947, sponsored by the Association to Spread Science in Kyoto University; the manuscript prepared by TANAKA Takao from the notebooks TANABE Shouei's and HONDA Gion's for the first and second lectures, and from YANAGIDA [formerly, YOKOI] Seizan's notebooks for the three lectures)

2. *SHOUSAN NO SHUUKYOU*, the Religion of Creation

(sixteen special lectures for the course of Buddhist Studies between May 1946 and February 1947; the manuscript prepared by Tokiwa from the notebooks possessed by Tanabe, Honda, Kongou, Hyoudou, and Tokiwa)

3. *ZETTAI GENJITSU*, the Absolute Reality

(nineteen special lectures for the course of Buddhist Studies, between May 1947 and February 1948; the manuscript prepared by Tanabe from his own notebook, revised by Tokiwa according to Yanagida's notebook)

B. The True Significance of the Pureland True School:

4. *BUKKYOUTEKI JITSUZON*, the Buddhistic Existence

(a lecture given at the Library Hall, Ryukoku University, under the sponsorship of the Ryuukoku Shinshuu Academy, November 20, 1947; the manuscript prepared by Tanabe from his own notebook, which was revised by Tokiwa according to Yanagida's notebook)

5. *GENSOU NO RONRI*, The Logic of the Return Aspect

(nineteen special lectures for the course of Buddhist Studies, Kyoto University, between April 1948 and February 1949; a manuscript prepared by KITAYAMA Masamichi from the notebooks of Tanabe, Honda, Hyoudou, and Abe for the lectures 1 ~ 5, 7, 8, and the first one third of Lecture 10, all revised by Tokiwa according to Yanagida's notebooks; another manuscript prepared by Tokiwa from Yanagida's almost complete, two notebooks, for Lecture 6, the two thirds of Lecture 10, and all the rest except for Lecture 15, for which Tokiwa relied on KONDOU Tesshou's notebooks kept by Yanagida; Lecture 19, which lacked the closing remark, was completed with four lines supplied by Tokiwa in [], which was adopted by the editor.)

6. The Philosophy of Buddhism

(seventeen lectures, the "Philosophy of Buddhism II," for the course of Buddhist Studies, Hanazono University, between April 1961 and February 1962; the manuscript was prepared by Mr. SANAE Kenshou from his own notebooks, revised through comparison with Mr. NISHIO Kenryuu's notebook; to the great regret of the editor

Shirai, he was obliged to omit the record of the first lecture on April 26 as it was too incomplete without any apparent connection with the following lectures.)

Volume Four: *JJI MUGE, shishi wuai*
IN EVERYTHING WITHOUT HINDRANCE

(including six groups of lectures with the author's own memoranda for the second group and a detailed chronology first prepared for this supplementary collection, edited by OKAMURA Keishin and TOKIWA Gishin, published on January 30, 1991. 498 pp.)

A. Lectures:

1. *HOKKAI-ENGI RON*, On the Dependent Co-origination of the *Dharma* World
(eleven lectures between April 30 and July 2, 1942, special research for the Studies of Religion, Kyoto Imperial University; the manuscript prepared by UEDA Taiji from his own notebook, revised by the editor through comparison with the notebook of another attendant, TANAKA Junshou)
2. *SHOUBOUGEN-ZOU*, Seminar
(Dougen's *Shoubougen-zou* taken up for a seminar at Kyoto Imperial University, in the autumn of 1942, the manuscript prepared by ABE Masao from his own seminar-notebook, accompanied with the author's memoranda for the lectures recorded and written up clearly by Abe)
3. *KEGON KONJISHI SHOU*, *Huayan Jinshizi Zhang*, "A Chapter of A Golden Lion"
An Exposition of the *Avatamsaka Sutra*
(eleven lectures on the text by Fazang, 643–712, a Buddhist scholar versed in the *Huayan-jing*, *Avatamsaka sutra*, in the Tang China, at Kyoto University on November 11, 1945, and ten times between March 11 and April 9, 1946; a manuscript prepared by Tokiwa from TANIGUCHI Shoudou's notebook)
4. *ZENGAKE SOKUKON NO KADAI*, The Task Immediate Now of *Chan* Studies
(thirteen special lectures at Rinzaigakuin College between October 6, 1945 and March 1946, a manuscript prepared by YANAGIDA (then, YOKOI) Seizan, made public in the *ZENBUNKA KENKYUUSHO KIYOU*, Bulletin of the Institute for Zen Studies, Kyoto, issued in March 1969)
5. *LECTURES ON THE SIXTH PATRIARCH'S PLATFORM SUTRA*
(ten lectures between July 1962 and March 1963, with the Ming text, a manuscript prepared by KAWASAKI Yukio from the tapes recorded at the meetings of the F.A.S. Society's Comprehensive Research on "The Essence of *Chan* and the Truth of Humans")

B. *NENPU*, Chronology

(the part between 1889, when the author was born, and 1970, when he was 81 years old, was made by KITAHARA Haruyo at the request of the editorial committee of the Risosha version of the author's collected writings, and revised by the author himself, according to Kitahara, and in 1988 the remaining part from 1971 till 1988 was added by Kitahara for this final of the Four-Volume Lectures on Buddhism, pp. 460 ~ 498)

B. Ten Works by the Author in Translation

1. *CHAN (ZEN) AND CHAN CULTURE* * 1~5

HISAMATSU Shin'ichi

I

Dear Professor Horton, dean of the Divinity School, and all of you, dear audience, I have seldom travelled in Japan, a country narrow in all directions, but this time, unexpectedly, in response to your cordial invitation I have come here from far across the Pacific Ocean, to stand on the platform of Harvard, this world-renowned university, and together with all of you who are willing to seek, without prejudice, for truth, I have been favoured with a chance to inquire into what we humans ought to be. It is really with my utmost joy in the *Dharma* (awakened truth) that I offer this talk.

In the introduction to the 1955–56 edition of the Faculty Guide here at the Divinity School, Dr. Horton refers to a saying transmitted in India that a truly holy place on the earth is where two rivers join. He writes to the effect that just as a sacred city of India, Allahâbâd, is where the rivers Ganges (Gangâ) and Jumnâ (Yamunâ) join, so does this divinity school stand on the confluence of many streams. I heartily expect the Harvard Divinity School to be a world-historic Allahâbâd where the two great rivers of the world, the West and the East, join.

On my part, together with you I would like to make sure in which direction one of the streams, originating in the East and fortunately reaching this confluence, will go on running, and what kind of new ripples it will cause.

You may wonder what kind of stream has joined here from the East. It is far from something strange like the person standing before you in a Japanese men's *kimono*; rather, it is you yourselves, naked, free of all clothes, that I call *Chan* (J. *Zen*).

By *Chan* I mean nothing else but your original true self. My saying this will only make you feel more skeptical, so let me talk, not historically, but in terms of the true way of *Chan* itself, avoiding its technical jargon and using everyday words as much as I can. To speak the truth, however, what is prior to verbal expressions is the clearest of all; the more I talk, the further you get from understanding. Nevertheless, as expressed by such sayings as "in the past humans ate fruit from the tree of knowledge," or they are "thinking reeds," we are animals that can be satisfied by nothing short of reason. Now I am finding myself in front of intellectuals who listen well, and I am nervous.

As for *Chan*, it has been expounded many times by my respected and beloved Dr. [Daisetsu Teitarou] Suzuki with his exhaustive knowledge and ability to use skilfully the language of this country, so there is no need for me to say anything superfluous. But the same water, when drawn up by red flowers appears red and when drawn up by yellow flowers appears yellow, so seeing the same water in different colours might be of some

help as you try to know the water.

Now, the question, "What is *Chan*?" requires careful procedures for answering and to grasp its content, but I think I can answer it briefly by saying it is the self-awakening of formless self. Ordinarily by saying "formless" one is likely to mean spatially formless. But that is not what I mean. Certainly it is formless spatially, too, but its formlessness is not limited to ordinary cases like when voices are said to be spatially formless because geometrically they go beyond measure. Further, usually our mind is considered formless. In a sense that differs from spatially being formless or being formless like voices, we can say the mind is formless. But when in *Chan* one speaks about formlessness, that means being formless both physically and mentally. Spirit, no doubt, like voices, is spatially formless. But spirit does have form. Even if spirit has no spatial form, it has spiritual form.

As for truth, beauty, or good, none of them can be said to have spatial form, but they have spiritual form, namely, as ideas. Those ideas are something distinguished and defined. Not only is truth distinguished from falsehood, good from evil, and beauty from ugliness, but also is truth distinguished from good, good from beauty, and beauty from truth. Insofar as they are distinguished, they must be said to have form. Therefore, one must say that spirit has spiritual form, or form as an idea. But, could there be any kind of spirit that goes beyond discrimination?

At first thought, there appears to be no such spirit, but you cannot deny the possibility. Let me say it is what we usually call self-awareness. Being the same as what we call self, self-awareness goes beyond any definition.

Sure enough, there are cases in which self-awareness is treated as the object of study, like in psychology, phenomenology, or philosophy in general. Regardless of the field of scientific study, insofar as self-awareness is treated objectively, it is being distinguished and defined. Unless distinguished, nothing will become object, so we cannot help saying it has to be distinguished [in order to be an object of study]. Insofar as it is distinguished, it comes to have form. But that does not allow us to say that self-awareness is anything objective, definable, or capable of being distinguished. Self-awareness is such that it cannot be made into anything objective, or what can be defined or distinguished.

The reason is that self-awareness is something that goes beyond objectification or distinction, since self-awareness is always on the subject's side. Even if in phenomenology or psychology self-awareness is treated objectively, when it is objectified, self-awareness as object is no longer self-awareness; rather, what has something as an object is self-awareness.

In other words, nothing can be called self-awareness unless it is that which can in no time become object but always remains subject. And in fact with us there is such self-awareness. Although not everyone might clearly recognize it, self-awareness is always like that. If you have self-awareness as object, the objectified self-awareness is no longer true self-awareness. What has gotten the objectified as object is self-awareness. There-

fore, however hard you may try to objectify it, you never can. As soon as you try to objectify it, it comes back; or, rather than coming back, it is always this side -- that is self-awareness.

Thus, speaking from the aspect of spirit, ordinary spirit has form, but self-awareness has no form. One can say that in every respect self-awareness is always beyond form, beyond definition. Likewise, true spirit is never the various forms of discriminated spirit; rather, the self that goes beyond discrimination, beyond objectification, can be called pure spirit. Our being spiritual means our being such a self. Accordingly, I think that the kind of spirit that can ideally be also called formless is self-awareness. Self-awareness is of such a nature.

Nevertheless, even self-awareness as pure spirit cannot yet be called formless, for even such self-awareness has a certain limit. Although apparently having no limit, such self-awareness has the nature of opposing another self-awareness. One formless self-awareness opposes another formless self-awareness. That is to say, such self-awareness has the distinction of self and other. Now I am speaking not about any objectified self-awareness, but about self-awareness itself, and the very self-awareness has the distinction of self and other.

With an ordinary self-awareness, which apparently is formless, a distinction exists from another self-awareness that is formless. Evidence of this lies in the fact that such a self without fail maintains a distinction between one's own self and others' selves. Against one's self there is another self.

Therefore, with such self-awareness there always is the distinction of I and you; the forms of I, you, he or she. And such self-awareness is extremely plural. In terms of plurality, nothing will be more plural than this. The reason is that with such self-awareness there is no identical self-awareness. In no ages, at no places, is there anyone the same as I, except for me. A statement, "I am I out and out," well expresses the independent nature or individuality of self-awareness. Everyone is each a self. Among tens of thousands or tens of millions of persons there is no other same person.

When I say there is not a single person who is the same as I, the proof of that statement is in nothing but self-awareness. As far as this is concerned, self-awareness is what is distinguished from all other self-awareness'es. In that sense, one could say it is the distinction at the very root of all distinctions. This sounds very interesting to me. Although free from distinction, self-awareness, by being the self, is distinguished from all the other self-awareness'es.

In this respect, even self-awakening turns out to have distinctions. Where there is any distinction, there is some form; and that also means objectification. But objectification or discrimination in this case is something quite different from some objective ideas having distinction.

Formlessness in *Chan* does not even mean that ordinary self-awareness has no

form. As has repeatedly been stressed, even ordinary self-awareness has form, but *Chan* self-awareness is thoroughly formless: formless physically, spiritually, or even as self-awareness. That is what is meant by being formless in *Chan*, where from the beginning it has been expressed as "*wu-xiang*," in Japanese, "*musô*." A *Chan* master Linji (Yixuan, ?–866) says,

"The awakened mind [*xinfa*; *shinbô*; mind-*dharma*], without form, penetrates ten directions."

Another *Chan* master, Huangbo (Xiyun, dates unknown, teacher of Linji), says,

"Even the Buddha's thirty-two features belong to form; whatever has form is all delusive."

The term "formless" is used in many senses; in contrast to what is physical, what is mental is said to be formless. Should "formless" mean no more than that, it won't deserve any special attention. But the *Chan* term "formless" stands for what is far more thoroughly formless than the formlessness of ordinary self-awareness. That kind of formlessness is well expressed in the Caodong school of *Chan* as "*shenxin-tuoluo*" (J. *shinshin-datsuraku*), body and mind fallen off. It means that with both body and mind fallen off we are no longer physical or mental because we are free from their limitations. Hence the expression, "By *Chan* is meant body-and-mind fallen off." This refers to the formless self that is formless physically and mentally.

We humans usually are physical and mental beings, with the ordinary self, as the subject of the mental and physical forms, constituting formless self-awareness. And having such self-awareness fallen off means having body-and-mind fallen off. In that sense one could say that the *Chan* formless self is what has the ordinary self fallen off. As has been mentioned above, since even the ordinary self has form and is discriminative, it has to fall off.

Just speaking about fallen off or formless might suggest a merely ideal negation or a mere thought about formlessness, but what is thought about and what *Chan* calls the formless self-awareness are quite different. What I refer to as formless is neither a concept nor an idea of having no form but the formless self. By "body-and-mind fallen off" I mean neither a material thing nor an idea of "body-and-mind fallen off" but the self that has no form of either body or mind. This self differs from the kind of self distinguished from other selves; rather it is the self freed even from that kind of self. Accordingly, this self is the self beyond one's self and other selves. The formless self that is free from the distinction between self and others is called *Chan*.

In Buddhism a buddha is interpreted in various senses, but in *Chan* by buddha is meant the self that is formless, and getting awakened to this self is called attaining Awakening ("*wu*; J. *satori*"). By buddha is meant the formless self, which is not anything apart from us that has form spatial, temporal, physical, or mental form, nor is it transcendentally or immanently objectively seen, known, believed in, or intuited. Rather it is what we

ourselves get awakened to. That is why in the *Chan* school there is an expression, "Don't seek for a buddha outwards; the more you seek, the further you are away." There is another remark, "A buddha apart from the formless self is no true buddha." In that *Chan* considers buddha to be the self-awakening of such formless self, I see various, important, new tasks included on religion, philosophy, psychology, phenomenology, art, and so forth.

II

In my first public lecture, to the question, "What is *Chan*?" I answered, "By *Chan* I mean the self-awakening of the formless self." And by comparing the *Chan* formless self to other senses of what is formless, I highlighted that this is the self that is without form either physically or mentally. My explanations of that point on *Chan* should have been more detailed, with quotations from numerous classics, but time limitations forced me to quote from only a few sources, like Linji's words,

"The mind-*dharma*, formless, penetrates the ten directions."

or the statement by Rujing (Zhangweng R., 1163-1228) of the Caodan school,

"By joining *Chan* ("*canchan*," J. *sanzen*) I mean body-and-mind fallen off."

Words to be quoted are too numerous to be exhausted, but now let me cite some.

The sixth patriarch Huineng (638-713) says, *6-1

"The mind in extension (Skt. *cittamatra*; Ch. *xinliang*; J. *shinryou*) is as vast as the empty sky, without demarcation, neither square nor round, not big or small, neither blue, yellow, red, nor white, neither up, down, long, nor short, without anger or delight, neither right nor wrong, not good or bad, without head or tail."

The mind quoted above is not what is in contrast to body, but mind without the forms of body and mind. That this mind is self is evident from what the Sixth Patriarch says:

"In my mind itself is buddha. The very self-buddha is true buddha. If in self is no buddha-mind, I wonder where to seek for true buddha. Your self-mind is the very buddha."

The Sixth Patriarch calls this mind our "original face" (Ch. *benlai mianmu*; J. *honrai no men-moku*), which means true self.

Takuan (T. Souhou, 1573-1645), a well-known Japanese *Chan* master, expressed this true self very clearly:

"I as true self am the I that am before the division between heaven and earth, not yet born from parents, without shadow or shape or birth or death. "

By "not yet born" or "before the division between heaven and earth" certainly he did not mean anything in the temporal, generative sense. He meant that with the true self there is no shape generated from heaven and earth, no form born from parents, no shape-form, no birth-death. True self, really as Takuan said, has no form. Besides, because apart from the true self there is no true buddha, a buddha that has form is no true buddha.

Among Buddhists there seem to be idol-worshippers who believe in buddhas with

forms, whom *Chan* master Zhaozhou (Zh. Congshen, 778–897) criticized thoroughly:

"No golden buddha crosses a hearth, no wooden buddha crosses a fireplace,
no muddy buddha crosses waters. "

No objectified buddha, no buddha that is not I, is the true buddha. Neither a representational buddha nor an ideal buddha is true buddha. That is why the Sixth Patriarch said,
"Your self buddha is true buddha."

From long ago it has very often been the case that not only scholars of Buddhism but even Buddhists would search for a buddha in historical time or space or in scriptural expressions, but what they seek is no more than a conceptual buddha, far from the true buddha. For that reason, in *Chan*, in the sense of not searching for buddha in scriptural texts or treatises, people speak of the maxim:

"Make no verbal demonstration;

Transmission is apart from scriptural teachings."

They mean that true buddha is not in letters or scriptures but is self. Since buddha is the formless self, it naturally should not be sought externally. That is why Nanquan (N. Puyuan, 748–835), when his disciple Zhaozhou asked about which direction he could turn so as to attain to the Way, gave an immediate response:

"As soon as you attempt to turn towards it, you go against it."

When you seek for it externally, you go further and further away from it. Linji quotes a story of Yajñadatta, a youth of India, who has lost his head, as a simile to warn against seeking for buddha externally. A handsome young man Yajñadatta, who used to look into a mirror with a smile, one morning, to his surprise, failed to see his face in the mirror. Suspecting that he had lost his face somewhere, he was so upset that he went around in search of it; finally he became aware that the face he was looking for, instead of being anywhere else, was the very searcher himself. Originally never having been lost, the face, as it is searched for, goes against the seeker. From the *Chan* point of view, not just seeking is wrong; if there should be any buddha to be sought after, that will be no buddha any longer. Buddha cannot even be an object of experience. If a buddha is experienced, that will be no true buddha.

Yongjia (Y. Xuanjia, 675–713) said,

"Knowing clearly, I see nothing, neither man nor buddha."

Linji proclaimed relentlessly:

"Within or without, should you have anyone to encounter, you kill that one;
should you encounter a buddha, you kill the buddha;
should you encounter a patriarch, you kill the patriarch."

My dear audience, I am presenting to you a really risky limit to achieving a live, authentic understanding of the *Chan* viewpoint. Please watch your step. This is a dangerous bridge to cross to the formless, true self.

Nanquan said,

"The great Way is without any trace; the truth is free from antitheses, so this does not belong to seeing, hearing, remembering, or knowing."

He also said,

"This is neither mind nor thing."

By great Way and truth he meant nothing but the true buddha. Yonming (Y. Yanshou, 904–976) said:^{*6–2}

"You cannot know the Way either with the thought of being (*youxin*; *ushin*) or with the thought of non-being (*wuxin*; *mushin*)."

As is known through these quotations, *Chan* does not represent a school of Buddhism which believes in a buddha or even that which experiences a buddha.

The above talks of mine might suggest that becoming this formless self is everything, but things are not so simple. The formless self should not become a form of that name, though ordinarily that is often the case. The formless self must be the formless self through and through. No wonder, a celebrated *Chan* layman in China, Pang Yun (740?–808), on his deathbed warned people, saying:

"I wish you may empty yourselves of whatever you have; please take care not to regard anything you don't have as real."

If formless self were to take a form as something like a formless self, no longer would it be the true formless self.

I think I have clarified what the formless self asserted by me is like and how my calling it *Chan* is not necessarily my dogmatic assertion. Then our next problems will be such pragmatic ones as, What kind of meaning does such a formless self have for people? How does it help us? Although Linji said, "The Buddha-*dharma* has no use for achieving merits," let me talk provisionally from the viewpoint of achieving merits.

I think it a very significant matter for humans that in the Orient, especially among *Chan* people, the human self has so deeply been reflected upon and investigated that what is called the formless self has been awakened to. Some people may attempt to find analogues to the formless self in the mysticism of the West or the East. But *Chan* has nothing to do with many cases of mysticism, in which, facing God or Buddha with the characteristic of otherness, or Universe or Nature -- even if characterized as personal -- one gives up or negates oneself and experiences union in an ecstasy with the other.

In the Occident, what Meister Eckhart, on the highest peak of mysticism, refers to as "*Nichts*" (Ch. *wu*; J. *mu*)" seems to me the nearest to *Chan*'s formless self. But if it is in the sense in which Rudolf Otto (1869–1937) interprets it in his celebrated book, *West-Östliche Mystik (Mysticism East and West)*, a clear line of demarcation should be made against Eckhart as well.

With *Chan* it is not that humans negate themselves, become absolutely nothing, either to depend on or to experience union with God or Buddha as something absolutely other. With *Chan* humans get awakened to their formless self, and by being formless,

naturally get emancipated from all bonds. Linji characterized this as "solitarily emancipated," and "non-dependent," to the extent that

"entering the realm of shape-colour, they suffer no delusion of shape-colour;
entering the realm of voice, they suffer no delusion of voice;
entering the realm of odour, they suffer no delusion of odour;
entering the realm of taste, they suffer no delusion of taste;
entering the realm of touch, they suffer no delusion of touch;
entering the realm of objects (*dharma-dhātu*), they suffer no delusion of objects."

That is the unique usefulness of *Chan*, unseen in other religions and mysticisms.

That being the case, if *Chan* is taken to be a religion, it will be different from many other religions in which through the power of God or what is holy as something standing absolutely beyond self in either a transcendent or immanent manner, the self is redeemed from sin or death. *Chan* is the kind of self-emancipating religion in which the self gets awakened to one's original, formless self, and thereby naturally gets free from all forms, and at the same time gets emancipated and liberated from all. That is why in a book entitled "*Ten Pictures of A Bull*," which expresses the process of *Chan* awakening through the symbol of a bull, that point is described as:

"Delusions of ordinary beings fallen off,
The trace of nobleness is also all emptied."

Zhaozhou had this remark:

"Where there is a buddha, don't stay;
Where there is no buddha, leave in a hurry."

Thus, *Chan* is a religion in which the self, by getting awakened to one's original, formless self, gets emancipated from everything. In other words, it is a religion of self-awakening, through getting awakened to the formless self, to be emancipated from the self that is bound by everything and lacking in freedom.

Our ordinary self necessarily has some form; by having some form it defines itself; by defining the self it has bound itself, and thus has its flexibility lost. To cite familiar examples, in health we define our selves to be in health and have the form of health; in disease we define our selves to be in disease and have the form of disease; in life, the form of life; in death, the form of death; a rich person has the form of a rich person, a poor person has the form of a poor person, a person of a high rank has the form of a high rank, a person of a low rank has the form of a low rank; a scholar has the form of a scholar, a professional religionist has the form of a professional religionist, and in this way we get our selves caught. Additionally, in joy we have the form of joy; in sorrow, the form of sorrow; in anger, the form of anger; in love, the form of love; in hate, the form of hate; in good, the form of good; in evil, the form of evil. And by having some form we define our selves, thus bind our selves by the use of our own code, and lose our independence.

Chan considers the very having of some form to be the cause of bondage. And not

just an undesirable form, but even a desirable one. A severe remark like, "you kill even a buddha; you kill even a patriarch," prevails because when even such a noble personage as a buddha or a patriarch becomes a form, that causes bondage. There is a *Chan* saying, "Even a gold dust causes a nebula in the eye." Gold is precious, but in the eye even a mote of it causes a hindrance. Not only that, even the formless self, if it becomes such a form, will bind the formless self. Accordingly, by *Chan* I mean that by getting awakened to the totally formless self one gets emancipated from every kind of bondage at once and becomes the kind of self that is not caught by anything.

Chan does not get one emancipated from particular cases of prejudice one after another ad infinitum. Rather by getting awakened to the totally unprejudiced self, one gets emancipated from them all at once. Humans resemble silkworms in that the more cocoons they spin with fine threads of civilization, the harder bound they find themselves in the complex cocoons, finally to turn into lifeless pupae like mummies. We should rather be like spiders, spinning threads of culture infinitely, always free from what has been spun, without losing independence. Spiders generate fine threads, weave complex but systematic nets in the sky, keeping themselves absolutely free from the nets, never bound by them. Abiding in the centre of the nets, they play the host, controlling the whole nets, and make free use of them. When they find the nets useless, they collect them without being caught by them, using them as material for new nets.

As you know through this simple example, *Chan* has us, by getting awakened to our formless self, and like spiders avoiding getting caught by any form, hold our self "solitarily emancipated" and "non-dependent," as Linji said, and thereby live in history while infinitely forming history, not getting caught in the history formed by us or even by the act of forming, and in the way we always live supra-historically in history. *Chan* is not anything that has us, because of emancipation from everything, assume a world different from the world of form or escape into such a world; rather, because it is without form, our self can take any form flexibly, without hindrance. Because of formlessness our self always can be free from being caught by any established form, and can freely take new form. Linji made a remark,

"[This self] has no form, no feature, no root, no base, no abiding place, and with liveliness and vivacity responds in various ways."

Here, interesting enough, we see that the *Chan* view of the relationship between form and matter is opposite to that of Plato in ancient Greece. With Plato and in the later Western philosophy of Idealism based on his thought, matter is what lacks independence, itself having no form, passively following form. With *Chan*, what corresponds to matter is, unlike what is passive to form in Plato's case, active to and independent of form, autonomously freely and flexibly taking form. With Plato, what has form is made much of, while what has no form is played down. With *Chan*, to the contrary, what has no form is made much of, while what has form is made little of. With Plato what is called "nothing" lacks in-

dependence; it is passive, against form and value, whereas with *Chan*, "Nothing" rather constitutes the independent, fundamental subjectivity of all forms, being absolutely active.

Fazang (643–712), the third patriarch of the Huayan (Kegon) school in Chinese Buddhism, in his "A Chapter on a Golden Lion," an exposition of the *Huayan-jing*; *Bud-dhâvatamsaka-sûtra*, took up relations between gold as matter and a lion as the form made of gold. Those relations are opposite to those of Plato's, and the same as those of *Chan*. I think here we can see a great difference concerning the way of thinking between the West represented by Plato and the East represented by Buddhism. It constitutes an important moment of difference in religion, philosophy, and art between the West and the East, and it seems to be a key to the relations between the East and the West. Having no time to spare for detailed discussion now, I just suggest that point.

At the beginning of my first lecture, by *Chan* I meant you yourselves naked, free of all clothes. However fine your clothes may be, you could not freely wear other clothes while putting on your own clothes. Only when you are free of all clothes can you freely wear any clothes. For one who freely wears all clothes, being completely naked is the most important condition. Talking only about unclothing oneself might suggest my clinging to unclothing and disengaging oneself from wearing clothing. But only when you are completely disrobed can you be free from particular attire, free to wear any clothes.

Let me take up another simile. I would like you to recall the question that came up in the question-answer period last time about whether the eye has form or not. Before hearing anything from me you must have already noticed that the eye has no form. The eye that has form is what has been observed, and this does not function as the eye. The seeing eye, which fulfils its own function, has no form or colour, nor any consciousness of seeing. Should the eye have any form or colour, it could not freely see all the forms or colours without hindrance.

Not only that, if any of the forms or colours seen by the eye should remain with it, the eye, hindered by them, could not freely and accurately see forms or colours that come next. For the eye freely to fulfil its own function without hindrance, it must always be emancipated from all forms and colours. By a healthy, living eye is meant the eye that has no form or colour. And, the true eye originally ought to be without form, and without anything inside.

I have just tried comparing the eye to our formless self. But not just as a figure of speech. In our formless eye we can see the flashing of the formless self in the eye. Linji made such comments as,

"The awakened mind, without form, penetrates ten directions; in the eye it is called seeing, in the ear it is called hearing.

On the mass of red flesh is true person of no rank, always coming in and going out of your face and gates; you who have had no occasion for

confirmation, look, look!"

Shouting thus, Linji thrusts the formless self before his audience. By true person of no rank, needless to say, he means the true human that rests on no rank, that clings to nothing. Linji is saying: "Don't you see this true self vivaciously working in every function of yours?" This could not be just a matter of the ninth century.

In a sense sufficiently, and in another sense insufficiently, I have expounded *Chan* that goes beyond exposition. Conclusively speaking, by *Chan* I mean the original way of life in which one gets awakened to the formless self, whereby one cuts off all bonds in one cutting, whereby one lives through without hindrance, flexibly and powerfully, and supra-historically forms history. In the words by the Sixth Patriarch,

"The self-nature, originally free from wavering, is able to give birth to millions of forms."

And from the Buddhist scripture, *Exposition by Vimalakîrti*:

"Everything that has its own characteristics rests on a baseless root."^{*6-3}

"You may dwell in a manner that retains your attainment while appearing in the marks of an ordinary being."

-- These express the ways of the *Chan* life.

Chan is nothing like uncritically and easily negating or affirming reality; or, out of despair over reality, falling in absolute nihilism; or living a life in which, without overcoming nihilism, one feels empowered by confronting nihil; or through the feeling of helplessness of the actual self attempting to flee into what transcends actualities; or abandoning the autonomous nature of humanity and taking shelter in God or Buddha as the absolute other. *Chan* is what thoroughly criticizes the actual self, breaks through the destiny at its basis by getting awakened to the formless self that is original to humans, and converts actualities positively and affirmatively into expressions of the formless self. On how such *Chan* differs from your own lives, or from the views on history prevailing in the world today, or from psychology, nihilism, theology of crisis, or existentialism, or what difference in significance there is between them, I cannot help today but wait for your judgment.

III

In the Orient, especially throughout China, Korea, and Japan for about ten centuries there has been a cluster of cultures that are unique and consistent in character, and unseen in Europe or America. Budding in China at the beginning of the sixth century (Liang period), extending their roots little by little towards the end of the seventh century (early Tang), gradually thriving until around the beginning of the fifteenth century (beginning of the Ming period), during the periods corresponding to the whole Middle Ages of the Occident, it was created, and attained its height.

Meanwhile, it was transplanted to Korea and Japan. To the latter it was vigorously transplanted from China for the first time in the thirteenth century (Kamakura period), flourished throughout the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, after which it

has ended to wither. Nevertheless, not only have its numerous precious cultural properties of the past been preserved, but even its roots remain alive today.

To my regret, in Europe and the United States, except for a very limited number of people, this is little known to the public. It has rarely been taken up even as a special subject of academic research. However, for us Orientals, who live in this tradition, especially for the people of Japan who preserve many of their cultural properties, to introduce *Chan* to the world, and to contribute not only to the cultural, academic world but to the creation of cultures in the future is a proper task and duty. Today, my having been favoured with a good chance to do this duty to some degree is my heartfelt joy.

You may wonder what kind of thing I mean by the systematic, large cultural group. I mean they cover a very wide area, such as religion, philosophy, ethics, manners, accomplishments, literature, pictorial arts and calligraphy, architecture, gardening, handicrafts, and so on, through which some common characteristics run. Their common characteristics, according to my deduction from those cultures, are seven: 1. not even or uniform; asymmetrical (*bu-junqi; fukinsei*), 2. plain and simple (*jiansu; kanso*), 3. austere and wizened (*kugao; kokô*), 4. natural (*ziran; shizen*), 5. deep and secluded (*youxuan; yûgen*), 6. free from being conventional (*tuosu; datsuzoku*), and 7. tranquil (*jingji; seijaku*). These characteristics have their grounds on *Chan*.

By asymmetry I mean breaking perfection and regularity. By simplicity I mean not being cluttered or minute. By being austere and wizened I mean aging, being seasoned, high, and steep. By naturalness I mean being detached and not being artificial. By being deep and secluded I mean keeping deep reserve instead of exposing the naked whole. By being free from convention I mean being detached and flexible without hindrance. By being tranquil I mean being free from noisiness, being solitary and calm. These seven characteristics, further, are not separate from one another; they constitute something inseparable, a unitary nature. Analysis of one of them leads to all the seven.

Now we must ask a question: What is it that for as long as more than ten centuries has kept expressing itself in so many cultures with these seven characteristics? I can demonstrate that it is *Chan*, for three reasons: first, the characteristics with which *Chan* expresses itself coincide with these seven characteristics; second, the ages and places of the creation of those cultures were just where and when *Chan* was flourishing; and third, as for what expresses itself in cultures with such characteristics, nothing other than *Chan* is thinkable; even among Buddhist schools, none other than the *Chan* Buddhism is thinkable. (For details, see my coming publication in Japanese, *Zen to Bijutsu: Zen and the Fine Arts*.)^{*7} As I cannot afford now to explain that, let me simply say conclusively that the cultures in the large group are nothing but *Chan* cultures.

But, what kind of thing is *Chan*? As I stated in my previous two lectures in this series, *Chan* is nothing other than the true self of humans, that is, the self-awakening of the formless self. What *Chan* people call "*satori*" (awakening) or "*kenshō*" (seeing into

one's nature) is just a synonym for this self-awakening of the formless self. Due to the inevitable nature of this self-awakening of the formless self, humans, to put it negatively, being emancipated from all bonds of actualities, and, to put it positively, while abiding in all of the actualities, without being bound by them, working flexibly without hindrances, -- that is *Chan*. Where this formless self expresses itself in things that have form -- there is the creation of *Chan* cultures. Where and when there is no self-awakening of the formless self, there is also no *Chan* culture.

From the end of Tang, through the Five Dynasties, and especially into the Song period when *Chan* came to its maturity, its cultural expressions also became diverse and much refined, generating varieties of unique and fine products. As you will see in slides next time, remarkable examples of painting constitute their mainstream:

The *Sixteen Arhats* by Chanyue (-913) in the late Tang (Imperial Household Collection), (Plate 10, Volume V);

The Second Patriarch in Repose by Shike in the Five Dynasties (mid-tenth century) (3, V);

The Sixth Patriarch Cutting Bamboo (5, V); *Shâkyamuni Descending the Mountain* (1, I); and *Budai* by Liang Kai of Southern Song (early thirteenth century) (61, V);

Eight Views of Xiaoxiang by Yujian (mid-thirteenth century) (cf. 19, V);

Persimmons (*Chaji* 27, IV); *Chestnuts*; and a set of three figures: *Bodhisattva Guang'yin* (*Chaji* 21, IV), *Monkeys*, and *A Crane* (1, V); as well as *Eight Views of Xiaoxiang*, by Muqi (mid- thirteenth century);

Grapes by Riguang of Yuan (late thirteenth century);

Hanshan and Shide by Yintuoluo (late fourteenth century) (4, V), and so on.

Peripheral Indian ink paintings by Xiagui, Ma Yuan, and so on are also included in this group.

Since *Chan* is counted among religions, originally as a Buddhist religion, *Chan* paintings may well be called Buddhist paintings. But *Chan* Buddhist paintings much differ in content from ordinary Buddhist paintings, which usually depict the figures of Buddhas or incidents connected with them. It is usual with *Chan* paintings that rather than transcendent, solemn, so-called holy Buddha-figures, they depict real, human figures, such as Shâkyamuni, an *arhat*, or a patriarch; rather than a mythical and transcendent world like the Pure Land, a land of bliss, they depict the actual world of mountains and waters, flowers, birds, monkeys, oxen, fruits, and so forth.

In *Chan*, as is expressed as "This mind is the buddha" (*jixin jifo; sokushin sokubutsu*) or "Outside of mind is no buddha" (*xinhuai wu fo; shinge mubutsu*), the awakened human is a buddha. Since apart from humans there are no buddhas as some sort of transcendent beings, no transcendent, seemingly holy buddhas are depicted; instead, naturally enough, actual, non-holy humans, whose awakening one can feel, are depicted. In a so-called Buddha-painting a transcendent buddha is depicted, while in a *Chan* painting a person

who has attained awakening is depicted. Liang Kai's *Shâkyamuni Descending the Mountain* is a typical painting that depicts an awakened person. *Chan* prefers awakened persons as true buddhas to buddhas of the scriptural description.

When incidents are depicted, *Chan* prefers incidents of awakened persons, that is, occasions when patriarchs attained awakening, to the scriptural description of buddhas' incidents. Such incidents of patriarchs, unlike those of mythical and transcendent of buddhas described in scriptures, are of such an indefinite nature that they may take place with anything of the actual world for their occasions. For some, a talk, for another, silence, for others, physical movement, and for still others, surrounding implements or things in nature will be the occasions for their awakening, which are thus innumerable.

The painting of Persimmons by *Chan* monk Muqi Fachang, in the collection of the Ryôkôin temple in the compound of the Daitokuji monastery in Kyoto, is a small still life, in which just six persimmons are depicted. But from the *Chan* point of view this is a buddha painting excelling over ordinary ones that depict buddha images. Also, the painting, *Eight Views of Xiaoxiang*, by *Chan* monk Yujian, is a mere landscape painting of views of the rivers Xiao and Xiang, but it is a buddha painting that far excels those that depict otherworldly conditions of the Pure Land of Bliss.

The reason is their depiction of a completely formless true buddha prior to any form, what *Chan* calls the formless self, not for an idealized buddha or buddha-land as in the buddha paintings. In this design for the formless self lies the uniqueness of *Chan* cultural expressions in general. In these still lifes or landscapes we sense a unique charm or fascination, not felt in paintings of other kinds. It is no mere accidental curiosity or interest in what is of a different nature; we have that sense because what is far deeper, lying in the depths of us humans: our true, formless self is expressed there. Unless the formless self is awake or there are people who have concern in the formless self, there can be no such expressions.

The periods in China from Tang to Song and Yuan had conditions for such expressions. This atmosphere, which in China gradually became thinner, was succeeded in Japan during the Kamakura, Muromachi, and Momoyama periods. From the late Tang into the Song and Yuan in China, and during the Kamakura, Muromachi, and Momoyama periods in Japan, a unique cluster of cultures unparalleled in any age in the world was formulated. The most likely reason for this is that the formless self was vigorously awake in those periods. That is to say, in those days the formless self had been making vivacious self-expression in various ways.

Here, needless to say, it is not that a formed (*youxiang*; *usou no*) self depicts a formed object nor even that a formed self objectively depicts what is formless, but that the formless self, following any occasion, as the subject expresses itself. Here the problem is not how realistically or how skilfully any objective matter is depicted; the problem is how the formless self, on encountering various occasions, as subject flexibly expresses

itself. No matter what is expressed, then, there in its true sense has the formless self been expressed. Here, after all, *the depicter is what is depicted. What is depicted is for the depicter nothing objective; the depicter, through what is depicted, engages in self-expression as subject.*

In this sense *Chan* art is neither realistic nor impressionistic nor symbolistic; rather, it is *expressionistic*. But it differs from normal expressions, of what is of some form; rather, it is expressions of the formless self. Various characteristics of the *Chan* fine arts derive from that. Since *Chan* is the so-called extra-scriptural Buddhism, it adopts *dharma* (i.e., awakened-truth)-materials not exclusively from sutras. Facing occasions of or conditions for attaining to awakening, from any event, matter, person, or object of the actual world, it adopts them flexibly. Even when it takes its *dharma*-materials from sutras, the way it treats them is qualitatively different from scriptural Buddhism, and the number of treatments is very small. This is evident when one sees occasions or conditions for attaining awakening by *Chan* patriarchs. And that very fact is because *Chan* is the Buddhism of extra-scriptural, special transmission.

The *dharma*-materials adopted by *Chan* have been of numerous kinds since long ago. To show how freely they are adopted, let me cite a few examples. To the question, What is the Buddha? Here are answers by some *Chan* masters:

Yunmen Wenyan (-949) said, "Dried faeces."

Fayan Wenyi (-958) said, "You are Huichao (the questioner's name)."

Dongshan Shouchu (-990) said, "Weighs hemp of three *jin*."

Mazu Daoyi (-786) said at one time, "Neither mind nor Buddha," at another time, "The very mind the very Buddha," and at yet another time, "The very mind is the Buddha."

Zhaozhou Congshen (-897) said, "The one inside the hall."

You can thus see how diversified the *dharma*-materials are for answering a single question, "What is the Buddha?" Nor are the questions fixed. They vary according to the circumstances, as follows:

"What was the intention of the First Patriarch (Bodhidharma) when he came from the west?"

"Apart from the four alternatives [of being, non-being, both of them, and neither of them] and beyond the one hundred negatives, please, Master, say something for me." (A question made by Zhaozhou of Nanquan)

"How is it when I bring here nothing with me?" (Venerable Yanyang asks of Zhaozhou)

"Millions of *dharma*s [i.e., everything] return to one; to where does one return?"

And, there are various other common questions, such as, "How do you taste your tea?" asked of one who was drinking tea, and "Where have you come from?" asked of a visitor monk. Of course, these questions are no ordinary questions; they are *Chan*-questions that imply deep meaning.

So in *Chan*, being emancipated from dogmatized sutra-restrictions, liberated from transcendentalized and consecrated buddhas and mythicized lands of bliss like the Pure Land, actual verbal expressions of the formless self become living sutras of the immediate present; humans awakened to their formless self are buddhas living now; the actual world that the formless self expresses is the living buddha-land.

Accordingly, in depicting humans and human events rather than consecrated buddhas, and depicting mountains and rivers, scenery, flowers and fruits, birds and beasts, *Chan* breaks through the framework of the so-called buddha-painting and opens up a free and new field of buddha-paintings. That is evident when one sees the subject matter treated by the most typical *Chan* painters like Liang Kai, Muqi and Yujian of Song.

Even when they take up the subject matter of the so-called buddha-paintings like Shâkyamuni, bodhisattva Guang'yn, or arhats, they treat them not as anything transcendent and holy, but as humans. And artists have created unique techniques and styles suited for *Chan* expressions. Unlike the analytical, inquisitive, and discriminative style of other religions, which is to go into the minutest details, *Chan's* style is to grasp truth at a stroke, and express it directly, without hesitation; instead of the direction from manifold to manifold, from discrimination to discrimination, it takes the direction from manifold to unity, from discrimination to equality, from complexity to simplicity, from materiality to immateriality.

As for the expression of unity or immateriality, it is done directly, too, like a flash of lightning or a spark from flint, without hindrance, flexibly. Instead of the manifold in the manifold or the material in the material expressing themselves, *unity in the manifold, and the immaterial in the material, expresses itself*. Accordingly, the manifold expressed is not for expressing the manifold, nor the material expressed is for expressing the material, but the manifold for expressing unity, the material for expressing the immaterial.

Among painters, Liang Kai, Muqi, and Yujian, of the Song, and Yintuoluo of the Yuan, represent the highest peaks; Zhiweng (thirteenth century), and Luochuang of the Song, Riguang, Xuechuang (fourteenth century), of the Yuan, and others come next. Shike (Five Dynasties), Chanyue (the Later Liang), Li Tang (early twelfth century), Ma Yuan (late twelfth century), Xia Gui (late twelfth century), Ma Lin (mid-thirteenth century), Chen Suoweng (mid-thirteenth century), Yanhui (fourteenth century), and Gao Ranhui (fourteenth century), represent a surrounding group of mountain peaks.

They deployed a painting style that was heretical and reformist in contrast to both the traditional style of Buddhist paintings and the orthodox style of common paintings. The most striking feature of their style is that, unlike the orthodox style in which the minutest details are elaborated with the skeletal brush use (*gufa-yongbi; koppô-yôhitsu*) to build up the whole, the whole is produced in one breath, at a stroke, and then parts emerge in it. In other words, *instead of the many building up to form the one, the one forms, and the many come to appear in it*. Instead of the many or the formed aiming for

the one or the formless, the one or the formless as fundamental subject expresses itself in the many or the formed. This matches the *Chan* way of immediate awakening (*dunwu: tongo*). The *Chan* of immediate awakening is not in the direction of the one or the formless; it is in the one or the formless working as the fundamental subject of expression. Insofar as Indian ink contains five tints, a monochrome painting of Indian ink has something to match *Chan*.

Paintings of Indian ink in the broken ink (*pomo; haboku*) and splashed ink (*pomo; hatsuboku*) styles, with the whole getting painted in one breath at a stroke with parts appearing infinitely within, match *Chan* far better than those of minute elaboration with the skeletal brush technique. As regards the brush technique, rather than delicate lines, wild and thick ones whose single line could contain ten thousand lines are more fit; as for their shape, rather than shapely and of regular proportion, deformed ones, those that deviate from the norm, are more suitable.

The broken-ink style, which is said to have been originated by Wang Wei (eighth century) of Tang, and the spashed-ink style, which Wang Mo (ninth century) is said to have first attempted, coincide with the *Chan* way of expression, and hence came to be regarded as exclusive brush techniques of the *Chan* painting. Here arose the new, so-called "norm-deviating" painting style, different from that of the orthodox Indian-ink painting in which the skeletal brush use was emphasized, and it was regarded by the orthodoxy as heretical.

Let me cite works typical of the *Chan* painting style. In terms of figure paintings, *The Second Patriarch in Repose*, by Shike; *Budai, Hanshan and Shide*, by Liang Kai; *Bodhidharma* (*Chaji* 20, IV), *Laozi*, by Muqi; and *Hanshan and Shide*, by Yintuoluo (bookend plate 28, IV).

In terms of landscape paintings,

Eight Views of Xiaoxiang, by both Muqi and Yujian; *Landscape in Snow*, by Liang Kai (58, V); and *Landscape in Rain*, by Xia Gui, (6, V).

As far as bird and animal paintings are concerned,

Ba-Ba Bird on an Old Pine (*Chaji* 29, IV), *Monkeys and A Crane* (1, V), and *A Dragon and a Tiger*, by Muqi.

And in the case of botanical paintings,

Peony, Chestnuts, Persimmons, by Muqi; and *Grapes*, by Riguang.

This painting style was introduced into Japan, where there came to appear many representative works by such artists as Mokuan (fourteenth century, 62, V), Kaou (fourteenth c.), Ryouzen (fourteenth c.), Bonpou (fourteenth c.), Sesshu (fifteenth c., 41, V), Sesson (sixteenth c.), Souami (sixteenth c., bookend plate 31, IV; 12, V), Tan'an (sixteenth c.), Touhaku (sixteenth c., 20, 41, V) Miyamoto Niten (seventeenth c., bookend plate 34, IV; 21, V), and Hakuin (eighteenth c.).

My talks thus far seem to have focused only on the characteristics of *Chan* paint-

ing in the large *Chan* culture. It was because of time constraints that in this third public lecture I have intended to take up *Chan* paintings to illustrate the characteristics of *Chan* culture in general. In my next, fourth public lecture, I shall choose those typical *Chan* cultural works that may be visually appealing, and not only *Chan* paintings, but *Chan* calligraphy, *Chan* architecture, *Chan* gardens, *Chan* ceramic ware, *Chan* handicrafts, and *Chan* entertainments as well. I will show them through slides to foster your concrete understanding of the characteristics of *Chan* culture.

IV

In my previous public lectures I talked about the outlines of *Chan* and its culture, especially the fine arts. Today by the use of slides I would like to show you a few of those works of *Chan* culture that are visually appealing. Before that, I'd like to talk about something to facilitate your appreciation of what I will show you.

As I told you last time, *Chan* fine arts are characterized neither as realism nor impressionism nor even symbolism, but as expressionism, in which the expresser, through what is expressed, in the fundamentally subjective way expresses himself or herself. Accordingly, the expresser is what is expressed, and what is expressed is the very expresser. *Chan* expressionism differs from that of Europe and the United States in that in the *Chan* fine arts the expresser is the formless, deep self that is *Chan*.

Whatever moment has been expressed, whether it is a human figure, a landscape, flowers, or birds, what is expressed is the formless self. Certainly it is quite natural that the occasional moment is expressed with the technique most appropriate for the expression of the formless self. This means that in the formed moment the formless self comes to be expressed. Accordingly, the meaning of the occasional, formed moment does not lie in the formed moment itself, that is, a human figure, a landscape, or flowers, or birds, but in the formless, deep self.

For an illustration let me take up the rock garden of the Ryouanji temple in Kyoto, which recently has become world-famous as a *Chan* art. (Here is a slide of that garden. 8, 9, v) This stone garden is not, as realists think, a realistic description of islands in the sea, or, as impressionists think, a good expression of the same impression, or as symbolists think, symbolization of *arhats* (nirvana-attainers in the early Buddhism). The meaning of this stone garden as a *Chan* art lies in the whole stone garden -- through its formation in such a rectangular space, on such white sands, with stones of such shapes being arranged in such a manner -- being an expression of the formless self.

Speaking from the side of one who appreciates this stone garden, the fact that many of those who see it feel, even if without a distinct realization, that it has something unique and deep in it is because this stone garden has what appeals to the formless self that deeply inheres within those who see it. The rock garden of the Ryouanji temple has seemingly been made into a picture in this painting of *Persimmons* attributed to Muqi. (Here the slide of *Persimmons* is shown. *Chaji* 27, IV) The whole painting, only with its differ-

ence as not being a garden, takes the same mode of expression as that of the stone garden; it expresses the formless self.

Last time, I cited and analyzed seven characteristics of *Chan* art: 1. asymmetry, 2. simplicity, 3. wizened austerity, 4. naturalness, 5. deep seclusion, 6. freedom from convention, and 7. tranquility. Now, to help appreciate the slides, let me mention them up again.

1. By asymmetry I mean the form that appears where there is freedom from punctiliousness, faultlessness, and shapeliness, where they are transcended and defeated. Its interest is that of being out of shape, of the cursive style, being crooked, of odd instead of even numbers, of the beauty not seen in what is symmetrical. Its *Chan* basis is the Rule of No-rule, or Non-holiness, which is equivalent to the *Chan* expression, "Delusions of ordinary beings fallen off, The trace of nobleness is also all emptied." (Here are shown slides of *Shâkyamuni Descending the Mountain*, a painting by Liang Kai, 1, I & *Chaji* 1, IV; the place below the eaves to receive raindrops of Katsura Imperial Villa, Kyoto, 43, V; and a calligraphy by Huaisu, 737-799?, 42, 51, V.)

2. By simplicity I mean not being cluttered, being neat and tidy; the highly naïve and simple beauty that is not found in what is complex or minute. It has its basis on *Chan*'s Non-complexity, Having-Nothing-at-all, Space-like Vastness, One, or Destitution. (Slides are shown of *Swallows*, *A Lotus Leaf*, two paintings by Muqi, 45, V; the room for musical instruments, Katsura Imperial Villa, 47, V; and tea flowers arranged by the author, *Chaji* 30, 31, bookend plate 82, 83, IV; 48, V.)

3. Wizened austerity corresponds to words like advancing in life, growing old, getting seasoned, becoming mellow, and so on. It is the sturdy, inviolable, and dignified beauty that, after years of experience, has lost all the childishness, youthfulness, greenness, unripeness, and weakness, and has become just the pith or core. It is like age-old pine trees which, after many years of being buffeted by wind and snow, have lost youth, greenness, weakliness, have had their leaves become firm, boughs dried, stems and skins thick, and are ever alert, equipped with sturdiness and dignity, standing imposing and lofty. It is based on what *Chan* people call No-rank, Skins-Fallen-Off, Solitarily-Austere, or Revealing-Openly. (Slides shown are of *A Crane*, a painting by Muqi, 1, V; calligraphy of two characters *xian-yin* (*kan-gin*, "Reciting [poetry] at my Leisure") by Jiun, 1718-1804 (cf. 13, V); and Shino ware tea-bowl named "*Unohana-gaki*," end of sixteenth century, 52, V.)

4. By naturalness I mean not being artificial, unadorned, being original without strain. This is not in the sense of inborn, naïve instinct; it means the full creative intention never looking unnatural. As is suggested by an expression used in the Way of Tea, "What has become mellow is good; what has been forced to mellow is bad," asymmetry, wizened austerity, freedom from convention are not artificial, but quite natural. This is based on *Chan*'s No-mind, No-thought, Original Face. (Slides are shown of the painting by Shike, *The Second Patriarch in Repose*, 3, V; stepping stones below the Tsukimi-dai, Katsura Imperial Villa, 55, V; and Oribe ware black tea-bowl, 56, V.)

5. By deep seclusion I mean not coming out to an end, pregnant with infinite significance and full of reverberation, with deep reserve. Here is unfathomable depth, peace, serene darkness. It has its basis on the Bottomlessness of *Chan*, or an Inexhaustible Supply in the midst of Destitution. (Slides shown are of Muqi's painting, *Evening Glow on a Fishing Village*, 57, V; a general view of Shoin, a study and drawing room, Katsura Imperial Villa, *Chaji* 17, IV; and a pose in the *Nou* play, Seiganji, 60, V.)

6. By freedom from convention I mean not adhering to things of the actual world, and not even to the buddha. Not adhering even to no adhesion, completely being free and easy. It has its basis on the Solitarily Emancipated, No Hindrance with Flexibility, or Sporting in Self-Concentration of *Chan*. (Slides are shown of a painting by Liang Kai, *Budai*, 61, V; a calligraphy by Huaisu, 42, 51, V; and Korean ware Cloven-footed tea-bowl, Yi dynasty, 63, V.)

7. Tranquility means not being noisy, being calm and serene. Not only quiet in the place of quietude, it is being quiet even when noisy, free from quietude or noisiness. There is a remark: "With the cries of birds the solitude of the mountain deepens." Instead of the naïve kind of quietude of the mountain where no birds are heard, it is the kind of quietude in which the mountain is felt quieter because of the cries of birds. This has its basis on *Chan* expressions like "Unmoved"; "Either in talks or in silence, in movement or at rest, I am in peace, for walking is *Chan*, sitting is *Chan*"; "A Moment of Silence that is like Thundering." (Slides are shown of Ma Yuan's painting, *Fisherman on a river in winter*, *Chaji* 23, IV; alley leading to the Gepparou, Katsura Imperial Villa, *Chaji* 10, IV; and Shiga-raki ware tea-bowl named *Fugen*, 68, V.)

The above seven characteristics constitute one indivisible whole; they never exist singly. They should be such that each contains the other six within itself. Even when any of the seven characteristics are remarkably noticed and others remain unnoticed, in the seven being indivisible lies the unique character of *Chan* art, differing in content from mere asymmetry or simplicity or naturalness. I wish that through the following slides (sixty-six slides on *Chan* fine arts) you will appreciate the seven characteristics mentioned above and see the specific character of *Chan* art. If you could take one more step forward to penetrate the *Chan* that is expressed there, it will be my unexpected *dharma*-joy.

By *Chan* I mean giving rise to a great doubt fundamentally subjective concerning the way of being of the formed actual self, getting awakened to the formless self, thereby reaching the great *satori* from the great doubt. By *satori* I mean, instead of knowing something objectively, having the fundamentally subjective, formless self awaken. *Chan* not being a mere faith or intuition, it doubts everything; while being Buddhism, it doubts even the buddha, has the doubt broken, and attains to a great *satori*, wherein it has its philosophy, different from a mere religion, established.

And insofar as its doubt is not an issue of objective knowledge but something holistic and fundamentally subjective, and in its solution, *satori*, is holistic and fundamentally subjective, there is established a religion different from a mere philosophy. While *Chan* realization is called *satori* (awakening), the buddha in Buddhism means the one

who is awakened. In *Chan* the term refers to the one who is awakened to the formless self. The reason is that according to *Chan* not only Shâkyamuni of India two thousand five hundred years ago was a buddha, but any person who has been awakened is a buddha, and Shâkyamuni's being a buddha derives from his having attained awakening. A true buddha is none other than the formless self who transcends any particular space and time, and who, because of that transcendence, flexibly expresses itself in space and time. In *Chan* this formless self is also called "Nothingness."

This "Nothingness" conveys the fact that the formless self has no form at all, has not a single thing; it never means a mere negation or non-existence. What is meant by the "Nothingness" is the formless self as the Original Face to which the actual, formed self has awakened after not having been able to completely rid of the endless contradiction-opposition between being and non-being but then having gotten free within from the opposition.

Accordingly, the "Nothingness" of *Chan* is not the so-called negation or non-being that affirmation or being inevitably faces; it means the self that no longer has the contradiction-opposition between affirmation and negation or being and non-being. In other words, that "Nothingness" is none other than the formless self as the Original Face of the formed self. This "Nothingness" is the self that, being formless itself, is free from any form and always awake. But this awaking involves no distinction between what awakes and what is awakened to, that is, no distinction between noesis and noema.

Accordingly, instead of being the kind of consciousness that has noesis-noema as its primary factor, it is the consciousness that lies at the basis of that kind of consciousness. Further, I would like to say that it is at once the one who is conscious and what the one is conscious of as an undivided self, and it is formless. Where and when this formless self expresses itself in formed matters and things there is the creation of *Chan* culture. Accordingly, it is quite natural that where and when there is no awakening of the formless self there cannot be any *Chan* culture.

Translated by TOKIWA Gishin

Translator's Notes:

- (1) Invited by the Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A., as a visiting professor from September 23rd to December 23rd, 1957, Professor HISAMATSU Shin'ichi had five student seminars and three faculty seminars, and gave four public lectures on "*Chan* and *Chan* Culture." He was accompanied by Mr. FUJIYOSHI Jikai, who was also invited as a visiting instructor to translate for the author. Mr. Richard DeMartino served as interpreter. Dr. D.T. SUZUKI, who in May of that year had finished his lectures at Columbia University, New York, where he had been teaching for more than five years since 1952, came to Cambridge in September, and welcomed the author and Mr. FUJIYOSHI at the Divinity School together with Dean Dr. Horton. Dr. SUZUKI stayed at the same hotel as the author and Mr. FUJIYOSHI, helped them in many

ways, and attended the author's classes as a commentator.

(2) According to Hisamatsu's letter addressed to the Gakudou-Doujou group (later the F.A.S. Society) in Kyoto, which he wrote after finishing his scheduled duties for the Divinity School in December 1957, in both the seminars he attempted to open a path to *Chan* in human nature by having the participants make thoroughgoing criticism of the image of modern humans. But their Christian preconceptions prevented them from engaging in free dialectic. In addition, their lack of penetration in everyday investigation obliged him to take time before he had them spontaneously plunge into the ultimate antimony of humans. He writes, he had to finish the introduction of the content of *Chan* at its entrance.

But he believed the problem he presented in the seminars concerning what constituted the objective and reasonable moment for true religion in humans and his insistence that the basic antinomy in people was that moment had caused controversy about the science of religion or theology among the attendants who had not delved into this problem.

(3) According to the author, in the case of his public lectures, he immediately started elucidating of *Chan*. In the first two lectures he discussed what was meant by the so-called self-awakening of the formless self and how it could be called *Chan* by citing *Chan* classics and historical facts; in the third lecture he explained what was included in *Chan* culture and what characteristics it had; in the fourth lecture, with the use of slides (that he had the Harvard Fogg Museum prepare, and whose screen effect was far better than that of the small slides he had brought from Japan) he had the audience appreciate the unique characteristics of *Chan* fine arts, and search where the formless self was expressed.

(4) According to Hisamatsu, on October 3 the first public lecture was held at the church attached to the Divinity School, with an overflowing audience, including Professor Paul Tillich. On October 24 the second public lecture was held at Andover Newton Theological School, a sister institution to the Divinity School, forty minutes by car from the university. That evening, despite heavy wind and rain, many people came from Cambridge and other distant places. The third and fourth public lectures (November 13 and December 12) were held in a large hall on the ground floor of the Fogg Museum with an audience of more than five hundred, which surprised the people concerned, who had expected around fifty to sixty. (Cf. the author's collective writings, *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU* Vol. 8)

(5) The original Japanese text of the present translation "*Chan* and *Chan* Culture" is included in the *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI CHOSAKUSHUU* Vol. 5 (pp. 1~45). This volume, *Zen to Geijutsu (Chan and Art)*, contains many plates of *Chan* fine arts, more than twenty of which are known to have been shown by the author at the Fogg Museum as slides. And, at the end of this volume twenty-eight plates are classified into seven groups to show which of the seven characteristics of *Chan* fine arts is most prominent in which work.

(6) As for the quotes from *Chan* texts in the present lectures, they are left without notes for the English translation, except the three in Lecture II, i.e., from Huineng, Yonming, and Vimalakīrti:

(6-I) On "the mind in extension", a quote from Huineng's exposition of the Mahayana

Buddhist scripture, Great *Prajñā* Perfection. Its original Sanskrit term, "*cittamâtram*", can be read in two ways: "the extension of mind" and "nothing but mind," which cover the same thing in an expression of the *Lankâvatâra sūtra*, "What is seen as something external is nothing but one's own mind." The Buddha of this latter scripture repeats this expression throughout as the core of the awakening (one hundred and twenty times according to Tokiwa's counting).

(6-2) On the quote from Yonming in Lecture II, which the translator has difficulty in identifying its source. The quote is: "Yonming (Y. Yanshou, 904-976) said: 'You cannot know the Way with the thought of being (*youxin*; *ushin*) or with the thought of non-being (*wuxin*; *mushin*).' "

In his main work, *Zongjing-lu* (*Sugyou-roku*, Collection of Records from the Ancestral Mirrors, one hundred fascicles, *Taishou Shinshuu Daizoukyou* Vol. 48, pp. 415~957), fas. 6, in a response to a question, "How should the Way be realized?" Yonming cites a verse from "Realizing the Way" (T48, 444c), which seems to be the source of Dr. HISAMATSU's quote:

"Being, non-being, going, or coming -- any such mind ceasing forever,
Within, without, intermediate, altogether, none is here.
If you want to see where the tathâgata, true buddha, is,
Just watch how a stone ewe can give birth to a lamb."

(6-3) On the passage from *Vimalakîrti Nirdeśa* (V'S Exposition) VI-6, Taisho University Press, 2004: The Sanskrit text goes: "*apratisthânamûla-pratisthitâh sarvadharmâh*". The three Chinese versions commonly follow the Sanskrit word-order, placing the predicate 立 before the subject 一切法, so that one can read the latter as the object of the former, and the whole passage comes to convey a very active tone. Dr. Hisamatsu reads it that way. Meanwhile, the translator follows the original word-order.

(7) The Japanese book, *Zen to Bijutsu*, was published by Bokubi-sha, Kyoto, in 1958; its English translation (by the present translator), *Zen and the Fine Arts*, in 1971, (paperback edition, 1982), by Kodansha International, Tokyo/ New York.

The above book, either its original Japanese or its English version, which includes plates of all the works of *Chan* culture cited by the author below, is now out of print. But many of the works can be seen in the plates included in Volumes One, Four, and Five of the author's *Chosakushuu* (collected writings in Japanese). For readers' benefit, reference will be made to the related plate number in a related volume.

(Corrected according to suggestions by Ms. TSUKUI Akemi, August 2010: re-corrected, January 30, 2011. Professor Christopher Ives, Department of Religious Studies, Stonehill College, Easton, MA, was kind enough to check this paper and "Selected Verses" carefully and to offer many precious suggestions. Tokiwa heartily appreciates his contribution. Needless to say, however, Tokiwa is responsible for all the present work. Aug. 2012)

2. ON *CHAN* ART ¹

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI

Generally speaking, religious art -- to be properly so called -- must be something which expresses aesthetically some religious meaning. However high a value as art some work may have, if it does not express a religious meaning, it cannot be called religious art. Similarly, however high a religious value may be expressed -- for example, conceptually, as in the case of a holy scripture, or morally, as in the case of a religious precept -- such expressions cannot *ipso facto* be said to constitute religious art. Religious art must not only be art ; it must *especially* express religious meaning.

A point of view often encountered is that the ultimate in art is itself religious, that whatever possesses a high aesthetic value is understood to be by that very fact religious. Such a view rules out the possibility that something may possess high value as art and yet not express the slightest religious meanings. And thus, religious art becomes no more than art of high aesthetic value. What is religious art and what is not, becomes simply a matter of the difference of the degree of aesthetic excellence and not a difference of some more fundamental quality. It would, accordingly, become impossible to speak of religious art as art which especially expresses religious meaning. Is, however, the difference between religious art and non-religious art really no more than simply a difference in the degree of aesthetic excellence?

To be sure, something of the nature of godliness or sublimity (p. 22) emanates naturally from a work of art of high aesthetic value. That is, there are in fact instances where at first glance a superior work of art causes one to feel that it is a work of religious art. In such cases, the sublimity of the aesthetic excellence strikes one as being religious. But can we in fact declare such sublimity to be religious?

In my opinion, there are works of art which possess sublimity and yet are not religious, and there are works of art which are religious and yet do not possess sublimity. A sense of sublimity may naturally accompany works of high aesthetic quality, but I do not think it can be said that because a work of art has this sense of sublimity it is thereby religious. Sublimity and religiosity are not in my opinion synonymous concepts.

Sublimity (Chin., *shenyun*; Jap., *shin'in*), numbered as the first of the six rules of painting in Chinese classical treatises on painting,² is no doubt the principal norm of aesthetics. Religiosity, however, does not constitute in any sense an element within any aesthetic norm. From the perspective of aesthetics, religiosity is no more than one possible theme which art may try to express. Accordingly, the presence or absence of sublimity is for aesthetics a most important matter, but the presence or absence of the quality of religiosity is for aesthetics *per se* of no consequence. The fact that an aesthetic work

lacks religiosity does not lower its aesthetic value. If, however, an aesthetic work tries to express religiosity, but does not in fact possess religiosity, it must then be said that even its aesthetic value is low.

For example, if a landscape painted by Sesshuu³ does not express a religious meaning, one does not, therefore, necessarily consider its aesthetic value to be low. But if a *Bodhidharma* painted by Sesshuu does not express a religious meaning, probably no one could consider it to have much aesthetic value. If, however, such a painting is taken not as a painting of Bodhidharma but as a painting of an hysterical monk angrily glaring at someone,⁴ then it is perhaps not necessary to speak of its aesthetic value as being low. If, on the other hand, Sesshuu tried to paint Bodhidharma the *Chan* master, but painted something that can only be regarded as an hysterical monk, (p. 23) then it is either because Sesshuu did not succeed in understanding the character of Bodhidharma the *Chan* master, or because even though he understood them, he was unable to express them. In either case, it is clear that Sesshuu was not able to paint Bodhidharma.

In the *Bodhidharma* painted by Hakuin,⁵ however, the characteristics of Bodhidharma as a *Chan* master are really well expressed. Since Hakuin was not, however, a professional painter, from the point of view of technique we may feel that there are some things that he could have done a little better. Nevertheless, the *Bodhidharmas* painted by Hakuin are far more Bodhidharma-like than those of Sesshuu, Dasoku,⁶ or Kei-Shoki,⁷ among others. This is because Hakuin first grasped thoroughly the characteristics of Bodhidharma and, in painting these characteristics, even though technically imperfect, created a *suitable style* for that expression.

In the case of the Sesshuu "*Bodhidharma*," even though it should, from the standpoint of general technique, contain an epoch-making innovation, if the *Bodhidharma* painted by that epoch-making technique is not Bodhidharma-like, it goes without saying that, as a painting of Bodhidharma, it is without value.

In order for one to paint a picture of Bodhidharma, the characteristics of Bodhidharma must first be made one's own characteristics, and then an appropriate technique must be found to depict them. Making the characteristics of Bodhidharma fully one's own, however, is not a matter of aesthetics but a matter of religion. Of course, the *Bodhidharma* which is made fully one's own through religion is not as such a work of art. In order for it to become a work of art, it must express itself aesthetically. Without, however, the religious realization of Bodhidharma's character, one cannot produce a true picture of Bodhidharma.

Accordingly, the evaluation of a picture of Bodhidharma must be made by determining how well the depicted *Bodhidharma* expresses the religiously realized Bodhidharma. That is, in evaluating a picture of Bodhidharma one must consider to what extent the religiously realized Bodhidharma vividly and graphically appears in the portrait painted.

So it is when any religious matter, and not just a portrait of Bodhidharma, such as Buddhist *gâthâs* or Buddhist chants (called *shoumyou*) must likewise be evaluated according to how well the religious substance is being expressed, in the one case through poetry, in the other through music.

This being so, in the case either of the creation, the appreciation, or the criticism of religious art, the creator, the appreciator, or the critic must first fully make his own the religious substance involved. If he does not, the artist-creator will lose the religious object which should be expressed through the work of art, while the appreciator and the critic will not be able to understand the religious meaning which the work of art intends to express.

Of late, there has been very little religious art worth looking at, and, further, the instances of valid criticism of religious art have also been few. May this not be because the religious realization on the part of the artists and the critics has not been sufficient?

If religious art means, as described above, not simply great and sublime art, but art which expresses religious meaning, i.e., the meaning which can be actualized only through religion, then that which I am here calling *Chan* art belongs to the category of religious art. This is because *Chan* art is art which expresses the *Chan* religious meaning (p. 25) which has been realized through *Chan* as a religion.

Examples which belong to the main line of *Chan* art are: in the field of painting: in China, Shi Ke and Guanxiu of the Five Dynasties period; Liang Kai, Muqi, Riguan and Yujian of the Song Dynasty; and Yintuoluo of the Yuan Dynasty; in Japan, Mokuan, Kaou, Bonpou, Josetsu, Souami and Shukou of the Ashikaga period; Miyamoto Musashi (Niten) of the Momoyama period; Isshi, Hakuin, Sengai, Seisetsu and Kougan of the Tokugawa period. In the field of calligraphy: in China, Wuzhun, Wu'an, Xutang, Zhongfeng, Yin Yuejiang, Ning Yishan, Wuxue Zuyuan and Feiyin; and in Japan, Shuuhou, Kanzan, Musou, Ikkyuu, Shun'oku Souyen, Kokei, Genkou, Takuan, Seigan, Ten'yuu, Daishin, Daigu, Jiun and Ryoukan.

In the field of literature: in China, the *Chanxi-ji* of Su Dongpo,⁸ the *Hanshanshi*,⁹ *Jianhu-fengyue-ji*,¹⁰ and *Zengi-gemon[-shuu]*¹¹; and in Japan, Gosan Literature,¹² the *Chan* records and the poems of the various Japanese and Chinese *Chan* monks; in the field of theater arts, there is the *Nou* drama; in the field of ceremonial arts, the tea-ceremony and the various ceremonial practices of the *Chan* monks; in the field of architecture, with their construction and decoration of *Chan* temples as well as tea ceremony rooms or houses; in the field of arts and crafts, the various utensils used in the tea-ceremony: tea-bowls, tea-containers, incense-boxes, flower vases, tea-kettles and serving-plates for sweets; in the field of garden construction, the gardens of *Chan* temples and the paths leading to the tea-houses. There are, of course, other corollary works of art which contain a *Chan* influence received from this main stream of *Chan* art. In both religious and aesthetic respects, *Chan* art constitutes a major current which

occupies an important, never to be overlooked, position in the history of Oriental art.

It is generally recognized that *Chan* constitutes an essential element in the Oriental spirit and, likewise, that *Chan* art partakes of (p. 26) the essence of Oriental art. But even if this were not so, that *Chan* art is a unique art form which thoroughly developed only in the Orient can probably be said without dispute.

Of course, in the West also there have continued to be from the earliest centuries until modern times instances of a religious realization extremely similar to *Chan*; for example, the mysticism of Plotinus, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, Eckhart, and Boehme, among others. But while this mystical tradition did exert a rather deep influence on Western religion and philosophy, it was not the main line of Western thought. Accordingly, unlike *Chan* in the Orient, it did not take the form of an independent school and did not become the *Zeitgeist* of any specific age. It is perhaps for this reason that this Western mystical tradition did not reach the point of creating out of itself a unique art or culture.

In the West also, there are paintings which may perhaps be said to be mystical; for example, the paintings of Daumier, Courbet, Whistler, Gauguin, Van Gogh, Blake, and especially Millet. The paintings of Blake seem to express something more strongly religious than the paintings of the others just mentioned. This religious quality, (p. 27) however, while it cannot be said not to be mystical, is a quality mixed with a great deal of the *supernatural*. It is not mystical in the pure sense of mysticism as found in such a figure as Eckhart. [Paintings by] Millet [are] is probably, by far, the most purely mystical.

And in the field of literature, in the writings of Maeterlinck and Yeats, one can very likely find a great deal which is mystical. But it cannot be said that such art or literature thoroughly or purely expresses the kind of "mysticism" expressed in the *Chan* art of the Orient. Even less can it be considered that this Western art comprises a definite aesthetic current based (p. 28) on mystical experience. In this sense, *Chan* art must be said to occupy an important position not only in the aesthetic history of the Orient but in the aesthetic history of the world.

Ordinarily, when people speak of *Chan* paintings they frequently have in mind simply paintings painted by *Chan* monks or paintings which treat of ancient *Chan* incidents.¹³ However, even though a painting has been painted by a *Chan* monk or is a painting which treats of *Chan* incidents, if it is a painting in which *Chan* meaning has not been expressed, it cannot be called a *Chan* painting. For example, even though they were *Chan* monks, the paintings of Tetsuou¹⁴ and those of the early Sengai¹⁵ cannot be called *Chan* paintings. Again, even though they are paintings which treat of ancients, the paintings appearing in many early twentieth¹⁶ century Japanese exhibition like Teiten and Inten¹⁷ portraying Bodhidharma, Hanshan-and-Shide and Nanquan-cutting-the-cat, cannot be said to be *Chan* paintings.

In contrast to these paintings just referred to, even though they were not painted

by *Chan* monks, such paintings as the "*Su Dongpo*" painted by Ashikaga Yoshimitsu,¹⁸ the "*Bodhidharma*," or the "*Wild Geese in the Reeds*" painted by Miyamoto Musashi,¹⁹ the "*Budai*," and the portraits of Hitomaro and Tsurayuki painted by Iwasa Shouei,²⁰ all fully possess the essential (p. 29) characteristics of a *Chan* painting. Again, although they do not deal with ancient *Chan* incidents, such paintings as Muqi's "*Six Persimmons*," "*The Wild Geese in the Reeds*," and the landscapes,²¹ "*The Orchids*" of Gyokuenshi,²² or the landscape of Souami,²³ may very well be said to be excellent *Chan* paintings.

The same may be said regarding calligraphy. Just because a piece of calligraphy was written by a *Chan* monk, or just because it consists of *Chan* words or phrases, does not mean that it can *ipso facto* be said to be *Chan* calligraphy. On the other hand, there are instances of calligraphy which can be said to be *Chan* calligraphy even though they are not the work of *Chan* monks and even though they do not contain *Chan* phrases. For example, although Isshi²⁴ was a *Chan* monk, his calligraphy is not as *Chan*-like as the calligraphy of Jiun,²⁵ who was monk of the Shingon sect.

The poem on the tomb of Emperor Wu cannot be called a *Chan* poem; however, when Genkou²⁶ took it as the subject of a piece of calligraphy, his calligraphy of this poem became an excellent piece of *Chan* calligraphy. (It is preserved at Rinkain, Myou-shinji Temple.) This being so, what is to be called *Chan* painting or *Chan* calligraphy is not a painting which has been painted by a *Chan* monk or a piece of calligraphy containing *Chan* phrases but rather a painting or a piece of calligraphy which expresses *Chan* meaning.

When *Chan* meaning is to be expressed aesthetically, it must be expressed through a form which is both suitable and possesses a (p. 30) necessary relation to the meaning to be expressed. It is precisely because it does possess such a form that a painting, a piece of calligraphy, a manner of living, a dwelling place, a face, a literary composition, or sportive play, is spoken of as "*Chan*-like." If a *Chan* monk wrote in the beautiful, delicate, haze-like, running *kana* style of ancient times, if he painted brilliant, gold Buddha images, or if he engaged in elegant, enticing behavior, he could not be said to be "*Chan*-like." In much of what is ordinarily characterized as "*Chan*-like," there is a great deal which has no necessary relation at all to the essence of a *Chan* man but which is, on the contrary, simply an accidental surface combination of factors or surface style. That which is to be truly called "*Chan*-like," however, has not any such accidental, superficial similarities to *Chan*; it must rather have those fundamentals which are rooted in the essence of what it means to be a *Chan* man.

This being so, no matter to what extent an act is actually performed by a *Chan* monk, that which does not derive from the essence of what it means to be a *Chan* man cannot be called "*Chan*-like." Therefore, in order to discriminate whether something is *Chan*-like or not, it is necessary to understand the essence of what it means to be a *Chan* man. And in order for the essence of what it means to be a *Chan* man to be understood,

Chan-meaning itself must be understood.

The understanding of *Chan*-meaning must await *Chan*-religious realization. What I am here calling "*Chan*-meaning" is not an intellectual, conceptual meaning, but it is the living "*Chan*-Mind" itself. It is impossible to discern clearly whether or not *Chan*-meaning is being expressed in a given expression without a very firm hold on this living *Chan*-Mind.

Regarding such questions as whether or not a certain conceptual discourse is in accord with the basic meaning of *Chan* or again just what *Chan* incident a certain painting is expressing, if one reads a book written about the basic meaning of *Chan* or if one consults a reference book on *Chan* incidents, -- even without any special grasp of the *Chan*-Mind, -- these matters can be determined relatively easily. Although they cannot, of course, be said to be conclusive, it is in this regard that ordinary *Chan* scholarly studies or essays on *Chan* painting (p. 31) are sometimes helpful.

In order, however, to determine which calligraphic style or which style of painting or which music expresses a *Chan* style, one must have a thoroughly vivid *Chan* realization. If one lacks this realization, one probably will not be able to understand why a certain calligraphic style, a certain painting style, a certain piece of music or a certain living manner especially expresses *Chan*-meaning.

Historians say that *Chan* flourished in China during the Song period, that it was at this time that the painting style of such artists as Muqi and Liang Kai²⁷ was born, that in Japan the *Chan* school came into prominence during the Higashiyama period,²⁸ that it was in this period that Song art was appreciated, and that in this same period the tea-ceremony arose. But they do not give adequate answers to such questions as follows : Why was it that when *Chan* flourished, such a painting style as that of Muqi's and Liang Kai's arose? Why, under the same influence, did the tea-ceremony arise? Why, in the Higashiyama period in Japan, were such simple, primitive and unpolished paintings as the Buddha paintings of Shi Ke,²⁹ Guanxiu,³⁰ and Muqi appreciated even more than the brilliant gold Buddha paintings of the Heian and Kamakura periods? Even when historians do attempt to answer these questions, they do not do so from within the meaning of *Chan* itself. Rather their answers are no more than external explanations (p. 32) given in terms of the attending circumstances.

For example the reason given to explain the appearance of such persons as Kaou,³¹ Mokuan,³² and Souami during the period from the end of the Kamakura era to the Higashiyama era, is that Japanese *Chan* monks of that period went to the China of the Song, and brought back *Chan* paintings of Yintuoluo,³³ Muqi, and others. In this explanation, however, the questions as to why the *Chan* monks who went to Song China brought back the works of Yintuoluo and Muqi, and why Japan during that period took in these works and was so receptive to their influence, are not dealt with very satisfactorily. If these questions are not asked and are not answered, even the historical explanation

cannot be said to have been thoroughly presented. But unless these problems are dealt with by one who has himself genuinely grasped the *Chan*-Mind, they cannot be answered.

This being so, in order to understand *Chan* aesthetics thoroughly, first the *Chan*-Mind must be vividly actualized and the question of why the *Chan*-Mind has to be aesthetically expressed necessarily through such and such a form must be determined. Following this, it must be clearly understood just why the several forms mentioned above as examples of *Chan* aesthetics -- paintings by Shi Ke or Hakuin, calligraphy by Su Donpo or Jiun, the tea-ceremony, the gardens of *Chan* temples, etc. -- constitute, each in its own way, necessary aesthetic forms for *Chan*.

To express the special characteristics of *Chan* aesthetics, the following terms are sometimes used³⁴:

"free from worldliness" (*tuosu*; *datsuzoku*), "crabbed with age" (*canggu*; *souko*),
"of serene emptiness" (*kongji*; *kuujaku*), "still and secluded" (*youqu*; *yuugeki*),
["of mature solitude"] (*[ji;]* *sabi*) ; ["of ripe poverty"] (*[cha;]* *wabi*),³⁵
"aged naiveté" (*guzhuo*; *kosetsu*), "simplicity" (*supu*; *soboku*),
"unseizability" (*meibabi*; *motsuhabi*), "untastableness" (*meiziwei*; *motsujimi*),
"all the more elegance [for the lack of it]" (*ye fengliu*; *ya fuuryuu*),³⁶
"directness" (*duande*; *tanteki*), "unrestricted freedom" (*satuo*; *shadatsu*),
"no-mind" (*wuxin*; *mushin*), "an unruly fellow" (*mengbalang*; *manparou*),
"imposing (p. 33) aloofness" (*aowu*; *goukotsu*), "mad" (*fengtian*; *fuuten*),
"unyielding" (*danban*; *tanpan*), and "purity" (*qingjing*; *shoujou*).

For a clear understanding of the birthplace in ourselves of these characteristics, we must go through the same procedures that were cited above as the method needed for a thorough understanding of *Chan* aesthetics.

NOTES:

1. (Original note :) This is a translation of "*Zen Geijutsu no Rikai*" (On the Understanding of Zen Art) from the author's book *Touyouteki Mu* ("Oriental Nothingness"), Kyoto: Kobundo-shobo, 1939, pp. 85-97. (Orig. n. ends.)

Translated by Richard DeMartino in collaboration with FUJIYOSHI Jikai and ABE Masao, and made public in *The Eastern Buddhist* vol. 1 no. 2, September 1966, p. 21-33; *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu*, Hozokan, Kyoto vol. five, pp. 93-101.

Revised by TOKIWA Gishin, the present version supplies the original translation with further notes for corrections and brief explanations, uses "*Chan*" for "*Zen*" except in "*Rinzai-zen*," replaces Chinese and Japanese characters by their romanized spellings, and uses *pinyin* for the spellings of Chinese words.

Illustrations omitted in this revised version for technical reasons are:

Bodhidharma by Hakuin (p. 23); *Shoukintei*, *Katsura Imperial Villa* (p. 26);
Persimmons by Muqi (p. 27); *Tea-bowl*, '*Goshomaru*' ware (ibid.); *Crane* by Muqi (p. 28);
Gin' (Singing) by Jiun (p. 29); and *Budai* by Liang Kai (p. 31).

2. The first of the six criteria for producing, appreciating, and criticizing paintings, mentioned by Xiehe, dates unknown, a Chinese painter of the Southern Qi Dynasty (479 –502), in his book *Guhuapinlu* ("A Record of Ancient Paintings Classified") is "permeation by grace and elegance (*qiyunshengdong*; *kiinseidou*).\" The other five criteria are; "the bones' way of brush application," "according with things in depicting forms," "following the type in bestowing colors," "managing the composition," and "handing down models by taking imitation.\" Cf. Shougakkan *Kokugodaijiten*, Tokyo 1981.
3. "Sesshuu" is a pen name of Touyou, 1420–1506, a Rinzai-zen priest, who had an inborn love of painting, and did not like reading scriptures. During the years of Kansei (1460–65) he went across to Ming China, and became the first-rank senior monk at the Jinde Temple of Mt. Tiantong. He is said to have remarked that he failed to meet any fine teacher of painting in the land of Ming, and that lands of scenic beauty were his only teachers. After returning to Japan, he abided in the Unkokuji, Suou Province, and then in the Daikian in Iwami. Famed for landscape painting, he also painted figures like Shakyamuni coming out of the mountain, Avalokitesvara, and Bodhidharma. In his *Zen and the Fine Arts* (*ZFA* hereafter), Kodansha International, Tokyo 1971, Hisamatsu takes up landscape paintings by Sesshuu (plates 3, 92, 93), but no figures by him at all. In this revised version "ou" and "uu" are used for transliteration of the two Japanese long vowels of "o" and "u" except for "Tokyo" and "Kyoto".
4. (Orig. n.): See Illustration 121 of *Oriental Ink-Painting* by Ernest Grosse.
5. Hakuin Ekaku, 1685–1768, a Rinzai-zen priest. "Hakuin" is one of his pen names. He invented the koan of the "sound of a single hand" at the age of sixty-four. Confer the plates 108, 111, and 113 in *ZFA* for Hakuin's painting of Bodhidharma.
6. Soga Dasoku (not Jasoku), ?–1483, a painter. Shuuyo was his name while Dasoku was his pen name. Cf. pl. 90, a portrait of Linji, by Dasoku in *ZFA*.
7. Shoukei, ?–1345, born of a painter's family, kept a taste for painting even after becoming a Rinzai-zen priest and serving as a secretary (*shoki*) at the Kenchouji, Kamakura.
8. "A Collection of Delights in *Chan*," a collection of prose and poetry on *Chan* by and anecdotes of Su Dongpo, 1046–1101, as well as of questions and answers between him and *Chan* master Foyin, ?–1098, nine volumes. Cf. Yanagida Seizan, *Zenke Goroku* II, Chikuma-shobo, Tokyo 1974.
9. A collection of poems of Hanshan, Shide, and Fengga, three hermits in Mt. Tiantai, one volume. The earliest publication of its extant text seems to have been in 1229. Cf. Yanagida, *Zenke Goroku* II.
10. "A Collection of Poems on Rivers and Lakes with Wind and Moon," an anthology of poetry and Buddhist verses by *Chan* priests toward the end of Song, compiled by Songpo Zongqi, a *dharma*-heir to Wuzhun Shifan, two volumes. Cf. Yanagida, *Zenke Goroku* II.
11. "A Collection of Model Expressions for *Chan* Rites in Chinese," compiled by Kokan Shiren, 1278–1346, a Gosan version, two volumes. Cf. *Zengaku Daijiten*, compiled at Komazawa University, Tokyo 1978.
12. A Chinese literature produced by Japanese Rinzai-zen priests who worked under

- the influence of Chinese literature while abiding in any of the five top temples and/or ten temples next high in official rank, in Kyoto, with three stages from the end of Kamakura toward the end of Muromachi periods. Cf. *Zengaku Daijiten*.
13. The original Japanese term "*kosoku-kien*" means "forefathers' words as norms" and their "occasions for Awakening." Their records are taken up for concentration in practice.
 14. Tetsuou Somon, 1791–1871, a Rinzai-zen priest.
 15. Gibon, 1750–1837, a Rinzai-zen priest. "Sengai" is one of his pen names.
 16. The word "twelfth" in the original translation was corrected to "twentieth."
 17. The Teiten or Teikoku-bijutsuin-tenrankai, Imperial Academy's art exhibition, began in 1919, changed its name in 1946 to the Nitten or Nihon-bijutsu-tenrankai, Japan Art Exhibition, and in 1958 became a non-official group named Shadanhoujin (the Juridical Corporate Association) Nitten. The Inten or Nihon-bijutsuin-tenrankai, Japan Art Institute exhibition, is a private group of painters, which started in 1898, as a reform movement of Japanese painting.
 18. Yoshimitsu, 1358–1408, the third Ashikaga *shogun*, had likings for poetry, music and art, and contributed to bringing in paintings from China to Japan in the Muromachi period. Hisamatsu's *ZFA* includes a plate of one of Yoshimitsu's paintings, "Du Zimei" (Du Fu, a poet of the Tang Dynasty) with ink on paper (pl. 89).
 19. Miyamoto Niten Musashi, 1584–1645, a renowned swordsman. *ZFA* includes plates of these two paintings.
 20. Iwasa Matabei Shouei, 1578–1650, a painter in the early Edo period. *ZFA* includes his "Hotei" (*Budai* pl. 100).
 21. Muqi is the pen name of Fachang, ?–1335/40, a *Chan* priest-painter. *ZFA* includes plates of his paintings, pls. 2, 55–72.
 22. "Gyokuen" is the pen name ("shi"; "-zi" in Chinese, is a title of respect) of Bonpou, dates unknown, in Muromachi period, a Rinzai-zen priest, *dharma*-heir to Shun'oku Myouha, 1311–88.
 23. Souami Shinsou, ?–1525, a painter who served the *shogun* Ashikaga Yoshimasa. See pls. 94–97 in *ZFA*.
 24. Isshi Bunshu, 1608–46, a Rinzai-zen priest.
 25. Jiun Onkou, 1718–1804, an excellent scholar of the Sanskrit studies.
 26. Nanke Genkou, 1538–1604, a Rinzai-zen priest. The Rinkain of Myoushinji was one of the temples founded for him by the contemporary political authorities.
 27. Liang Kai, Liang Fengzi in pen-name, dates unknown, was a painter-in-attendance at the Imperial Painting Academy during the Jiatai period (1201–04) of the Southern Song.
 28. The period between 1449, when Ashikaga Yoshimasa became the eighth *shogun*, and 1490, when he died.
 29. Shi Ke, dates unknown, painter of the Five Dynasties period, mid-tenth century. Pls. 33 and 34 in *ZFA*.
 30. Guanxiu, 832–912, a *Chan* priest, was good at poetry, calligraphy, and painting. King of Wuyue, the Qian family, respected him as "Great Master Chanyue." Pls. 29–32 in *ZFA*.

31. Kaou Sounen, ?–1345, a Japanese Rinzai–zen priest, who crossed to Yuan China around 1317, and after ten years' stay returned. Pl. 83 in *ZFA*.
32. Mokuan Reien, ?–1345 ?, a Japanese Rinzai–zen priest, who crossed to Yuan–China, and died there around 1345. Pl. 85 in *ZFA*.
33. Yintuoluo (Indra, in Sanskrit), mid–fourteenth century, Yuan Dynasty, was born, it is said, in India, came to China, and was head–priest of the Daguangjiao *Chan* temple in Bianliang, Honan. Pls. 78–82 in *ZFA*.
34. (Orig. n.): The reader is warned that the translations of these terms are necessarily tentative giving only the general sense of the original meanings. English renderings are too often negative in their connotation. These terms in Japanese are positive expressions that describe the qualities associated with *satire* experience.
35. In his letter dated February 23, 1976, Hisamatsu, in reply to Tokiwa's question, wrote : "Both *wabi* and *sabi* are values of a higher order which appear on the negation of worldly values like high ranks, glory, pomp, charm, etc. Now think of one who has renounced the world, one free from worldliness, a recluse ; the aged golden color, bright colors now patinated, the taste of crudeness rather than fineness, the gracefulness of dull finish, the tastefulness of ageing instead of youthfulness, the fun of asymmetry, old landscapes, etc. One could say *wabi* is more of a subject while *sabi* concerns an object." Then Hisamatsu cited examples of artistic works in his *ZFA* in which the two values were better expressed : (1) For *sabi*, pl. 16, Warikoudai–type tea bowl ; pl. 17, Goshomaru–type tea bowl ; pl. 114, Yang Ningshi, Excerpt from the *Shenxian–qijufa* ; pl. 55, Muqi, *Persimmons*. (2) For *wabi*, pls. 33–35, Shi Ke, *The Second Patriarch in Repose* ; pl. 6, Hakuin, the Character *Mu* ("No") ; pl. 40, Liang Kai, *The Sixth Patriarch Destroying the Sutra* ; pl. 45, Liang Kai, *Sage of Yaotai* ; Pls. 81, 82, Yintuoluo, *Hanshan and Shide* ; pl. 136, Hakuin, Sanskrit character. (3) For both *sabi* and *wabi*, pl. 37, Liang Kai, *Shâkyamuni Descending the Mountain* ; pl. 87, Josetsu, *Three Sages* ; pl. 152, Pillar and hearth for preparing tea, Sa'an tea room, Gyokurin'in Temple, Kyoto.
36. The previous rendering "but elegance" was replaced by the above, which is the final part of the final seven–character line of the four–lines of verse to praise Linji, who demonstrated his firm conviction to have realized the Buddha–*dharma* of his master Huangbo through rejecting help from his advisor Dayu by giving a few pokes to the other's side, a well–known verse by Baiyun Shouduan, 1025–72, *dharma*– heir to Yangqi Fanghui. (*Zokuzoukyou* 120–436b)

3. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF ORIENTAL NOTHINGNESS ¹

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI ²

Preface

What I should like to call Oriental Nothingness is, in my opinion, a Nothingness ("Nothing," "Non-Being," or "Not")³ peculiar to the Orient. It is, especially in contrast to Western culture, the fundamental moment of "Oriental" culture. I also consider it to be the core of Buddhism, and, moreover, the essence of *Chan*. Further, it is the living experience of Self-realization which constitutes the concrete base of my own religion and philosophy. I have from time to time already written about it in my various works according to the respective themes of those works. But since these treatments are fragmentary and un-integrated, I should like here to single out the characteristics of this Nothingness and to present, through a negative as well as a positive delineation of those characteristics, an all-inclusive explanation.

The mode of explanation thus employed is analytical and conceptual. It seeks to differentiate clearly Oriental Nothingness from other possible kinds of nothingness in order that it not be confused with them. Oriental Nothingness thus conceptualized and discriminated from other kinds of nothingness is, of course, not the true, concrete, living Nothingness. That it can not avoid being simply a shadow of the true Nothingness must be said to be a fate which a conceptual explanation can not escape.

In spite of this, however, throughout the centuries conceptual discourses concerning Oriental Nothingness have never been lacking. This, in part, is due to the mere conceptual demands and scholarly interests of men. But it must also be said to be due in large measure to a religious impulse. This is the religious impulse to provide an unerring signpost or exemplification for the one who, seeking to awaken to Himself, is trying to get into exact accord (p. 66) with Nothingness and to know it for himself very much as he would know for himself hotness and coldness. Descriptions of Nothingness by modern scholars usually result from an academic interest. The various patriarchs up to now, on the other hand, out of this impulse to help man come to his Self-realization, intentionally discriminated Nothingness, which is beyond discrimination, in the attempt to make a compass to sail the ocean of fog and to light a true beacon for the one seeking to awaken to Himself.

Consequently, although both patriarchs and scholars have engaged in this scholarly inquiry and conceptualization, we must recognize that there is between them a difference in their objective and in the nature of their concern. In so far, however, as Oriental Nothingness is being treated scholarly and conceptually, that it must be precisely discriminated goes without saying. For regardless of the extent to which it may derive

from the impulse to help man come to his Self-realization, if the treatment or presentation while taking a conceptual form lacks conceptual preciseness, it will fail even in its primary objective.

I. A Negative Delineation

What can that which I wish to call Oriental Nothingness be said not to be? Although one and the same term "nothingness" ("nothing," "non-being," or "not") is spoken of,⁴ the meanings in which this term is generally used are several. It is never used in any one sense alone. Accordingly, in order clearly to distinguish and explain what I am calling Oriental Nothingness, let us inquire whether its meaning is or is not to be found within the meanings for which the term "nothingness" is ordinarily employed. To do this, I should like to examine the meanings expressed by the term "nothingness" ("nothing," "non-being," or "not"), roughly dividing them into five.

The first is non-being or nothingness as the negation of being. This is non-being or nothingness in the sense that something -- whether something material or something spiritual -- which has being is negated, as, for example, in saying, "*There is no desk*," or, "*There is no pleasure*." That is, it is the non-being or nothingness in the case of "There is not [a certain subject]." This includes both the negation of some individual being, for example, "There is not this desk," or, "There is not this pleasure," and the negation of all being, as, for example, "There isn't anything," or "There is nothing at all."

The second is "not" or nothingness as a predicative negation, or, as a negative predicate. This is the "not" or nothingness of a negative predicate (p. 67) expression involving the copulative verb "to be," as, for example, "A desk is not a chair," or, "Pleasure is not grief." In this sense, unlike the first, the being of the desk is not negated, but the predication concerning the desk is negative. That is, this is the "not" or nothingness of "A is not B." This, again, includes both the case in which the predication concerning the subject is a particular or partial negation, as "A desk is not a chair," and the case in which the predication concerning the subject is a total negation, as, for example, "That isn't anything whatever," or, "That is nothing at all."

In this latter instance of total negation, once again, two possibilities must be distinguished. While, in the case of "This desk is not anything," the negation is total, it does not negate predication as such. However, in the case of "*Bhûta-tathatâ* (True Suchness) is not anything," this is not only a total negation in the sense that *Bhûta-tathatâ* is not anything else outside of *Bhûta-tathatâ*, but is also an absolute, total negation in the sense that *Bhûta-tathatâ* in Itself is beyond all predication.

The third meaning is non-being or nothingness as an abstract concept. This is not the "not" or nothingness of "There is not a certain subject," or "It is not a certain thing." This is rather non-being or nothingness in general, in contrast to being or somethingness in general. It is non-being or nothingness as an abstract logical concept, as in the

case of "Nothing is not something," or "Being does not arise from non-being."

The fourth is "not" or nothingness as a conjecture. This conjectured "not" or nothingness is the "not" or nothingness in the case in which something which in fact exists is entertained in thought as if it does not exist, as when, for example, I, at present living and existing, imagine myself as dead and not existing. This also includes both conjecturing that some individual being is not, as "This desk is not," or "I am not," and conjecturing that "The whole of being is not."

The fifth meaning is "not" or nothingness in the sense of the absence of consciousness. This is when as in deep sleep, faint,⁵ death, or an unconscious state of mind even though awake, a particular existence or the whole of existence is said not to be.

Thus the very same expression, "nothingness," ("nothing," "non-being," or "not") can be taken in various senses. But what I wish to call Oriental Non-Being or Nothingness is different from all of these.

Oriental Nothingness is not like nothingness in the first sense of the negation of being, in which either some particular being alone "is not" or the whole of being "is not." No one, of course, would think that the "not" or nothingness of "This desk is not," or "This pleasure is not," is, in any (p. 68) way, a peculiarly or uniquely Oriental Nothingness. When, however, Oriental Nothingness is expressed by such phrases as "The three worlds [of *samsara* beings, those of desire, form, and formlessness] are without anything graspable as something,"⁶ "All is *sûnya* (empty of their substance)," or "not a single thing,"⁷ one possibly may misunderstand Oriental Nothingness to mean that the whole of being is not.

Such expressions as "The three worlds are without anything graspable as something" and "not a single thing" taken literally do in fact mean that "the whole of being is not." To take Oriental Nothingness in this sense when expressed by such phrases is, therefore, not without reason. The expressions "The three worlds are without anything graspable as something" and "not a single thing," however, actually aver that "there is not one single thing -- whatever it may be -- which can be said to exist" in and for Oriental Nothingness-in-Itself or in-Its-Self-Inner-Realization. If, therefore, because of such expressions, Oriental Nothingness is understood simply as "There is nothing," this will not do. Through the centuries, falling into such a distorted understanding was strictly admonished by calling such an understanding "a literal-negative understanding," an "annihilating-nothingness view," or a "rigid-nothingness view."

In the second chapter, entitled "*Prajñâ*," of his *Platform Sutra* (*Liuzufabaotanjing*, T48, 350a) the Sixth Patriarch, Huineng (7th century), declares: "The Mind in its dimensions is broad and great, like empty-space.⁸ It has no sides or limits ; it is neither square nor round, neither large nor small. It is neither blue, yellow, red, nor white; it has neither upper nor lower; it is neither long nor short. It knows neither anger nor pleasure, neither right nor wrong, neither good nor evil. It is without beginning and without end. But good friends, do not, hearing me speak of emptiness, become attached to emptiness."

In Huangbo's *Wanling Record* (T48, 386b) also, it is written: "The Mind–Ground is like empty–space; it has neither form nor shape, it is without direction or location. But it is not nothing exclusively."

Again, Oriental Nothing is not nothing in the second sense of a negative predication. Probably no one would consider the "not" or negation in "A desk is not a chair" to be Oriental Nothing. If, however, one should say "not this, not that," or "not anything whatsoever," some might possibly wonder if such a "not" or nothingness is not Oriental Nothingness. But the predication "not anything whatsoever" can be asserted on any subject -- as, "This desk isn't anything whatsoever," or "That chair isn't anything (p. 69) whatsoever." Since, however, in the case of "this desk" and "that chair," these are things which are already in and of themselves delimited, although we may predicate "not anything whatsoever" on them just the same, this predication doesn't go any further than merely asserting that "It isn't anything whatsoever outside of itself; it is just what it is." This is not going beyond all predication absolutely. To be specifically delimited already necessitates having a predicate.

In the case, however, of "God is not anything whatsoever," this does not simply mean that "God is not anything outside of God; God is God." This rather has the meaning that "God is beyond all predicates." That is, "God is not anything whatsoever" is not merely a negative expression of the tautological law of identity, as is the statement "This desk isn't anything whatsoever [outside of itself]." It must rather be taken to mean that "God is beyond all delimitation." In Christianity as well, when it is said that "God isn't anything whatsoever," "God is not anything within the totality of all that is," that is, "God is nothing," it is meant in this sense.

Thus, with a finite, relative thing like a desk, since it is already delimited, the judgment "This desk isn't anything whatsoever" is not at all different from the judgment "This desk is this desk." As a judgment it has little value, amounting to no more than a mere tautology. But the judgment "God is not anything whatsoever" as a judgment about God's transcending delimitation, must be said to be, among all possible judgments, the judgment of highest value.

Such a statement as found in *The Mahayana Awakening of Faith* (*Dashengqixinlun*, T32, 576ab), "The Self–Nature of True *Tathatâ* (Suchness) is not with–form, is not without–form, is not not–with–form, is not not–without–form, is not both–with–and–without–form, is not one–and–the–same–form, is not different–forms, is not not–one–and–the–same–form, is not not–different–forms, is not both–one–and–the–same–and–different–forms," means that "The Self–Nature of True *Tathatâ* is finally and ultimately not anything whatsoever, that is, it is nothing."

This nothing is no other than the nothing meant in Christianity when God is referred to as beyond all predication, that is, as "nothing." The instances in Buddhism in which the term "nothing" is used in this sense, as the predication of Buddha–nature, True

Tathatâ, or *Nirvâna*, are extremely numerous. Such a nothing, however, is no more than the nothing of merely negative predication, meaning "not anything within all that is." This is not Oriental Nothing.

Oriental Nothing is Itself also beyond delimitation and beyond predication. (p. 70) It can, therefore, be said that "Oriental Nothing is not anything within all that is," that is, that "Oriental Nothing is nothing." But Oriental Nothing is not identical with this nothing of mere predicative negation or negative predication. If it were identical, there would be no reason especially to call it Oriental.

Oriental Non-Being or Nothingness, further, is not non-being or nothingness in the third sense, that is, in the sense of an abstract concept. Non-being or nothingness as an abstract concept is not non-being or nothingness as the negation of being, as in "There is not some particular thing," or "There is not any thing at all." Nor is it "not" or nothing as a negative predication, as in "It is not some particular thing," or "It is not anything at all." Rather, it is non-being or nothingness as a universal, just as "being" as an abstract concept does not mean "there being something," or "it being something," but means "being" as a universal.

Non-being or nothingness in the technical phrase "being and non-being," or in the proposition "Being is not non-being, non-being is not being," is not the non-being or nothingness of "there not being some particular thing," or of "it not being some particular thing." It is rather non-being or nothingness as a universal, and should be called non-being or nothingness as an abstract concept. This non-being, of necessity, is relative to being. If it is being, it is not non-being; if it is non-being, it is not being. There can not obtain both being and non-being at the same time.

Together with "being," such "non-being" or "nothing" is an indispensable logical category for the cognition or judgment of things. It may be said also that the being or non-being of a concrete thing is determined by these *a priori* forms or categories.

For Parmenides, "being" is that which fills up space and "non-being" is empty space. For Hegel, the unity of "being and non-being" is "becoming." This non-being, with both Parmenides and Hegel, is non-being as an abstract concept. Oriental Non-Being or Nothingness is not, as is non-being as an abstract concept, the mere non-being.

Oriental Nothingness or Non-Being is neither non-being as an *a priori* form, nor is it non-being which is defined in terms of an *a priori* form. Oriental Non-Being does not belong to the non-being in "being or nonbeing." It is rather Non-Being which goes beyond "being or non-being." It is in this sense that it is said that True *Tathatâ* belongs neither to being nor to non-being.

In the twenty-first fascicle of the *Nirvana Sutra* (*Niepanjing*, T12, No. 374, 487a) it is said : "Buddha-nature is not being and is not non-being."⁹ In the second fascicle of (p. 71) the *Shata Shâstra* (*Bailun*, T30, 181c) it is stated¹⁰: "It is because being and non-being are not existent at all." "Comment: In the truth of reality, as I have expounded in various

teachings, being and non-being are all empty of themselves, for, if being is non-existent, non-being is not existent, either. That is why "*being and non-being are not existent at all.*"

Such statements, as well as the term "*True Non-Being*," found in the *Zhaolun* (*Treatise by Sengzhao*, T45, 152a), have no other intention than to try to express the Non-Being which transcends being and non-being.

Oriental Nothingness is also not imagined or conjectured nothingness. We can imagine that the desk which is really here at present does not exist. If I give free rein intensively to my imaginative power, I can imagine that the desk which is actually present before my eyes here and now does not exist to the extent of my no longer being able to see it. It sometimes happens that when thinking intently that something is, what actually is not can be seen as if it were, and when thinking intently that something is not, what actually is can appear not to be. Thinking intently in this way, it can appear as if all things are not, that there is neither desk nor chair, neither floor nor house, neither earth nor heavens, neither body nor mind. For one intently thinking in this way there obtains one sort of the experience that "Everything is *sûnya* (empty of their respective self-nature)."

In the *samâdhi* attained when contemplating on Buddha by thinking of the major marks of the Buddha-figure and meditating upon them wholeheartedly, even while keeping the eyes open one comes to see the Buddha right before one's eyes. Similarly, the experience of "Everything is *sûnya*" just mentioned is, so to speak, a contemplated "Everything is *sûnya*." Corresponding to the contemplating or concentrating upon Buddha, it may also be possible to speak of contemplating or concentrating upon nothingness. Oriental Nothingness, however, is not such a contemplated nothingness. If it were, Oriental Nothingness would be no more than merely one subjective state of contemplation.

Oriental Nothingness is not anything like a subjective, contemplative state. Seen from the perspective of Oriental Nothingness, just as the contemplated Buddha is not the True Buddha, so the contemplated "Everything is *sûnya*" is not the True *Sûnya*. Oriental Nothingness is not the passive, contemplated state, but is rather the active, contemplating Mind. It is not, however, simply active contemplation. It is rather Subject-Nothingness, in which active and passive are one, and in which the duality of mind and object is left behind. (p. 72)

In Huangbo's *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission*, (*Chuanxinfayao*, T48, 381a) there is the statement: "Ordinary people cling to objects, while seekers after truth cling to the mind. Not clinging to or being confined by either mind or object is the True-*Dharma* (Awakened Truth)." This statement, as well as Linji's saying "'the very listening to the *dharma*'--itself"¹¹ and, in reply to a monk's question, "How can one see into the True Nature?" Dazhu's declaring that "Seeing is Itself the True Nature"¹² must all be said to have a reason.

Whether speaking of "mind" or of "seeing," if they are externalized or objectified, they are no longer the true "Mind" or the true "Seeing." It must be said, as was said by the lay follower Pang: "I only ask you to void that which is, but please take care not to reify or be captured by that voidness."¹³

Oriental Nothingness is not, again, nothingness in the fifth sense of unconsciousness. Deep sleep, fainting, and death cannot be said to be exactly the same states. However, these states are the same in so far as there is in each of them nothing of which we are conscious. That is, for us at such times there is nothing. Everything has completely disappeared. In each of these states, not alone the things of the natural world but even one's body and one's mind are not present. Such a world may probably also be called a world of nothingness.

Since, however, our consciousness is not functioning, such a nothingness is no more than our not being conscious of anything -- not even of the nothingness. In this regard this is different from conjectured or imagined nothingness as in the fourth sense. With imagined nothingness, the imaginative function of consciousness is at work, and so there is a conscious nothingness, the object of that imagination. But with unconscious nothingness, since the function of consciousness is completely non-operative, nothingness does not become an object of consciousness. Oriental Nothingness, however, is not this kind of nothingness.

Oriental Nothingness is "perfectly lucid and clear," is "thoroughly clear ever-present awareness," that is, is that of which we are most clearly aware. Although I say "we are clearly aware," this is not an awareness in which nothingness is external or objective, different from the one who is aware. This is rather an awareness in which subject and object are one. That is, Oriental Nothingness is that awareness of Oneself in which the subject and object of awareness are one and not two.

In this sense, in its being aware of Itself by Itself, it must be said that Oriental Nothingness knows Itself. Oriental Nothingness is not the same as (p. 73) our -- when we are unconscious -- not being conscious of anything. If it were the same nothingness as obtains when we are unconscious, then we should be able to come to Oriental Nothingness through sleep, fainting, or death. No matter whether we speak of Oriental Nothingness as "No-Mind," "No-Consciousness," the "Great Death Itself," or "*Nirvâna*," it is not the unconsciousness of sleep, fainting or ordinary death.

But even further, "No-Mind" or "No-Consciousness" is penetratingly clear to a degree which is absolutely impossible in any other state. It does not permit the slightest obscurity or turbidity. It has the absolute clarity of a polished mirror or an autumn moon. Whatever other condition one may speak of, there is no condition in which one is so clearly aware as in that of "No-Mind" or "No-Consciousness," and there is no time when life is so alive and so ready to burst as in the "Great Death Itself." Although Baizhang Huaihai said "Do not remember anything at all,"¹⁴ and Huangbo said "subject and object are both

forgotten,"¹⁵ this is not a blank loss of consciousness. On the contrary, this is rather Supreme Awareness in which there is not the slightest unawareness or unclarity.

Again, although Huaihai said "The Mind, like wood and stone, harbors no discrimination," and Huangbo said, "Inner and outer, body and mind, all cast away together,"¹⁶ and Dôgen said "to stop the working of the mind and its consciousness,"¹⁷ these statements do not mean to become something without consciousness, like wood or stone. Nor do they mean to dissolve consciousness, get rid of the body and psyche, and die.

Bodhidharma, similarly, counseled the Second Patriarch, Huike, saying, "Outwardly bring an end to all contingencies, inwardly the mind is to be without disturbance. With the mind being like a wall, one can then enter into the Awakened Way."¹⁸ But this, too, is not saying to become unconscious. As Huike truly understood and actually realized, this was instructing him to become the "No-Mind" of "thoroughly clear ever-present awareness."¹⁹

When the term *ekstasis* from Western mysticism is translated into Japanese by such an expression as "to be bereft of one's senses," it is sometimes understood in the sense of the divine inspiration or the divine possession of a spiritual medium who proclaims, in a state of unconsciousness, God's word. However, the *ekstasis* or *unio-mystica* of Oriental Nothingness is neither "divine possession" nor "a state of bewitchment." Rather, it must always be the Nothingness-*Samâdhi* of "thoroughly clear ever-present awareness," in which subject and object are not two. The *samâdhi* of Oriental Nothingness is Formless-*Samâdhi*, True-*Sûnya-Samâdhi*, True-*Tathatâ-Samâdhi*, Sovereign(p.74)-*Samâdhi*, One-Form-*Samâdhi*, One-Act-*Samâdhi*.

In the above discussion, I have particularly taken up five meanings of the term nothingness which are especially liable to be misunderstood as and confused with the meaning of Oriental Nothingness. At any rate, I have re-surveyed the fact that these meanings of "nothingness" ("nothing," "non-being," or "not") differ from the meaning of Oriental Nothingness. But to the extent that these other five meanings of nothingness can be easily confused with the meaning of Oriental Nothingness, they must contain certain similarities to Oriental Nothingness. Indeed, once Oriental Nothingness has truly come "to be known in itself in its coldness and hotness,"²⁰ these other meanings may then become suitable verbal media through which to express it.

It is for this reason that in spite of the fact that it is different from the first meaning of nothingness as the negation of being, Oriental Nothingness has, from long past, been fondly expressed by such phrases as "not a single thing" and "There is nothing at all." It is for this same reason that in spite of the fact that it is different from the second sense of "not" or nothing as a negative predication, it has been fondly expressed by such phrases as "neither this nor that," "not anything whatsoever," and "going beyond the four logical propositions [: is, is not, both is and is not, neither is nor is not,] and the hundred negations." Again, in spite of the fact that it is different from the third sense of nothing-ness as an

abstract concept it has been fondly expressed in negatives such as "*wu (mu)*," "*kong (kû ; sūnya)*," "*fei (hi)*," and "*bu (fu)*." Once more, in spite of the fact that it is different from the fourth sense of conjectured nothingness, it has fondly been said, "Intensely concentrating upon nothingness, enter into nothingness—*samâdhi*," or "Contemplate upon nothingness." And, finally, it is for the same reason that in spite of the fact that it is different from the fifth sense of unconscious nothingness, it has been fondly expressed by such phrases as "No-Consciousness," "No-Mind," "Not-Conscious," "like wood and stone," the "Great Death Itself," and "*Nirvâna*." If we do not employ nothingness in these above meanings as media, the term Oriental Nothingness itself can not be established, and one, in trying to express Oriental Nothingness conceptually, would certainly encounter many inconveniences and constrictions.

Since, however, Oriental Nothingness should be thoroughly and completely "known in itself in its coldness and hotness," Huangbo taught in his *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission* (T48, 382c): "This Awakened Way is original truth ; in its origin it has no name. It is only because people of the world do not understand, are unawakened, and (p. 75) are in a state of clinging-attachment that the various Buddhas appear, and, fearing that you people will not understand, provisionally set up names for the Awakened Way in order to tell what it really is.²¹ But do not stick to the names and thereby produce misunderstanding." If, therefore, one simply clings to the conceptual expression and tries to understand Oriental Nothingness, or if one begins and ends with searching within the words, even though one struggle through the three infinite *kalpas* of time, one will never be able to grasp it.

To say that Oriental Nothingness must be "known in its coldness and hotness" is quite different in its import from saying that there isn't anything, in so far as it is actually experienced, that is not "known in its coldness and hotness." With Oriental Nothingness, its being "known in itself in its coldness and hotness" is in its very nature an essential necessity. With ordinary things, however, since they are particular, de-limited things, they can be taken hold of and conceptualized. So, too, their being "known in themselves in their coldness and hotness" -- that is, in experience -- can also, in its essential nature as an experience, be grasped and conceptualized. But since Oriental Nothingness, not being anything, is, also, not de-limited, its "Experience" in its essential nature goes beyond being grasped and goes beyond conceptualization. In this sense it must be said to be a "being known in itself in its coldness and hotness" which completely transcends expression.

Thus, for example, in saying that water or fire is "known in itself in its coldness and hotness" and in saying that *Chan* is "known in itself in its coldness and hotness," while the expressions are the same, the meanings are essentially different. As for "being known in itself in its coldness and hotness," in the case of water or fire this is not different in essence from the matter of their conceptualization. With *Chan*, however, the "being known

in itself in its coldness and hotness" for the first time becomes really apt, and, further, only in such a case does its difference from the matter of conceptualization for the first time become clear. "Being known in itself in its coldness and hotness" can genuinely be said only as regards that which cannot be conceptualized. The expressions found in the *Lankâvatâra Sutra*, "not even one word spoken,"²² and in *The Mahayana Awakening of Faith*, "True *Tathatâ* apart from words,"²³ also were uttered in regard to that which truly goes beyond conceptual discrimination. (p. 76)

II. A Positive Delineation

A. The "Not a Single Thing" Nature of Oriental Nothingness

Why is it that, as I have just indicated, in spite of the fact that Oriental Nothingness is not simply the same as nothingness as the negation of being, from times past it has so often been expressed in terms of nothingness as the negation of being -- to such an extent as to be thought almost to be the same? This is because Oriental Nothingness does have a characteristic which is best able to be expressed by nothingness in this sense. The "not a single thing" nature of Oriental Nothingness now being considered here refers to this characteristic. The "not a single thing" nature of Oriental Nothingness means that as regards that which is generally said "to be," there is *in and for* Oriental Nothingness not one single such thing.

Although saying there is not even one single thing, this does not mean simply that "Individual things severally are not (this is not and that is not)," or that "Everything jointly is not (there is nothing at all)." It rather means that it is *in and for* Oriental Nothingness that there is nothing whatsoever. Oriental Nothingness is not an objective world outside of me like an empty space in which there is not one single thing. Oriental Nothingness is the Nothingness-state of Myself, that is, it is no other than Myself being Nothingness. There being nothing whatsoever *in and for* Oriental Nothingness must mean, in other words, that there is nothing whatsoever in Myself.

When I say there is nothing whatsoever in Myself, this might be taken to mean that there is something on the outside of myself. But my saying here that there is nothing whatsoever in Myself, does not mean that there is nothing whatsoever in some internal world standing in contradistinction to what is usually called the external world. In saying that there is nothing whatsoever in Myself, this "Myself" goes beyond internal and external. There is nothing whatsoever in Myself, consequently, rather than meaning that there is nothing whatsoever in some "internal" which stands in contradistinction to "external," means that there is nothing whatever wherever. And, again this nothing whatever wherever is I, Myself. I, Myself, am this nothing whatever wherever.

Nothing whatever wherever being Myself and Myself being nothing whatever wherever is Oriental Nothing. Nothing whatever wherever which is not Myself is no more than merely empty space. The myself which is not nothing whatever wherever is no more than

merely a mental or physical something which "is." Neither can be called Oriental Nothing. (p. 77)

Ordinarily, within -- and for -- oneself there obtain the various contents of the "internal" and "external" worlds, such that it can never be said about oneself that there is not even one single thing. If not externally seeing colors or hearing sounds, then we are internally lamenting, rejoicing, or thinking about something. It may be said that there is almost no time when one is not entertaining some internal or external object. The ordinary "I," therefore, is an "I" which is always connected with an object. This is the reason that consciousness is said to be of the nature of *noema-noesis*. Such an "I" is an "I" which can not but be limited by color when seeing color, by sound when hearing sound, by evil when thinking of evil, and by good when thinking of good. It is an "I" which is always limited and captured by the "internal" and "external" realms, that is, by objects. In external appearance, this "being captured" and the state of *samâdhi* may appear to be similar. But while they may seem to be similar, they are not, for in the case of a genuine *samâdhi* state, the base is different.

[What is referred to in *Chan* as] the so-called "spirit dependent upon grass or attached to trees" is no other than the "I" which has internal and external objects, and which, because of those objects, is changing and impermanent, going through the process of birth and death. Because, in having a physical body and having a mind, I am captured by them, I think that with the death of the body, I die and that with the extinction of the mind, I am extinguished. The "I" which is captured by wealth or fame and becomes the same thing as the wealth or fame, the "I" which is captured by the Buddha and becomes the same thing as the Buddha, the "I" which is captured by nothingness, if we speak of nothingness, and becomes the same thing as nothingness, and the "I" which is captured by "nothing whatever wherever," if we speak of that, and becomes the same thing as that, are all no other than "I"s which are shackled and "spirits which are dependent upon grass or attached to trees." But, on the contrary, the "I" which does not have an object, the "I" which does not have a single thing, is the "I" which is no longer dependent upon or attached to anything. It is the "I" which is not of the nature of *noema-noesis*.

When we say there is nothing whatsoever in Myself, some may question, is there not therein still the consciousness of "there is nothing whatsoever," which, in that case, is the *noema*, and, further, as regards this *noema* is there not then also a *noesis*. "There is nothing whatsoever in Myself," however, is not an objectifying consciousness which makes "there is nothing whatsoever" into an object. If it is, it is not what I am calling the true "there is not a (p. 78) single thing." The true "there is not a single thing" is I, Myself, and not my objective world.

That which has become an object to me is already a being, and, further, is a something which has captured me. Even though one says "there is not a single thing," if objectified, in fact it is not that "there is not a single thing." When objectified, "there is not a

single thing" finally becomes itself one thing, albeit called "there is not a single thing." If I am truly not a single thing, I am not delimited or captured by any-thing; I am absolutely free and unbounded. And, furthermore, since this "I" is beyond internal and external, it is One-Alone -- or "Only-One."

The numerical "one" is a unit, and although we say one, since there are many such units, we can not say one is "only one." "Only one" must be Myself as "not a single thing," that is, "Myself" beyond internal and external. Huineng, the Sixth Patriarch, said (T48, 350a) : "The Mind-dimension is broad and great, like empty-space. It is without boundaries." He further said (Ibid., 356c) : "Your True Nature is like empty-space. Realizing that there is not one single thing to be seen is called Right-Seeing." Again, in *the Poem on the Realization of the Way* (Zhengdaoge, T48, 396c) and in *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission* (T48, 383c) it is said : "In clearly Seeing there is not one single thing -- neither man nor Buddha." These expressions all refer to this "I" of not a single thing. The Sixth Patriarch's "One-Direct-Mind" (T48, 352c) is also no other than this "I."

One-Direct-Mind does not mean a moral, honest mind but must be taken to mean a Straightforward-Mind which is not captured by any-thing. The mind when captured swerves to the right and swerves to the left and can not be straightforward. A mind which is captured by color, by sound, by falsehood, by evil, or even by truth or by goodness can hardly be called a direct-straightforward mind. The Mind of "not a single thing" alone is a mind which is not captured. If it is this Mind which in its Nature is "not a single thing," there is no way for it even to attract dust.

The Mind which is "the not being caught up in the thinking of good and evil" is the Direct-Mind. Further, since it is One-Alone and not many, it is called One-Direct-Mind. Also, it is such a Mind of the nature of "not a single thing" which for the first time can be, as Linji has said, a free mind which, "entering into color, is not deluded by color, entering into sound, is not deluded by sound"²⁴ and entering into the good, is not deluded by the good. It is only with this Free-Mind of "not a single thing" as a base that there (p. 79) can truly occur "the non-obtaining of any obstacle between any thing and any other thing (*shishiwuai; jijimuge*)," the "*samâdhi* of permeating each and every dust-particle (*chen-chen-sanmei; jinjinzanmai*)," and the "*samâdhi* of free-unattached-play (*yoxi-sanmei; yugezanmai*)."

Such *samâdhi* as last mentioned have a completely different base from the state of being captured by some thing and, thus captivated by it, blindly entering into it. In contrast to a state of being captured, only such *samâdhi* as above mentioned can genuinely be called *samâdhi*. But while these *samâdhi* are genuine *samâdhi*, they are not simply of the nature of "not a single thing," but are rather the operation of "not a single thing" in and among "things." Consequently, since they involve some particular form-contents of color or sound or goodness, they are individualized *samâdhi*, phenomenal *samâdhi*.

The Mind of "not a single thing" in Itself, however, being thoroughly without internal or external and without limitation or boundary, is One-Alone, going completely beyond any subject and any object. It is not, therefore, an individual or phenomenal *samâdhi*, but is rather "One-Alone-Samâdhi," "One-Form-Samâdhi," "One-Act-Samâdhi," and is truly Sovereign-Samâdhi. It is only because they are based on this Sovereign-Samâdhi that the "various vassal- *samâdhi*" are for the first time made possible.

Indeed, it is exactly according to whether or not its base is this Sovereign-Samâdhi that being captured by a thing and clinging to it can be differentiated from truly being a thing's *samâdhi*. It is for this reason *The Mahayana Awakening of Faith* declares (T32, 582b) that it is based on "One-Act-Samâdhi," that is, "True-Tathatâ-Samâdhi," that the "innumerable-*samâdhis*" arise.

It is with this very same meaning that the Sixth Patriarch has said (T48, 361ab): "If you wish to realize the [Buddha's] all-knowing-wisdom,²⁵ you must reach One-Form-Samâdhi, One-Act-Samâdhi. If in all places you do not abide in form,²⁶ and if, as regards all forms that are, you do not give rise to either love or hate, and if, further, there is no accepting or rejecting, if you do not think of profit, coming to be, passing away, and such things, if you are peaceful, tranquil, unimpeded, and unconcerned, this is called One-Form-Samâdhi. If, in all places, whether in walking, resting, sitting, or lying, you are the pure One-Direct-Mind, and if, without moving from the seat of Awakening, you truly establish the Pure Land, this is called One-Act-Samâdhi."

Mazu (8th century) also has said, "Here, in Myself, I do not have even one single thing."²⁷ This "I" is the "I" of "in all places not having anything." "Not having even one single thing," as is said in the *Records* (p. 80) *Mirroring the Original Source* (*Zongjinglu*), fascicle six as well, is not the same as "the hollow emptiness of the great void, which is vacuous and un-knowing" [, which is criticized by the compiler Yongming there (T48, 448c)].²⁸ It is one's Self "not having even one single thing."

In the *Night Talks at the Tôkai [Temple]* (*Tôkaiyawa*) by Takuan²⁹ it is stated: "The Confucians misunderstand Emptiness and slander it. When speaking of Emptiness, they think it to mean there is simply nothing whatever and speak from this misunderstanding Rather, nothing being left in the Mind is called Emptiness. Again, the mind is an actor which performs every role.... The Mind being left with no role is called Emptiness.... Its not being restricted by any one role is called Emptiness." What is here called "Emptiness" is no other than the Mind of the nature of "not a single thing."

B. The "Empty-Space"³⁰ Nature of Oriental Nothingness

Oriental Nothingness, as just indicated, possesses a characteristic such as has, from the past, been expressed by the phrase "not a single thing." But it further possesses a characteristic such as has been expressed by the term "empty-space." This characteristic I shall call its "empty-space" nature. Why then is Oriental Nothingness expressed by this

term? In order to make this clear, let us first consider the meanings which are embraced by the term "empty-space."

Yongming in his *Records Mirroring the Original Source*, fascicle six (T48, 446c), quoting from the *Commenting on the Mahayana Shastra (Shimoheyanlun)* fascicle three, says that "empty-space" has ten meanings. The first is the meaning of no-obstruction. This means that in and among the various things of form empty-space knows no obstruction. The second is the meaning of omnipresence. This means that there is no point not reached by empty-space. The third is the meaning of impartiality. This means that empty-space is impartial, showing no instance of choosing. The fourth is the meaning of being broad and great. This means that empty-space is broad and great, having no limits. The fifth is the meaning of being formless. This means that empty-space is formless, going beyond *rûpa* (corporeal)-forms. The sixth is the meaning of purity. This means that empty-space is pure, having no worldly dust.³¹ The seventh is the meaning of stability. This means that empty-space is stable, that is, without coming to be or passing away. The eighth is the meaning of the voiding of being. This means that empty-space destroys the existence of any measure.³² The ninth is the meaning of the voiding of voidness. (p. 81) This means that empty-space is not attached to its voidness. The tenth is the meaning of no-obtainment. This means that empty-space can not be clung to.

If we deliberate and analyze in further detail, there will probably be many other meanings of the term "empty-space." In general, however, it may be said to have these ten implications or meanings. And since Oriental Nothingness possesses characteristics similar to these meanings, it has, from the past, often come to be spoken of as "like empty-space."

In the "Night-Sitting *Gâthâ* (Verse) (*Yezuoji*)" contained in the *Treatise on the Awakening to -- and of -- the Buddha Nature (Wuxinglun)* it is said (T48, 373a) : "[In the midnight:] the Mind is pure like empty-space. It permeates the ten directions. There is no place it does not penetrate. Mountains, rivers, and stone walls do not obstruct it. Worlds as numerous as the sands of the river Ganges are contained in it." This *gâthâ* expresses the fact that the Mind, that is, Oriental Nothingness, possesses characteristics corresponding to the first, second, and sixth meanings of empty-space, unobstructedness, all-pervasiveness, and purity.

In the *Discourse on the Direct-Lineage of the Dharma (Xuemailun)*, T48, 376a) it is written: "This Mind is without form, without cause and effect, without sinew or bone. It is like empty-space. It can not be taken hold of." This expresses the fact that the Mind or Oriental Nothingness possesses characteristics corresponding to the fifth and tenth meanings of empty-space, formlessness and unattainability.

In *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission* (T48, 379c) it is affirmed: "This Mind from the beginningless past never is born, never passes away. ...It is like empty-space, which is without spatial or temporal limitations and can not be measured." This

treatise also states (Ibid., 380a) that "*Tathatâ* in Itself, innerly, is like wood and stone. It is without commotion; it does not vacillate. ...Outerly, it is like empty-space. It does not shut off; it does not obstruct." In the *Lankâvatâra Sutra* it is declared (T16, 500b): "There is no Mind-dimension of Mind."³³ These statements express the fact that the Mind possesses characteristics corresponding to the first, fourth, seventh, and eighth meanings of empty-space, unobstructedness, unlimitedness, stability, and the voiding of being.

In the *Sixth Patriarch's Platform Sutra* we find the expression (T48, 358a): "The Mind is like empty-space, but does not have the dimension even of empty-space." And, again (Ibid.): "The Mind is like empty-space, but does not stick to a fixed emptiness-perspective." In *Verses on the Faith-Mind (Xinxinming)* it is asserted (T48, 376c): "Not even (p. 82) the one is held on to."³⁴ These statements express the fact that the Mind possesses the characteristic corresponding to the ninth meaning of empty-space, the voiding of voidness, that is, the emptying even of emptiness.

Such expressions concerning Mind as "taking the form of whoever comes, a non-native or a native Han"³⁵ and "the state of simply detesting discrimination"³⁶ express the fact that the Mind possesses the characteristic corresponding to the third meaning of empty-space, impartiality.

The term empty-space, besides these ten meanings, probably also includes the meanings of "One-Alone" and "without inner or outer." "One-Alone" means that empty-space is only one and not two. "Without inner or outer" means that empty-space has no outer, that it is only "inner." But if it is "only inner," it can not even be said to be "inner." "Only inner" really means to transcend outer and inner. To speak of Oriental Nothingness as "Only this One-Mind," "One-Direct-Mind," "'without two'-ness," or "the One-Form of the *Dharma*-World" is to liken it to the "One-Alone" nature of empty-space. To speak of Oriental Nothingness as "one perfectly round light having neither inner nor outer,"³⁷ "the *Dharma*-World of True *Tathatâ*, without either self or other,"³⁸ "For this Mind there is neither inside, outside, nor middle; in fact, there is neither place nor direction,"³⁹ is to liken it to the "without inner or outer" nature of empty-space.

Thus, Oriental Nothingness, in its characteristics, closely resembles empty-space. When we find such a statement by Huangbo in his *Wanling Record* (T48, 387a) as, "The sphere of empty-space exhausting the ten quarters is from the first one's own 'One-Mind in Itself'. However you may move or act, how can you in those movements or actions ever be separated from empty-space?" or, as in his *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission* (T48, 381a), "The *dharmakâya* (the body as Awakening itself) is empty-space. Empty-space and the *dharmakâya* do not have different forms," it might be thought that empty-space and the One-Mind are exactly the same thing. It need not be said, however, that the One-Mind, that is, Oriental Nothingness, is not the same thing as empty-space.

Oriental Nothingness and empty-space do have similar characteristics, and to this extent may seem to be the same thing. But, of course, Oriental Nothingness is not the

same as empty-space, which has neither awareness nor life. Oriental Nothingness is the One who is "always clearly aware." Therefore it is called "Mind," "Self," or the "True Man."

In the *General Preface to the Collection of Various Expressions Concerning Chan Fundamentals* (*Chanyuanzhuquanji-duxu*,⁴⁰ T48, 404c-405a) (p. 83) it is said: "The meaning is that True-Nature is not the same as empty-space, wood, or stone. Therefore, it is called Awareness."⁴¹ And, again, in the *Records Mirroring the Original Source*, fascicle six, it is stated (T48, 448c):⁴² "Mind is its name, awareness its identity."⁴³ The nature of Awareness, which is beyond conceptual-differentiation, is that it directly knows Itself in and through Itself. It is not like ordinary consciousness or knowing, which is a conditioned, object-dependent, intentional knowing. It is not, however, identical with the hollow emptiness of the great void, which is vacuous and unknowing." This is no other than an expression of the fact that the Mind is not the same as mere empty-space, which is vacuous and unaware.

Huangbo also in many places employs the mode of expression, "Mind is like empty-space...." But it can never be said that he ever suggests Mind and empty-space to be one and the same thing. We do find him, as already noted, sometimes using such expressions as, "The sphere of empty-space is from the first one's own 'One-Mind in Itself,'" and "the *dharmakâya* is empty-space." When, however, we also observe that he clearly states that "What is meant by the figurative expression 'the *dharmakâya* is empty-space; empty-space is the *dharmakâya*' is to say that the Buddha's true *dharmakâya* is like empty-space," or, again, that "*Buddhakâya* is without intentionality. It does not fall into diversity. Provisionally, I use the analogy of empty-space," it is understood that empty-space, as regards the *dharmakâya*, is simply a simile. It is also understood why this must be said to be different from pantheism, in which the spatial world itself is God.

Thus, Oriental Nothingness is not the same thing as empty-space. Since, however, Oriental Nothingness does possess characteristics such as may be likened to empty-space, I may now try to explain these "like empty-space" characteristics in terms of the previously noted ten meanings of empty-space. Oriental Nothingness in its nature of course goes beyond all forms and differentiations. This, therefore, is no more than an analogical consideration of Oriental Nothingness in terms of the various differentiations of the phenomenal world.

1. That Oriental Nothingness is without obstruction means that Oriental Nothingness, like empty-space, is not obstructed by any of the various internal and external phenomena. The freedom or emancipation quality of Oriental Nothingness derives from this. Oriental Nothingness is in everything, but is not obstructed by anything; it contains everything within it, but does not retain a trace of anything contained. In this it is like empty-space.

2. That Oriental Nothingness is omnipresent means that, like empty-space, Oriental Nothingness permeates all phenomena -- regardless of whether they are distant or

near, large or small, deep or shallow, coarse or fine, bright or (p. 84) dark. Oriental Nothingness not only permeates all material things as does mere empty-space, but Oriental Nothingness permeates all mental phenomena as well, and is thus even more all-pervading than empty-space. It is precisely Oriental Nothingness which can be said to be that which is truly omnipresent.

3. That Oriental Nothingness is impartial means that, like empty-space, Oriental Nothingness "only detests discrimination." For it "all things being without fault,"⁴⁴ it accepts equally the pure and the defiled, it welcomes similarly the noble and the base, it treats in the same way good and evil, it sees alike the true and the false, it accommodates together the ordinary man and the saint, it neither takes hold of [one] nor casts away [another].

4. That Oriental Nothingness is broad and great means that it is the whole, there not being anything "other" or "outside." Oriental Nothingness is not limited by anything "other," and, therefore, is without delimitation or termination. This not only means the spatial unlimitedness of empty-space, but also means temporal eternity. No! It is more than that. It should rather be said that, on the contrary, spatial unlimitedness as well as temporal eternity both derive from the *"proto"-temporal and "proto"-spatial* limitlessness of Oriental Nothingness. Buddha is spoken of as being broad and great without boundaries precisely because the True Buddha is no other than this Oriental Nothingness.

5. That Oriental Nothingness is formless means that Oriental Nothingness has neither spatial-material form nor temporal-mental form. This not having form is not meant in the usual sense in which things are considered to have form and mind not to have form. Seen from the Formlessness of Oriental Nothingness, even mind, which ordinarily is said not to have form, still has the form of mind. It is difficult, therefore, to say that the ordinary mind is really formless. Other than Oriental Nothingness, there isn't anything which can truly be spoken of as formless.

6. That Oriental Nothingness is pure means that, not being any-thing material or mental, Oriental Nothingness is completely beyond delimitation, and hence is not only in itself not defiled, but can never become defiled by anything else. As for the things which are ordinarily called pure, since they are all delimited in some way, they can not be said to be of true, absolute purity. To be delimited already in itself means to be defiled. That which is some-thing -- even without being defiled by something else -- is, by its very being something, already in itself of contamination and defilement. Even such a thing as is called a Buddha -- if it is some-thing -- is of defilement. For this reason, even as regards those things which are ordinarily (p. 85) called pure, there is not one which can genuinely be called pure. Oriental Nothingness, which is beyond all delimitation, is alone the truly pure, the truly undefiled. True purification is realized for the first time when I am neither a material something nor a mental something, when I am beyond all delimitation.

7. That Oriental Nothingness is stable means that since Oriental Nothingness is

without beginning and without end, is un-born and un-dying, it is, therefore, without becoming or decaying. Since it is beyond left and right and beyond upper and lower, there is no way for it to waiver or to vacillate. That stability which stands in contrast to instability is no more than merely a temporary and provisional state, and can not really be called stability. True stability must be totalistic, beyond "other" or "outer." If it does not transcend time and space and contain them within itself, it is not truly stable. Only that which does transcend time and space can validly be called serenity or peace of mind. To the extent that I am body or mind in the usual sense, genuine stability does not realize itself within me.

8. That Oriental Nothingness is the voiding of being means that Oriental Nothingness can not be measured spatially or geometrically in terms of metric, dry, or liquid measurement, nor can it be evaluated according to the standard of truth or beauty. It is here that there is established the ultimate meaning of completely going beyond discrimination and measurement.

9. That Oriental Nothingness is the voiding of voidness means that although Oriental Nothing is said to be Nothing, it is not the nothing of "something and nothing." Transcending being and non-being, it is neither some-thing nor nothing. Since it is Nothing as Non-Abiding-Subjectivity, which is completely beyond all delimitation, it neither abides in something nor does it abide in no-thing. If it is a nothing which sticks fast to nothingness, it is none other than a nothing which stands in opposition to something and is not Oriental Nothing. In this characteristic of Oriental Nothing lies the basis of the True Buddha's not abiding in -- or clinging to -- even *Nirvâna*. A *Nirvâna* which clings to or abides in itself is an extinction which stands in contrast to life and is not True *Nirvâna*.

10. That Oriental Nothingness is without that which is obtainable means that since Oriental Nothingness is of the nature of not [being or having] a single thing, it neither has any "other" thing nor does it even have itself. It is completely without anything "obtained." It is here that there is established the meaning of the True Buddha's being without anything obtained, being unobtainable, being without greed, being of absolute poverty, and being without merit-accumulation. (p. 86)

C. The "Mind-in-Itself" Nature of Oriental Nothingness

As related above, since Oriental Nothingness possesses characteristics which closely resemble those of empty-space, it has frequently been explained through the use of the analogy of empty-space. But since empty space, of course, is not Oriental Nothingness, Oriental Nothingness can not be fully exemplified by empty-space. The principal feature not exemplified by empty-space is the "Mind-in-Itself" nature of Oriental Nothingness. That is to say, Oriental Nothingness possesses a characteristic akin to that which we ordinarily call mind, which characteristic is not served by the simile of empty-space.

It is said that in addition to man higher beings among animals as well possess mind, and that the beginnings of mind are seen also among the lower forms of life. Empty-space, on the other hand, is not only completely without mind, but, moreover, does not have the slightest feature to be called life, which is possessed by even a micro-organism. In this regard, too, it can be said that empty-space is most inadequate as an analogy for Oriental Nothingness, and that, from the aspect of it possessing life, indeed a micro-organism would be more appropriate.

Oriental Nothingness is, thus, in no sense inanimate like empty-space. It is living. Not only is it living, it also possesses mind. Nor does it merely possess mind; it possesses self-consciousness. That is to say, it has all of the aspects and qualities of mind. Such phrases in *Chan* as "Right-*Dharma*-Eye-Treasury, *Nirvâna*-Wondrous-Mind," "directly pointing to the Mind of man, realizing Its Nature, and attaining Buddhahood," "a transmission from-Mind-to-Mind," "it is the straightforward Mind which is the seat of Awakening," "Self-Mind is Buddha," "Mind-in-Itself is Buddha," "there is no *Dharma* outside of Mind," "Pure-Mind," "Unattainable Mind," "Mind-*Dharma*," "Mind-Nature," "Mind-Source," "Mind-Ground," and "Mind-Itself" all express this "Mind-in-Itself" nature of Oriental Noth-ingness.

Not only in *Chan*, but in Buddhism in general, while likening the True Buddha to empty-space, that it is said, nevertheless, that Buddha is "Mind-Itself" or "Awareness-Itself" attests to the fact that Buddha is mind-like.

Although Oriental Nothingness is said to be mind-like, it can not be said to be exactly the same as what we ordinarily call mind. Mind, in saying that Oriental Nothingness is mind, is Mind which is, again, to be likened to empty-space as described in the previous section. For this Mind is Mind possessing all of the characteristics of empty-space : un-obstructedness, omnipresence, impartiality, broadness and greatness, formlessness, purity, stability, the voiding of (p. 87) being, the voiding of voidness, unattainability, "one-alone"-ness, having neither interior nor exterior, and so on. Since what we ordinarily call mind does not possess these characteristics of empty-space, in order to clearly distinguish the two, it has, from ancient times, been said that this "Mind is like empty-space."

When it is also said that the True Buddha, like wood and stone, is "without mind," "without thought," "free from thought," "not caught up in the thinking of good and evil," "'not-thinking'-itself" or "the stopping of the functioning of mind, thought, and consciousness," and when it is said that true knowing is "being free from knowing," true awareness is un-awareness, or that True Nature is ungenerated and unperishing, without birth and death, these statements do not mean that what they are referring to are all merely, like wood and stone, without mind, self-consciousness, or life. They rather mean that the ordinary mind, self-awareness, and life which we have are not the true mind, true self-awareness, and true life, and that the true mind, true self-awareness, and true life

must possess the characteristics of empty-space.

The True Buddha is not without mind, but possesses Mind which is "without mind and without thought," is not without self-awareness, but possesses Awareness which is "without awareness," possesses an ego which is no ego",⁴⁵ is not without life, but possesses Life which is ungenerated and unperishing. The mind which we ordinarily have is a mind which has obstructions, places where it does not reach, differentiation, limitation, form, defilement, arising and decaying, dimension, attachments, acquisitions, an interior and exterior, and is uncollected. One generally has such a mind as subject, and therefore is an ordinary being and not Buddha. When one composes this mind and returns to the Original-True-Mind, which is like empty-space, then for the first time one is oneself Buddha. "Chan sitting" in which mind and body have "fallen off" is no other than a state of the realization of such a "Mind which is like empty-space." The mind referred to in a quote from the *[Guan-]Wuliangshou-jing* [and the text that follows the quote in the *Record of Masters and Disciples of the Lankâ (Lenggashiziji*, T85, 1288a)], " 'The Mind is the Buddha; it is Mind which becomes Buddha.' You must know that Buddha is no other than Mind. Outside of Mind there is no other Buddha,"⁴⁶ is precisely this "Mind which is like empty-space." In speaking of the "Mind-in-Itself" nature of Oriental Nothingness, my intention is to indicate that Oriental Nothingness as mind is this "Mind which is like empty-space." (p. 88)

D. The "Self" Nature of Oriental Nothingness

Oriental Nothingness can be said to be Mind in the sense described in the previous section. Even though we say mind, however, it is not such a mind as can be viewed objectively outside of ourselves. It must be inside us as the subject of ourselves. That is, it must be such that the Mind is Myself and that I am the Mind. This Mind is not the mind which is seen, but is, on the contrary, the Mind which sees. Speaking in terms of "seeing," this Mind is the "active seeing" and not the passive "being seen." When we say "active seeing," this of course does not mean physical, visual "seeing." It must rather be taken to mean "active" in the sense of being the subject of all functions, "active" from the standpoint of which all functions are themselves passive or "seen," that is, "active" as the all-integrating subject of all functions.

If I speak in this way, however, it may be thought that by such a mind is only meant the "active" aspect of "active and passive." But, when I say here that this Mind is "active," I mean that this Mind does not obtain as object, but obtains as subject. It does not mean that such a Mind is simply the aspect of "the active" in separation from "the passive." In this Mind there is no duality of active and passive. Since, however, that which is of the non-duality of active and passive (or, subject and object) is so frequently taken as something objective, here saying it is subjective is no more than to say that it is not something objective.

As indicated before, the Mind of which I am speaking is not merely that which is ordinarily called mind, but is the Mind which is itself Buddha. But when I say Buddha, this, again, is frequently taken as transcendent and objective. Buddha is often considered to be, in relation to us humans, "other" and objective. If Buddha were something perceived as an object by our senses, then its being "other" and objective would go without saying. But even a Buddha which becomes an object of feeling, faith, volition, or reason must also be said to be something other and objective. In such a case, we are not Buddha; we rather stand in contrast to Buddha. Thus, that to which I stand in contrast can not be said to be a Self or Subject.

The instances in religion as well as in metaphysics in which either God or Buddha is thought of as "other" and objective are numerous. That this is so in Christianity need not be mentioned. But even in Buddhism, in many cases Buddha is considered as something objective. Needless to say, in religion, (p. 89) since God (or, in Buddhism, Buddha) is often seen as controlling us in some sense, and since we, in turn, obey and rely upon Him, God (or Buddha) is not merely something "other" and objective. Even though being "other," God and Buddha can also be said to be subjects.

When it is said in Christianity, "it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me," or in the Jôdo Shin Sect of Buddhism, "abandoning my own devices and leaving everything to Amitâbha," Christ and Amitâbha can be said to be "other," and at the same time to be subjects who give true life to us. Buddha as the Mind of which I am speaking, however, is not such a subject which is "other," but is a subject in which the something "other" is completely Oneself. This Subject is not the naïve self-subject of modern anthropocentricism. It is rather a Subject such that what is for naïve subject something "other" is for this Subject, Self.

Buddha as Mind is not something which I simply absolutely obey, rely on, and belong to. In such a case in which I simply obey Buddha, Buddha, while a subject which controls me, would be, nevertheless, internally or externally transcendent to me. The Buddha of which I am speaking, however, is not a subject in the sense of transcending and controlling me, but is a subject in the sense that Buddha is I, Myself. While the transcending, controlling Buddha is to be called an objective-subject, it can not be spoken of as being a pure subject. In contrast to this, the Buddha which is I, Myself, is to be called a subjective-subject, and is a pure, absolute subject.

It is for this reason that although in *Chan* it is said that Buddha can not be known by man and that man should die the Great Death, *Chan* especially emphasizes the "Self" nature of Buddha, saying that Buddha is Self, is Self-Mind, is Self-Nature, and the like.

When coming upon such an expression as is found in the chapter on "Life and Death" in Dôgen's *Right-Dharma-Eye-Treasury* (*Shôbôgenzô*, "Shôji," T82, 305bc), "Simply letting go, forgetting our body and mind and throwing our self into the Buddha's house, being conducted from the side of Buddha and behaving accordingly, then, not exerting

any force, not expending the mind, we leave behind life and death and become Buddha," if one understands this Buddha to be "other power" as conceived in Jôdo Shin Buddhism and fancies it to be an objective-subject, this must be said to be a superficial understanding which does not penetrate into Dôgen's true meaning.

Chan possesses its distinctive characteristic and its pre-eminent strongpoint in taking Buddha as a radically subjective-subject, that is, as an absolute subject. In the history of Buddhism, the main factor accounting for the (p. 90) flourishing of *Chan* may also be said to be this emphasis on -- and Self-Realization of -- the "Self" nature as well as the "Mind-in-Itself" nature of Buddha. *Chan's* signal phrase, "Directly pointing to man's Mind, realizing Its Nature and attaining Buddhahood," is no other than a setting forth and an emphasizing of the "Self" nature and the "Mind-in-Itself" nature of Buddha.

In the *Discourse on the Direct-Lineage of the Dharma* (T48, 374c) it is declared: "Un-oriented people do not know that their Self-Mind is Buddha. They search about outwardly. The whole day they are busy contemplating Buddha and paying him homage. But where is the Buddha? One should not entertain any of these views. Only know your Self-Mind. Outside of the Mind there can be no other Buddha."

In the *Sixth Patriarch's Platform Sutra* (T48, 362a) it is said: "The Self-Buddha is the True-Buddha. If one did not have the Buddha-Mind within oneself, where would one seek the True-Buddha? Your own Self-Mind is Buddha. Do not doubt any further." And in the *Poem on the Realization of the Way* (T48, 362a) we find: "Self-Nature in its original source is the Genuine Buddha." Again, in *The Pivotal Point of Mind-to-Mind Transmission* (T48, 381a) it is stated: "Only know immediately here and now that the Self-Mind in its origin is Buddha. There is not a single thing to be attained; there is not a single discipline to be practiced. This is the unsurpassable Way."

In such sayings, the reason that the *Chan* masters and patriarchs especially emphasize that there is no Buddha other than Self-Mind, is to lead us back -- when we are sometimes liable to go astray and think that Buddha is outside of us -- to the true nature of Buddha.

Nor can the True Buddha be sought by building temples, forging images, translating sutras, writing commentaries on sutras, meditating, and the like. What is spoken of as Bodhidharma's "no merit whatsoever" retort to Emperor Wu,⁴⁷ was also no other than to express strongly the fact that the surging tide in Buddhism at that time of building temples, forging images, paying homage, making offerings, and so forth were not the means for seeking the True Buddha. It was, further, an attempt to have the Emperor enter directly into the True Buddha's "Meritlessness"--itself.

Huangbo, in the *Wanling Record* (T48, 384c), declared that "Even the thirty-two major marks of distinction belong to form, and all forms are delusive. The eighty minor marks also belong to materiality or corporeality. If one sees Me with corporeality, one practices the wrong way and is unable to see the Tathâgata." This also (p. 91) intends to

express the fact that however one may speak of a Tathâgata of perfect features possessing the thirty-two major and eighty minor marks of distinction, such a Buddha is still objective, is something outside the mind, and is not the True Buddha.

The fact, then, that the True Buddha is not simply the naïve self, is not "other," and is not even an objective-subject, but is the subjective-subject, that is, the absolute subject, expresses the "Self" nature of Oriental Nothingness.

E. The "Freedom" Nature of Oriental Nothingness

Oriental Nothingness as the subjective-subject is, further, the completely free subject. We say free, but there are various kinds of freedom. What, then, is the nature of the freedom of Oriental Nothingness?

It is often said in *Chan*, if you wish to go, go; if you wish to sit, sit; when hunger comes, take food; when drowsiness comes, sleep. This expression, if taken literally, seems to mean to indulge in whatever the heart desires. An animal or an infant tries to do whatever it wants to do and tries to eat whatever it wants to eat. It dislikes intensely whatever checks it in its inclinations. This is because animals and infants also desire freedom. As they mature, however, even children come gradually to cease to covet this sort of "freedom of indulgence." On the contrary, they rather come to try to check such freedom. They check themselves and refrain from doing things that they should not do, even though they want to do them, and come to do dutifully what should be done, even though they do not want to do it. They wish to come to the point where they do freely what should be done and freely refrain from doing what should not be done.

The mature adult, rather than craving the kind of indulgent-freedom the young child seeks, aspires to the kind of freedom which, on the contrary, criticizes and controls such indulgent-freedom. It is in the longing for this mature, critical freedom that there lies the distinction between the human adult on the one hand and animals or young children on the other.

Because adult human beings can criticize and control the kind of freedom animals and young children desire, it is said that adult human beings, unlike animals and young children, are rational. The freedom children desire is sensuous freedom ; the freedom adults desire is rational freedom. What Kant termed the freedom of the will is no other than this rational freedom. Kant calls the final culmination of this rational freedom "holy." What Confucius spoke of as acting in accordance with the mind's desires and (p. 92) yet not transgressing the norms is also rational freedom. It is precisely this rational freedom which is genuine human freedom. So it is that the aspiration to such rational freedom is characteristically human. The object of human morality lies in attaining this freedom. But is religious freedom the same as such a rational freedom or not ?

Religious freedom, it must rather be said, is to be found in the negation or transcendence even of human reason. Indeed, Christianity goes so far as to say that the fact

that man came to possess human reason was the cause of his being banished from Paradise. In Buddhism, also, human reason as discriminating intellect is considered to be the source of delusion. Reason being discrimination, is never free from dualistic polarities. There can not be any reason which is free from the discrimination of right and wrong, good and evil, profane and sacred, ordinary beings and Buddhas, being and non-being, and so on.

Religion, however, has as its basic objective the transcendence of, or the liberation from, such discriminations. If right is taken throughout -- to the very last -- as right, wrong as wrong, good as good, evil as evil, and sin as sin, then no basis could be found for sin being forgiven and for an evil man being saved just as he is, as in Christianity and in Jôdo Shin Buddhism. As for a sinful man being saved, this can not occur on any other standpoint than the transcendence of good and evil.

Chan not only speaks of not being caught up in the thinking of good and evil, but furthermore does not even set up the distinction between profane and sacred, between ordinary beings and Buddhas. As for anything which is "non-*dharma*," *Chan* would, of course, transcend it. But *Chan* would indeed transcend "*dharma*" itself.

In Christianity and even in Buddhism -- as in Jôdo Shin Buddhism -- while good and evil are transcended, God and man, or Buddha and ordinary beings, are sharply distinguished to the very end. God and Buddha are, as regards man and ordinary beings, completely transcendent and objective.

For *Chan*, however, the placing of Buddha transcendentally and objectively outside of ordinary beings is a rope which still constrains freedom. *Chan* would indeed transcend any discrimination, even the so-called "Buddha-clinging-view" and "*dharma*-clinging-view." Linji's saying, "encountering Buddha, killing Buddha, encountering the Patriarch, killing the Patriarch,"⁴⁸ and the declaration in *The Blue Cliff Collection* (*Biyanjì*, T48, 218a), "Do not stay where Buddha is. If one stays there, horns will grow on the head. Quickly pass through where there is no Buddha. If (p. 93) one does not quickly pass through, the grass will grow ten feet deep," both intend to express just this transcendence. Thus is realized the truly free mode of being which is neither bound nor obstructed by either man or Buddha. It is this freedom which is the "freedom" nature of Oriental Nothingness.

Liberation in Buddhism is to be thoroughly true in this freedom. In this, true liberation in Buddhism differs from the state of salvation of religions like Christianity. Even such a Buddhist sect as the Jôdo Shin Sect which, in the external aspect of its state of salvation, resembles Christianity, is different from Christianity to the extent that as a Buddhist sect it, too, must have its ultimate base in the freedom nature of Oriental Nothingness. I should like to call this freedom nature of Oriental Nothingness subjectively-subjective freedom, that is, absolutely subjective freedom.

In *Chan*, this freedom is attained through seeing into one's True Nature. The very "seeing into one's True Nature" itself is the free subject. The Sixth Patriarch, Huineng, has

said (T48, 358c): "The person who sees into his True Nature is free when he advocates something as well as when he does not.⁴⁹ He is free both in going and in coming. There is nothing which retards him, nothing which hinders him. Responding to the situation, he acts accordingly; responding to the words, he answers accordingly. He expresses himself taking on all forms, but he is never removed from his Self-Nature. That is, he attains the 'Free-Wondrous-Play-Samâdhi.' This is called seeing into one's True Nature." Such an account is no other than an explanation of the "freedom" nature of "seeing into one's True Nature."

"Seeing into one's True Nature" is of the nature of freedom because, as Huineng says (T48, 353b), "When the True-*Tathatâ*-Self-Nature gives rise to consciousness, although the six sense organs function in terms of seeing, hearing, sensing, and knowing, they are not defiled by the ten thousand objects. Thus the True Nature is always free," and, further, because "seeing into one's True Nature," not being any-thing, is everything, and being every-thing, is not any-thing. It is in this sense that the true meaning of "Absolute negation is in itself absolute affirmation ; absolute affirmation is in itself absolute negation," is to be understood.

"Not to abide anywhere, and yet to activate that Mind," is not merely "not abiding anywhere," but is "not abiding anywhere" and yet activating that Mind. Nor is it merely "to activate that Mind"; but rather while activating that Mind, yet "not abiding anywhere."

Linji's description of the "non-dependent Man of *Dao* (the Awakened Way)" which appears in the *Linji Record* (*Linjilu*, T47, 500a), "Entering (p. 94) the world of form, not suffering from form-delusion; entering the world of sound, not suffering from sound-delusion; entering the world of smell, not suffering from smell-delusion; entering the world of taste, not suffering from taste-delusion; entering the world of touch, not suffering from touch-delusion; entering the world of cognition, not suffering from cognition-delusion. Thus realizing the six worlds of form, sound, smell, taste, touch, and cognition to be all Empty-forms, nothing can constrict this non-dependent Man of *Dao*," is no other than an exposition of the "absolutely free subject."

Further, as Linji has also said (T47, 498a), "The Buddha-*Dharma* is not in any special functioning. It is, simply, the ordinary and uneventful -- discharging feces, passing water, wearing clothes, taking food, and, when drowsiness comes, sleeping." This, like the previously noted expressions, "If you wish to go, go; if you wish to sit, sit," and "when hunger comes, taking food; when drowsiness comes, sleeping," when used in *Chan*, does not mean merely an indulgent freedom, but means the freedom of being completely unconditioned and non-dependent.

F. The Creative Nature of Oriental Nothingness

Being creative must be taken to be one of the main characteristics of man, because man, as it is said, in making tools is different from the other animals. That human culture from

the beginning of history is the result of man's creative power need hardly be mentioned. This creative power has developed together with the evolution of man, and where it will stop we do not know. The progress of science during the last century is probably sufficient to prove how great man's creative power is.

Man's creative power is as great as all this, but, upon second thought, it may also be considered to be really quite negligible. Man can extract fiber from a plant, spin it into yarn, produce cloth, and make clothes, but he can not create the plant itself. Far from that, man still has not succeeded in creating even a micro-organism of one single cell. How much more so must it be said when it comes to the creation of man himself, or to the creation of heaven and earth, that man is completely powerless.

Thus, although we say that man creates things, there is not a single thing that he can create except that its original-stuff already be given. Within anything that man creates there is always included that which he can never create. In this sense, the creative power of man -- in whatever it creates -- can never be said to be primary or absolute.

(p. 95) In Christianity, the creative power of God, however, signifies absolute creative power. It is said, in Christianity, that God created out of nothing (*ex nihilo*) heaven and earth, plants, man, and all things. Before God created, there wasn't anything. It is precisely this creating out of nothing which can be called true creativity. In the God of Christianity we can find the perfect idea of creativity.

Scotus Eriugena divided nature into four classifications; that which creates but is not created; that which creates and is created; that which does not create but is created; that which neither creates nor is created. Man is that which creates and is created. God is that which creates but is not created. Although that which creates and is created is also a creator, to the extent that it was itself already created, it is not completely creator. Only in and as that which creates but is not created can creativity be said to be primary and absolute.

From this point of view, that which creates but is not created is a complete creator. But such a being is not one which can be actually confirmed by us in fact. Such a being, consequently, is either an idealization or an ideation of that human creativity which can actually be attested to by us, or else is no more than a being which simply has been hypothesized or is believed in. If it is just an idealization or ideation, it is no more than merely the perfect idea of creativity, and does not possess actual creative power. Again, if it is simply an object of faith, its actuality is not assured. The idea of such a creator can be entertained, but it is not something which itself possesses creative power and creates.

In Buddhism there is the expression, "All is made up by mind alone."⁵⁰ This, however, is not merely an idealization or a matter of faith, but is an actual certification by the "mind alone." Kant says that the actual world we daily experience is not, as we commonly think, something which exists completely external to and independent of our mind, but is something which our mind has created. If what is ordinarily called the external world is

replaced by the term "all things," then all things are the creation of our mind. That is, all things are created by mind alone.

What Kant speaks of as the "mind which creates all things," however, is so-called "consciousness-in-general" (*Bewusstsein überhaupt*). For Kant mind forms according to the formal categories of "consciousness-in-general" the impressions which it has received from what he calls the "thing-in-itself." Such a mind is like a mirror which in turn reflects according to the form(s) of reflection that which comes to be reflected in it from the (p. 96) outside. In as much as that which is reflected by the mirror is something transformed by the form(s) of reflection it is not separate from the mirror. If, however, there were only the mirror and nothing coming to it reflected from the outside, there could be no reflected image. The image, thus, can not be said to be produced from within the mirror.

In Buddhism, on the contrary, that which is reflected in the mirror is not something which comes from outside the mirror, but is something which is produced from within the mirror. It is produced from within the mirror, is expressed by being reflected in the mirror, passes away in the mirror, and, passing away, does not leave any trace in the mirror. The Mind in the Buddhist expression, "All is made up by mind alone," is like this mirror. That which is reflected is never something which comes from outside of that which reflects. In this sense, this Mind must be said to be different from anything like Kant's "consciousness-in-general."

Since, however, a mirror which produces from within that which is reflected, is not an actual possibility, this Mind is not fully served by the analogy of a mirror. The frequent use in Buddhism of the analogy of water and waves,⁵¹ is in order to try to illustrate more adequately the creative nature of this Mind which is not fully taken care of in the analogy of the mirror.

Waves are not something which come from outside the water and are reflected in the water. Waves are produced by the water but are never separated from the water. When they cease to be waves, they return to the water -- their original source. Returning to the water, they do not leave the slightest trace in the water. Speaking from the side of the waves, they arise from the water and return to the water. Speaking from the side of water, the waves are the movement of the water. While the water in the waves is one with the waves and not two, the water does not come into being and disappear, increase or decrease, according to the coming into being and disappearing of the waves. Although the water as waves comes into being and disappears, the water as water does not come into being and disappear. Thus, even when changing into a thousand or ten thousand waves, the water as water is itself constant and unchanging. The Mind of "all is made up by mind alone" is like this water. The assertions of the Sixth Patriarch, Huineng, (T48, 349a): "Self-Nature, in its origin constant and without commotion, produces the ten thousand things," and "All things are never separated from Self-Nature," and the statement in the *Vimala-*

kîrti-nirdeśa Sūtra (T14, 547c): "From the Non-Abiding origin are produced all things," express just this creative feature of Mind.

Oriental Nothingness is this Mind which is to be likened to the water as (p. 97) subject. The creative nature of Oriental Nothingness is to be illustrated by the relation between the water and the waves, in which the water is forever and in every way the subject. If one were to make a subject of the waves which are produced and disappear, this would be the ordinary self of man. It is in such an ordinary subject's reverting back from waves to water -- that is, returning to their source -- and re-emerging as the True-Subject or True-Self that the characteristics of Oriental Nothingness must be sought and are to be found.

Translated by Richard De MARTINO in collaboration
with FUJIYOSHI Jikai and ABE Masao
Revised by TOKIWA Gishin (Mar. 2005; Jan., Aug. 2012)

NOTES:

1. The translation by Richard DeMartino in collaboration with FUJIYOSHI Jikai and ABE Masao was made public in *Philosophical Studies of Japan*, Vol. II (1959), pp. 65–97.

Japanese text: *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu* vol. I, pp. 33–66, first published in 1946. The present revision contains the following five matters:

1) Making sure of sources of the quotes from Buddhist and *Chan* texts and simplifying the forms of sources; 2) Using *pinyin* for transcription of Chinese letters, using "*Chan*" for "*Zen*," and removing all the Chinese and Japanese characters throughout the text; 3) Partially adopting the diacritical marks for romanizing Sanskrit spellings; 4) When corrections other than the above three are made, they are notified with footnotes, except for explanations in brackets of some technical terms as well as corrections of wrong spellings and wordings; 5) There is change in the numbering of pages as well as footnotes. The page numbers of the DeMartino version are shown in parentheses like (p. 66).

2. (The original note 1) Professor of Philosophy and Religion, The Kyoto City College of Fine Arts. (The original note 1 ends.)

The author retired from professorship in Buddhism and Religion at Kyoto University in 1949, and taught at the Kyoto City College of Fine Arts from 1952 through 1962.

3. (Ori. note 2) Although in Japanese this is a single term, *mu* (Chin., *wu*), in order to make clear in English the various meanings and nuances contained within it, these several alternative translations are offered.

4. (Ori. n. 3) See Translator's note bottom of p. 65 (i.e., Ori. n. 2).

5. The previous rendering "unconsciousness" is replaced by "faint" for *kizetsu*.

6. "Without 'things'" is replaced by "without anything graspable as something." The whole term "*sanjie-wufa*" is from a statement by Panshan Baoji, dates unknown, a *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi, 709–88. Cf. *The Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle seven, Taisho Tripitaka vol. 51, p. 252b (hereafter, T51, 252b).

7. A phrase from the verse by Huineng, the sixth patriarch of *Chan*: "Bodhi (Awakening) originally has no tree, and the bright mirror [of mind] is also without a stand; Originally

not having a single thing ("wuyiwu"), where does it attract any dust ?" in the *Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch's Dharma Treasure*, T48, 349a.

8. (Ori. n. 4) In the analogy of "empty-space" used by these ancients, space is, of course, still understood as absolute and empty. (Tr.)

9. The *Nirvâna Sutra*, tr. by Dharmakshema, in Chapter 10-1, Fascicle 21, has the term "the Tathâgata's *nirvâna*" instead of "Buddha-nature," as what is "not being and is not non-being," with no difference in meaning. The same text in Chapter 10-2, Fascicle 22, has the expression: "Buddha-nature is neither internal nor external"; "Buddha-nature is neither permanent nor impermanent."

10. From *The One-Hundred-[Verse-]Treatise*, by Aryadeva with Vasu's Commentary, tr. Kumârajîva, two fascicles.

11. The *Linjilu* (T47, 497b) has this expression by Linji Yixuan, ?-866: "Do you want to be able to discern a Patriarch or a Buddha ? He is none other than you listening to the *dharma* (*ni tingfadi*) in front of me."

12. Dazhu Huihai, dates unknown, *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi, 709-88, says: "Seeing is Itself the True Nature, for no True Nature is incapable of seeing." (*Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, T51, 247c).

13. Layman Pang Yun, ?-808, *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi, said this to Yu Di, the prefectural governor who visited him in his sick-bed, and finished, saying : "May abide well in the world, which all is like shadows and echoes." Then with his head on the governor's lap he passed away. (*Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle eight, T51, 263c)

14. Baizhang Huaihai, 749-814, *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi, to a monk who asked the *Mahayana dharma*-gate for the simultaneous attainment of Awakening, showed his view including what the author quotes here and below. (*Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle six, T51, 250a)

15 . This seems to be another expression by the author of the previous quote from Huangbo's *Chuanxinfayao*: "not clinging to or being confined by either mind or object."

16. From the *Chuanxinfayao*, T48, 382a.

17. From his *Fukan-zazengi* ("The Universally Recommended Norm for Sitting-*Chan* Practice"), T82, 1a, by Dôgen, 1200-53.

18. From the *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle three, T51, 219c.

19. Ibid., T51, 220a.

20. Senior monk Ming, who had left the Fifth Patriarch's assembly to follow Huineng, caught up with the latter on the way to the south, asked for the *dharma*, and, upon the words of the Sixth Patriarch, he suddenly, silently accorded with them. Then Ming saluted the master and said: "One who drinks water, knows it cold or hot oneself. For as many as thirty years in the assembly of the Fifth Patriarch, how wrongly I have practiced! Today I am aware of my past folly." (Huangbo, *Wanling Record*, T48, 384a)

21. The phrase "teach and explain it" is replaced by "tell what it really is" for *shuopo-cishi* (*seppashiji*).

22. T16, tr. by Gunabhadra, 498c.

23. The *Dashengqixinlun* (T32, tr. Paramârtha, 576a) gives the reason for the naming of *zhenru* (true *tathatâ* or suchness) as follows: "All the *dharma*s (what have their own characteristics) are, since their beginnings, apart from the characteristics of being words, names, and the mind's objects, and ultimately equal, without changes, beyond destruction; they are nothing but the One Mind. Therefore, they are named true *tathatâ*."
24. The *Linjilu*, T47, 500a.
25. The rendering "the source of all wisdom" was replaced by "the [Buddha's] all-knowing-wisdom" for [*yiqie*-]*zhongzhi*; *sarvajñânâ*.
26. The original rendering, which followed the quote in the Japanese text, "*bushengxiang* (not give rise to form)," is corrected according to the *Platform Sutra* text, "*buzhuxiang* (not abide in form)." (T. 48, 361a) Of the end of this quote the original reading is corrected.
27. To the question Mazu asked of Dazhu, where he had come from, the latter said he had come from the Dayun Temple in Yue-zhou. Mazu said, "Coming here, what do you want to do?" Dazhu : "I've come to seek after the Buddha-*dharma*." Then Mazu said, "Instead of attending to your own precious deposits, by abandoning your house and running about, what are you doing? Here with me is not a single thing. What Buddha-*dharma* do you seek after?"
28. *Zongjinglu*, by Yonming Yanshou, 904–76, one hundred fascicles. The author cites the passage which includes this quote below without notice, after a quote from Zongmi, See Note 42.
29. Takuan Sôhō, 1573–1645, a Japanese Rinzai-zen priest, had the Tôkai Temple built for him in Edo (now Tokyo) through dedication by the third Tokugawa *shōgun* Iyemitsu. The above talk is from pp. 85–6, the first of the three books in the fifth of the six cases, *Takuan-oshō-zenshū*, Tokyo 1930.
30. (Ori. n. 5) See footnote p. 68 (i.e., Ori. n. 4). "Like Empty-space" Nature is replaced here by "Empty-Space" Nature.
31. The rendering "afflictions" is replaced by "worldly dust" for "*chenlei*."
32. The rendering "The eighth is the meaning of voiding-being. This means that the being of empty-space is void, having no dimensions" is replaced by the above for "*ba zhe youkong(uku)-yi. mieyouliang (metsu-uryo) gu.*" (*Zongjinglu*, 6, 446c; *Shimoheyanlun*, 3, T32, 614c–615a)
33. According to the Sanskrit text ("*niscittam cittamâtram*"), the Chinese rendering reads: "*wuxin zhi xinliang*; mind-only in the sense of no-mind." But the author reads the Chinese as above ("*wu xin-zhi-xinliang*").
34. The text "*yi yi mo shou*" reads as: "Don't abide by unity, either."
35. Zhaozhou Congshen, 778–897, made this remark (*Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle ten, T51, 277a): "It's like when you have a bright pearl in the palm of your hand : A non-native comes, and the non-native appears on it; a native Han comes, and the native Han appears on it (*hu lai hu xian*; *Han lai Han xian*)." The renderings "barbarian" and "Chinese" are replaced here by "non- native" and "native Han."
36. This refers to the second of the one hundred and forty-six phrases of the *Xinxinming*. The first and the second phrases (T48, 376b) go as follows: "The ultimate Way has nothing

difficult; Only that it detests discrimination (*zhidao wunan, weixian jianze*)."

37. From the *Zhengdaoge*, T48, 396a.

38. From the *Xinxinming*, T48, 377a.

39. From the *Chuanxinfayao*, T48, 382c.

40. By Guifeng Zongmi, 780–841.

41. The beginning four words, "The meaning is that," for "*yi shuo*," which precede "True-Nature" for "*zhenxing*," but which had not been translated, are newly added.

42. This is from the *Zongjinglu* by Yongming Yanshou, but the author failed to cite the source here, for apparently he thought it unnecessary for the reason that the final part of this quote was cited above toward the end of II. A.

43. The rendering "Awareness realized in Itself is called by name, Mind." was replaced by "Mind is its name, awareness its identity." for "*xin shi ming, yi zhi wei ti*."

44. From *Xinxinming* T48, 376bc.

45. The rendering "an egoless ego" is replaced by "possesses an ego which is no ego."

46. The *Lenggashiziji* should have referred to the Pure Land sutra as *Guan wuliang shoujing* (Scripture on the Contemplation of Amitayus Buddha). And the quote from the Pure Land sutra here is the first two clauses. The rest ("You must know ... no other Buddha.") belongs to Daoxin, the fourth patriarch of *Chan*, according to the *Lenggashiziji*.

47. Cf. The *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle three, T51, 219a.

48. In the *Linjilu*, T47, 500b, Linji said : "Way-seekers, if you want to attain the view which accords with the *dharma* (Awakened truth), only don't suffer delusion from others ; either within or without, upon an encounter, immediately kill the other. Encountering a buddha, kill the buddha; encountering a patriarch, kill the patriarch; encountering an arhat (*nirvâna*-attainer), kill the arhat; encountering father- mother, kill the father-mother; encountering a relative, kill the relative. Only then will you attain emancipation, and, not being constrained by anything, be thoroughly emancipated and free."

On another occasion Linji introduced the Mahayana concept "the five immediates (transgressions leading to immediate ruin)" with a slight variation (T47, 502b). The *Lankâvatâra Sûtra* calls them the internal five immediates (T16, 498a), and says to the effect : By mother is meant desire, which leads to rebirth, accompanied by joy and passion, by father ignorance which causes a group of inner and outer seats for perception of, and clinging to, inner self and outer objects to arise, and by killing mother and father, completely severing both these roots. By killing an arhat is meant completel exterminating the reposing passions, which, enemy-like, cause a rage like a poison in a rat. By causing schism in the monastic order is meant thoroughly hurting the accumulated mass of the five constituents or twelve seats or eighteen elements of a human being which are mutually disjoined. By shedding blood with wicked intent on the body of a tathâgata is meant completely hurting the seven groups of discerning faculties, which do not realize that what is external with specific and general characteristics is nothing but one's own mind seen as such, with a wicked alternative that is free from passion, i.e., the threefold emancipation of voidness, formlessness, and wishlessness, with reference to the buddha of the sevenfold discerning faculty. And one who commits the immediates is said to have

the Awakened truth realized.

Linji knew this internal interpretation of the five immediates. Nevertheless, he announced committing the immediates as the attainment of Awakening, apparently without distinction of internal or external. It seems Linji wondered if anyone expected him to make any distinction in this regard.

49. This is for "*jianxing zhi ren li yi de, bu-li yi de.*" The passage that precedes this goes as follows (Ibid., 358c) : If one gets awakened to one's self-nature, one will no longer set up *bodhi* or *nirvâna*, nor will one set up the wisdom of emancipation [as something to be attained]. Only when one has not a single thing to obtain, can one build up millions of things as truths. If one understands this meaning, one can cite names like "Buddha's body," "*bodhi*," "*nirvâna*," or "the wisdom of emancipation."

50. By "all" is meant all that is of the threefold world of desire, form, and no-form. The source of the term is considered to be the statement by the bodhisattva Vajragarbha in the *Huayan-jin*, tr. Siksânanda, fascicle thirty-seven, T10, 194a (in the sixth of the ten bodhisattva stages of the *Dasabhûmika*) : "Whatever of the threefold world is mind only; those twelve links of *samsâra*-beings, which were explained in detail with division by the Tathâgata, are all based on the one mind."

51. Here are some verses from the *Lankâvatâra Sûtra*, fascicle one, T16, 484bc, to illustrate the analogy of water and waves: "Just as ocean waves, blown to arise by high winds, Dancing roll forward, in no time interrupted," (Verse 96); "So does the *âlâya*-stream, constantly blown by the winds of objects, Dancing, prevail with various waves of discerning faculties." (V. 97); "As the ocean's transformation this variety of waves is, As [the transformation of] the root [discerning-faculty] there prevail varieties of a discerning faculty by name." (V. 100) "While the mind, ego-thought, and the [six] discerning faculties are determined for definition's sake, Of inseparable characteristics are the eight, none being defined, none being the definer." (V. 101) "No occurring to it exists; one's own mind is free from being grasped, a truth that is established as likened to waves." (V. 106) "As the body-property-and-location the discerning-faculty appears to people, So does its occurring appear, much like ocean- waves." (V. 107)

Cf. The *Lankâvatâra Suûtram ;A Jewel Scripture of Mahayana Thought and Practice*

-- An English Translation by TOKIWA Gishin, Osaka 2003, pp. 51-52.

4. CHAN : ITS MEANING FOR MODERN CIVILIZATION

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI

1. *Chan means Emancipation and Construction* ¹

As to the question, "What is *Chan*?"² if one is to be brief, it may perhaps suffice to utter just one word or, indeed, to utter no word at all. If, however, one is to elaborate, it may be said that no amount of elaboration can ever prove to be exhaustive. The intention here, however, is to be as simple and as plain as possible.

In the common view, *Chan* is a school of Buddhism which was founded by Bodhidharma in the sixth century in China. Speaking from the side of *Chan*, however, *Chan* is not one particular school within Buddhism; it is, rather, the root-source of Buddhism. There is a good reason for this.

Each of the various schools of Buddhism has a basic expression to characterize its fundamental teaching. *Chan's* basic expression, dating from the early period of *Chan's* introduction into China and attributed to Bodhidharma, is:³

*"Not relying on words or letters,
An independent Self-transmitting apart from any teaching;
Directly pointing to man's Mind, having them
See their (Original-) Nature and actualize the Buddhahood."*

This expression attempted at once to do several things: to criticize and to break through radically the kind of Buddhism prevalent in China at the time of the rise of *Chan*; to express verbally the true nature of Buddhism; to return to the true source of Buddhism and to produce anew, therefrom, a genuine Buddhist creation.

This mode of creative criticism raised fifteen centuries ago may provide a suggestive precedent not only for present-day Buddhism but also for present-day religion in general. For it is an authentic and appropriate way to revive and make fully alive again religions which have succumbed to formalization and conventionalization.

As regards the first part of *Chan's* basic expression, "Not relying on words," this is not to be taken simply literally. "Not relying on words" does not mean the complete negation (as ordinarily understood) of words. Rather, it is to be taken to mean "prior to words" in the sense of not depending on words, not being bound or caught by words. It must be explained that as here used the term "words" refers to the Buddhist sutras, which are all expressed in words. Ordinarily, the Buddhist sutras are treated as records of the oral expositions of Shâkyamuni and are considered to be the source of and the authority for Buddhism. Today, however, modern research into the historical actualities of the compilation of the scriptures has made clear that what is spoken of as the sutras are not all the direct discourses of Shâkyamuni, but also include sutras which were composed

many centuries after Shâkyamuni. Until this realization, however, the sutras were generally regarded by Buddhists as the ultimate foundation and authority of Buddhism. When each of the various schools of Buddhism was about to be founded, the founder always sought in the sutras the final authority for the truth to be embodied in the new Buddhist form. In the traditional Buddhist view, the final norm of truth was contained in the sutras; that which had no basis in the sutras could not be called truth.

Accordingly, each Buddhist school has its own particular sutra (or sutras) as the ultimate authorization of its teaching. For example, the Kegon School has for its authoritative scripture the *Avatamsaka Sûtra* (*Huayanjing*); the Tendai and the Nichiren Schools, the *Saddharmapundarikâ Sûtra*; and the Pure Land School, the "three Pure Land Sutras." To prove that they are Buddhist and that their teaching is true, the various schools have recourse to their authoritative scriptures. In this regard, the same is true of Christianity. For Christianity, the Bible is the exact counterpart of the Buddhist sutras; it constitutes for Christianity the final criterion of truth and is itself absolute truth.

Chan, however, has no such authoritative sutra upon which it is based. This does not mean that it arbitrarily ignores the sutras, but rather that it dares to be independent of the sutras. *Chan* severely condemns that Buddhist sutra-dogmatism or sutra-magic which makes the sutras the final norm of truth. *Chan* rather casts off such dogmatism and magic and seeks to return to the source of the sutras -- that is, to that which is "prior to" the sutras. In this, Bodhidharma's response of "No-Merit!"⁴ was a great criticism of the Buddhism of his time; indeed, it was revolutionary.

When I say here "prior to" the sutras, this "prior to" is liable to be taken temporally or historically. But, of course, I do not mean historically "prior to." I mean, rather, the source which is "prior to" the sutra expressions. In *Chan*, this source is expressed by the term "Mind," which is, however, radically different from what we today commonly call mind. It is, for *Chan*, this "Mind" which is the root-source of the sutras, and, thus "prior to" the sutras.

It is this Mind, the "Mind" as the source of the scriptures, which is meant in the previously mentioned, "Directly pointing to man's Mind, having them See their (Original-) Nature and actualize the Buddhahood." By the word Nature in "See their (Original-) Nature" is meant man's original nature, that is, one's true way of being. This is generally called, in Buddhism, Buddha-Nature or Mind-Nature. In *Chan*, however, it is called "*Self-Nature*" or "*one's Original-Face*," expressions which are far more intimate to us humans. Self-Nature is our own original human nature, and this original nature is no other than "man's Mind." For *Chan*, it is precisely "man's Mind" which is the "Buddha-Mind." Apart from this "Mind of man," there is nothing which is truly to be called "Buddha." Again, Buddha is not to be sought outside of this "Mind."

Consequently, "See their (Original-) Nature" means finally, that we human beings "see" man's own original nature. This does not mean "objectively" to see, to contemplate,

to cognize, nor, of course, to believe in the nature of some Buddha which is wholly other to man. That is, though we say "to see one's original nature," this does not mean to see with the eyes. Nor does it mean to contemplate, as in the case of "contemplating the *dharma*." As Dazhu (a Chinese *Chan* master of the 9th century)⁵ said, "*the Seeing is itself the (Original-) Nature*." This "seeing" is man's awakening to one's own original nature. In *Chan*, apart from the one who has awakened to one's original nature, there is no Buddha to be called Buddha. It is the awakening of man's original nature which is the actualization or attainment of Buddhahood; hence, "See their Original-Nature and actualize the Buddhahood."

As is well known, the term "*Buddha*" means, in Sanskrit, "the Awakened-One." This "Awakening" means, again, man's awakening to one's own original nature, that is, to one's Buddha-Nature. Shâkyamuni is called "Buddha" only because of his awakening to this original nature.

Returning to the matter of the Buddhist sutras, there are written within those sutras many things which are no longer acceptable today, however much one may try to make them acceptable by forced interpretations. This reminds one of Bultman's "demythologizing" [with which he pointed out the same problem in the Christian context].⁶ Especially today when the influence of Western religion, philosophy, and science has entered into the Buddhist sphere, if one is taken up with the words of the sutras, then one is caught and bound by words expounded in the past; this, then, becomes an obstacle to an understanding of the original meaning and, consequently, it becomes impossible to give that original meaning a new and free contemporary expression. Rather than rely on what has been expressed in the past, that is, rather than rely on the sutras, it is far better to enter directly into the source "prior to" what is expressed, that is, into what is "before" the sutras. Then, equipped with the living "eyes with which to read the sutras," one can then interpret them freely and, according to the particular situation or occasion, give a new and truly spontaneous expression of their "source." So it is said, in Kumârajîva's translation of the *Mahâprajñâ-pâramitâ Sûtra*, "To use words to expound the *dharma* which is without words." ⁷

2. The Chan Method

Chan, thus, does not rely on the sutras but rather makes its main concern the direct entering into the Mind which is "prior to" the sutras. To repeat, *Chan* does not stand on any authoritative sutras. This, after all, is what is meant by the phrase "*apart from the teaching*" in the expression, "An independent Self-transmitting apart from any teaching." This phrase, "apart from the teaching," stands in contrast to "standing within the teaching." "Teaching" here means, again, that teaching which has been established with the written sutras as its basis. In contrast to that Buddhism which relies on the sutras and is therefore said to "stand within the teaching," *Chan*, not relying on the sutras but entering

directly into the Mind which is the source of sutras, is said to be "apart from or outside the teaching." "Apart from or outside the teaching" thus does not mean apart from or outside Buddhism; rather, it means *the inner source of that which is "within the teaching."* In other words, considered from the side of the sutra-expressions, *Chan* is "apart from," or "outside"; considered from the source of what is expressed in the sutras, *Chan* is rather even more "inner" than what is ordinarily called "within or inside the teaching." Thus, in contrast to that which is ordinarily considered to be "within the teaching," that which is within this ordinary "within" therefore becomes "apart from or outside the teaching." If we think in terms of base or foundation, it may therefore be said that *Chan's* base or foundation is that root-source which is even more "inner" than the sutras.

In fact, however, *Chan* does not only not rely on the sutras; it does not rely on anything. The *Record of Linji* ⁸ has such expressions as:

"[True students of the Awakened way of being are] *solitarily emancipated*;" "*they rely on nothing.*"

This derives from the basic nature of "Mind" itself. If there were "that which relies" and "that which is relied upon," or, again, if it were just a matter of not relying on the sutras, then it would not be ultimately not relying on anything. The kind of reliance in which one has nothing to rely on but oneself as a reliance, is a true reliance. A reliance in *Chan* lies where relier and relied-on are nondual. In other words, that in which the relier and the relied-on are of one body, and which has no distinction between them is a true reliance. Accordingly, since there is no distinction between that which relies and that which is relied on, there is, in fact, no relying. Thus, true-relying is "not-relying." It is as Huang-bo has said:

"All through the twelve divisions of the day, I don't rely on anything." ⁹

In this respect, *Chan* greatly differs from Christianity and even from the Jôdo Shin School of Buddhism. Christianity and the Shin school are religions which rely absolutely either on God or on Amida Buddha. In these religions, that which relies is always that which relies, and that which is relied upon is always that which is relied upon. Their duality is never removed. It is for this reason that Christianity is called a religion of absolute dependence and the Shin school a religion of the absolute "other power." Consequently, the understanding of man in these religions is that of a being absolutely dependent upon and supported by God (in Christianity) or Amida (in the Shin School). This is not the *Chan* view of man Linji has described to be "Solitarily emancipated" and "Relying on nothing." Linji has further characterized such a person as the "*Non-reliant man of Awakening*" and also as the "*True man.*" He has, moreover, asserted that other than such a person there is no Buddha to be properly so called. And in a very severe statement he has declared:

"Encountering a Buddha, killing the Buddha; encountering a Patriarch, killing the Patriarch; encountering an Arhat, killing the Arhat; encountering mother or father, killing mother or father; encountering a relative, killing the relative: only thus does

one attain liberation and disentanglement from all things, thereby becoming completely unfettered and free."

In a later period, Wumen Huikai (1185–1260) similarly pronounced, at the beginning of his *Gateless Barrier*:¹⁰

"Encountering a Buddha, killing the Buddha; encountering a Patriarch, killing the Patriarch: therein does one attain the Great-Freedom at the brink of life-and-death and actualize the samâdhi of sportive-play in the midst of four modes of birth in the six realms of existence."

These expressions emphasize that the true person of *Chan* is emancipated even from Buddhas and Patriarchs; he/she is a person of absolute non-reliance -- of absolute in-dependence -- beyond the Buddhas and the Patriarchs.

In the *Discourse on the Direct-Lineage of the Dharma*, attributed to Bodhidharma, we read:

"Beings of perverted mind do not know that *the Self-Mind is the True-Buddha*. They spend the whole day in running to and fro, searching outwardly, contemplating or honoring Buddhas, and looking for the Buddha somewhere outside of themselves. They are misdirected. Just know the Self-Mind! Outside of this Mind there is no other Buddha."¹¹

The Sixth Patriarch of *Chan*, Huineng (638–713), also says, in his *Platform Sutra*:

"The Self-Buddha is the True-Buddha. ... Your Self-Mind is the Buddha."¹²

Mazu¹³ likewise declares:

"Outside of the Mind, no other Buddha;
Outside of the Buddha, no other Mind."¹⁴

Huangbo, in his *Essentials for Transmitting the Mind as the Awakened Truth*, asserts:

"Your Mind is the Buddha; the Buddha is nothing but the Mind.
Mind and Buddha are not separate or different."¹⁵

Yongjia,¹⁶ in his Song of Actualizing *Bodhi*, says:

"In clearly seeing, there is not one single thing;
There is neither man nor Buddha."¹⁷

To talk in this way may sound as if to be negating Buddha and to be extremely anti-religious. From the standpoint of *Chan*, however, the self still depending on Buddha or his teachings is not the truly emancipated, free, self-supporting, independent Self.

The fundamental aim of Buddhism is to attain freedom from every bondage arising from the dualities of life-and-death, right-and-wrong, good-and-evil, etc. This is the meaning of ultimate emancipation as understood in Buddhism. Thoroughgoing emancipation is thus not being bound by anything, not depending on anything, not "having" anything -- that is, being in *unhindered freedom from everything*. The expression in the *Prajñâ-pâramitâ Hridaya Sutra*, "The Mind has no obstruction,"¹⁸ has no other meaning

than this.

Chan emphasizes, further, that this ultimate emancipation is not to be sought only as a future ideal which can not be actualized in the present. On the contrary, *Chan* insists upon its actualization in the present. The self that is dependent on Buddha is not yet the truly Buddhistic Self, that is, is not yet the Mind spoken of in *Chan*. The Mind of *Chan* is not dependent on any Buddha or *dharma* outside of itself; rather, this Mind is the very Buddha as the their root-source.

In Buddhism, Buddha is considered the most honorable. But even that which is most honorable, if it is outside of us, would bind and obstruct us. When we are bound by something which is insignificant, we easily become aware of it. When we are bound by something very important and honorable, however, we tend to be blinded by it and fail to notice our bondage.

In Buddhism, however, what it considers ultimate is for us to awaken to the Self not bound by anything and, more than that, to work freely *without* being bound even by the not being bound. Indeed, it will be even more correct to say that Buddhism considers it ultimate to be able to work freely *just because it is not* bound by anything.

Ordinarily considered, the above quoted *Chan* phrase, "Killing the Buddha, killing the Patriarch," would be an expression of the most extreme anti-religiousness. To draw even one drop of blood from the body of a Buddha is regarded by Buddhists as one of the five deadly sins. Thus, to kill a Buddha or a Patriarch is, from the viewpoint of Buddhist faith, absolutely inadmissible. However, from the standpoint of *Chan*, this utterance most thoroughly expresses *Chan's* being "outside the teaching," which means being free even from Buddha-bondage or *dharma*-bondage. Indeed, this phrase is rather to be regarded as expressing the ultimate position of true faith. The third *Chan* Patriarch, Sengcan,¹⁹ meant this when he said, in his *Xinxin-ming* ("Verses on the Mind of Faith"), that:²⁰

"The mind of faith is nondual;
Nondual is the mind of faith."

In Buddhism, there are, ordinarily, innumerable forms of Buddha. In *Chan*, however, the true Buddha, as stated above, is the Mind which is emancipated from every kind of bondage and is completely free of all forms. *Chan* denies to be the true Buddha not only Buddha figures depicted on paper, in earthenware, in wood, or in metal, but even those most sublime Buddhas possessing the so-called thirty-two major and eighty minor marks of excellence. For *Chan*, indeed not such Buddhas as the Buddhas of the recompense body, the response body, or the transformation body are to be called the true Buddha.

In the Shin School which has as its central religious concern the Buddha-with-form called Amida Buddha, it is likewise recognized that the source of Amida is the *dharmakâya* (Awakened Truth-Body), which is without form. Shinran (1173-1262), the founder of the Shin School, writes in his *Yuishinshô-mon'i* ²¹:

"The *dharmakâya* is without shape, *without form*, and, accordingly, beyond the reach of the mind, beyond description in words. That which takes form and comes forth from this Formless– Suchness is called the *upâya-dharmakâya* (Expedience–Form of the Awakened Truth–Body)."

Again, in his *Jinenhōni-shō*,²² which he wrote at the age of eighty-six, Shinran says:

"The Supreme Buddha is *without form*. Because it is without form, it is called Self-effected. When we represent it with form, it can not then be spoken of as the Supreme Nirvâna. It is to make known this Ultimate Formlessness that we speak of Amida–Buddha."

Here it is made clear that the *upâya-dharmakâya* expressed in form, that is, Amida–Buddha, is not the Supreme Buddha or Supreme Nirvâna. Again, in the fifth book, "The True Buddha and His World," of his main work, *Kyōgyōshinshō*,²³ Shinran, quoting from the *Larger Sutra of Eternal Life*,²⁴ says that attaining rebirth in the Pure Land is "enjoying the Self-effected, Unlimited *Dharma* Body of Emptiness." This is quite reasonable if, in the Shin School, rebirth is considered, as it should be, equivalent to attaining Nirvâna. They call the attainment of Nirvâna the "going aspect." Since, however, Nirvâna is the Self–Nature, the Original Way of life of all beings, the attainment of Nirvâna is also spoken of by Shinran (in his *Yuishinshō-mon'i*) as "the *returning to the capital of Dharma–Nature*."

From this we can see clearly that a Buddha which has form is not the ultimate or true Buddha, that *the true Buddha is without form*. It is in this sense that for *Chan* the Buddha without form is the true Buddha; and it is just the true Buddha which is the true Self, *the true Man*. Therefore, *Chan* has nothing to do with idols -- and this in a most thoroughgoing fashion. Accordingly, *Chan* Buddhism does not worship, pray to, or believe in any Buddha with an objective form, whether material or ideational. Rather for *Chan*, Buddhism means awakening to the True, Formless Mind; that is, awakening to the True–Buddha. It is this awakening to the True–Buddha that *Chan* calls *Seeing One's Nature* or awakening to One's Original Face.

According to *Chan*, it is precisely the Original Face of man -- of any one of us human beings -- which is the True–Buddha. The True–Buddha is no other than the Original Way of human life, or, in other words, *the True–Self*. Awakening to one's Original Face is "*Seeing man's Nature and becoming Buddha*." By the Seeing of one's Nature we do not mean any objective contemplation, objective awareness, or objective cognition of Self–Nature or Buddha–Nature; we mean *the awakening of the Self–Nature itself*. Since there is no Buddha apart from this awakening, to "become Buddha" means to come to the true Self–Awakening. Thus it is that the term "Buddha" literally means "the Awakened one." Since, for *Chan*, there is no true Buddha outside of the one who is awakened to one's True Self, Linji calls this awakened one the "True Man."²⁵ All Buddha–forms, like the so-called recompense body, response body, or transformation body, are but different modes of expression of this "True Man" and have meaning only as such.

It is in this sense that we can say that *Chan* is neither a theism which sets up a transcendent god, nor a humanism centered on man in the ordinary sense, but that it is rather "*True-Man'ism*," centered around the True Man awakened to one's Original true Self.

As has already been made clear, *Chan* has no reliance at all. If we are to speak of any reliance in *Chan*, its basic authority is the True Self, that is, the True Man. This authority, however, is to be called the reliance of no-reliance. Accordingly, the Buddhistic method of *Chan* is to get oneself -- and to get others -- to awaken to the True Self, which all humans are in their primal nature. This is what is meant by "Directly pointing to man's Mind." *Chan* takes its occasions or opportunities to come to this awakening not simply from within the teaching but freely and directly from life itself in its every aspect and action, such as walking, abiding, sitting, lying, hearing, seeing, raising the eye-brows, or blinking the eyes. If one looks into the *Chan* occasions and *Chan* opportunities which appear according to the different places and different times in the *Chan* history, this becomes clear at a glance. Such occasions and opportunities are simply too numerous to be counted. A few well known examples are: Nanquan's "Killing the cat";²⁶ Zhaozhou's "Go to have a cup of tea" and his "Cypress tree in the garden";²⁷ Longtan's "Blowing out of the lantern";²⁸ Yunmen's "What is the meaning of wearing a clerical gown at the bell-signal?" and his "Dried dung stick";²⁹ and Shoushan's "Bamboo spatula."³⁰ Thus, according to the time and place, *Chan* makes use of any of the innumerable phenomena of life as the occasion to awaken oneself or to have others awaken to one's true Self-Nature.

For this reason, to seek for the Buddha externally is wrong in its very direction. Nanquan, in his *Chan* teaching-expression, "The Ordinary Mind is the Awakened Way," goes so far as to say to Zhaozhou, "Even to set upon the quest for awakening is to go contrariwise."³¹ Linji also, using the example of Yajnadatta (a young boy of that name who once, looking into the mirror, went about searching for his real face), admonishes that in searching externally for the Buddha one only goes far and far away from the Buddha.³² The *Discourse on the Direct-Lineage of the Dharma*, cited above, states that so long as one searches externally, not knowing that the Self-Mind is the Buddha, even if one is busy the whole day contemplating the Buddha and making obeisance to the Patriarchs, one misses the very Buddha.

For *Chan*, that Shâkyamuni is a Buddha is only because he is awakened to his True Self-Nature. And not only Shâkyamuni, but anyone without exception, who is awakened to one's true Self-Nature is, for *Chan*, a Buddha. Here lies *the sameness quality* of being a Buddha. In the Buddha-Nature every person is completely equal. The Buddha being some particular person's mode of being or being transcendent does not represent the Buddha's true mode of being. Conversely, man's not being the Buddha does not represent man's true mode of being. Thus it is even said that man as man is is Buddha while not being Buddha is delusion. The same is meant by the Sixth Patriarch when he says in his well-

known verse:

"Originally not-a-single-thing,
Where can dust collect?"³³

When historians say that Shâkyamuni lived in India two thousand five hundred years ago, they are referring to Shâkyamuni in form. Shâkyamuni as Buddha is not the Shâkyamuni who existed temporally and spatially 2500 years ago in India, but is the Formless True Person who is not delimited by time or space. In this sense Shâkyamuni is *the eternal "right-now," the infinite "right-here."* Shâkyamuni as Buddha can not be understood by those historians who would negate the Self-Buddha through their use of the categories of time and space. Shâkyamuni as Buddha can be known never as an object but only as Self-Awakened Existence, as the Awakening awakened to Itself.

This means that wherever and whenever any person is awakened to one's True Self-Nature, the Buddha-Shâkyamuni is there and then. This "there and then" is the root-origin of Buddhism which is "prior to the sutras." From this root-origin there can be created newly and freely, appropriate to the time and place, *dharma*-expressions of the past, such as the Buddhist sutras and Buddha-images. *Chan's* "not relying on words" means freedom not only from the already established forms but, indeed, from every form; further, it means that while continually creating forms in Self-expression, one is not captured by those forms or by their creation. It is just in this meaning that the *Vimala-kîrti-nirdeśa* speaks of "On the non-abiding root does every *dharma* abide,"³⁴ and that the Sixth Patriarch says, "Only with no *dharma* to be attained are all *dharma*s to be established."³⁵

Chan thus may be said to have two aspects: one is *the aspect of the true emptiness* of the True-Self which, unbound by any form, is completely free from all forms; the other is *the aspect of the wondrous working* of the Self which, unbound by any form, actualizes all forms. These two aspects constitute the "substance" and "function" of the True Self. True emptiness is the "abstraction" of all forms; the wondrous working is *the free formation of every form*. This is the Self-expression of the absolutely Formless Self. It is here that we have the ground for the non-dualistic oneness of thoroughgoing *abstraction* and thoroughgoing *expression*. Ordinary abstraction is not completely free from form, since it is still only a stage in the process going toward the liberation from all forms. Ordinary expression is not yet a free expression which is not bound by anything, since it is still an expression deriving from some kind of form. Herein lies the *Chan* basis for a thoroughgoing abstract art and a thoroughgoing expressionism.

3. The Chan Prescription

When *Chan* arose in the sixth century, much had been going on in Chinese Buddhism in the way of translations into Chinese of the sutras, the construction of Buddha images, of the building of monasteries, and the giving of offerings to the monks. Emperor Wu (464–

549) of the Liang dynasty (r. 502–57) had achieved so much in the line of these Buddhist works that he was called the Buddha-minded Son-of-Heaven. It was just during this Emperor Wu's reign that Bodhidharma came to China from India. Bodhidharma was asked by the Emperor what kind of merit he could expect from the innumerable good works which he had sponsored since his enthronement, such as the construction of monasteries, the copying of sutras, and the ordination of monks. Bodhidharma replied that all these accomplishments were of "No-Merit!" This single phrase of "No-Merit!" may be said to be a basic and thoroughgoing criticism of the mode of Buddhism of those days. For Bodhidharma, these works were trivial fruits attained within the birth-death bound cycle of *samsâra*, and still remained causes for defilement. They were not to be regarded as ultimate realities. Upon being asked further by Emperor Wu what, then, was the true merit, Bodhidharma answered, "The Wisdom of Purity being perfect in its functioning, the Functioning *Self is empty and calm*." ³⁶ What this means is that this Empty-Calm-ness is the root of all merits, the merit at the heart of all merits; that if this is neglected, however devotedly one undertakes the construction of monasteries, the reproduction of sutras, and the ordination of monks, these achievements must be said to lack the essential point. The Empty-Calm-ness of the Functioning Self, spoken of by Bodhidharma, is nothing but the Original Face of the truly Empty-Self mentioned previously. Awakening to this Self is, for Bodhidharma, the highest merit, the essential meaning of Buddhism. This radical criticism by Bodhidharma together with the later spread of *Chan* brought about a great change in Chinese Buddhism, redirecting it from its diversion toward accidentals back to its basic source.

This direction toward the root-source, however, does not mean the process of going toward the root-source, but rather means, as is expressed in the *Chan* phrase "Directly pointing to man's Mind," directly entering into the root-source, that is, directly awakening to the Original Face of the Self. That is why direct and straightforward ways to open up this awakening came to be so greatly emphasized. The innumerable occasions of *satori*, that is, of Seeing one's True Nature, which appear in the history of *Chan* are so many instances both of this unique method and of its actual fruition in Self-Awakening.

The examples of the so-called ancient cases of *koan* which are recorded in and make up many of the *Chan* texts such as the *BiyANJI* ("Blue-Cliff-Collection"),³⁷ the *Congronglu*,³⁸ the *Wumenguan* ("Gateless Barrier"),³⁹ etc., constitute no more than a very small portion of these *Chan* occasions. These occasions, it is to be emphasized, all involve the concrete things of the ordinary world of man, including such extremely common things of the natural world as the bamboo, the peach, the pine, the cypress, various animals such as the dog, the cat, the wild duck, the ox, and the tiger, or the daily activities of the monks – traveling about to different monasteries, begging alms, drinking tea, taking meals, taking a bath, talking, keeping silent, raising the hands, or stretching out the legs. This concreteness of the occasions, however, is no mere concreteness. As the sutra

-expression "Concrete matter is itself empty" indicates, it is only the occasion according to the time and place for the direct entering into True-Emptiness; that is, this concreteness is no more than the moment for the direct awakening to the true Emptiness-Formlessness, which is the "abstraction" which emancipates concreteness. This abstractness, in turn, as indicated by another sutra-expression "Emptiness is itself concrete matter," is not simply the negation of concreteness. It is, rather, the very basis of the turning away from the concreteness which is to be negated (that is, the false being) to the concreteness which is to be affirmed (that is, the true being).

We have said that natural things and human affairs serve as the occasions and the opportunities for *Chan*. There are, however, not a few instances in which phrases from the various Buddhist scriptures, such as the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa Sûtra*, the *Vajracchedikâ Sûtra*, the *Avatamsaka Sûtra*, and the *Saddharmapundarîka Sûtra*, also serve. For example, *Chan* makes use of the following sayings quoted or derived from Sutras:

"The Original Being, consummate and fulfilled in Itself -- Why has it gone astray and become the unawakened beings?" ([derived from the] *Vimalakîrtinirdesa*); ⁴⁰

"To enter the Dharma-gate of Non-Duality" (*Vimalakîrtinirdesa*, T14. 530c-2a);

"The fourfold Dharma-World" ([derived from the] *Avatamsaka Sûtra*); ⁴¹

"Originally all pure! Why comes there to be mountains, rivers, and the great earth?" (*Lengyan jing*, T19, 120a);

"Activate that Mind which abides nowhere," (*Vajracchedikâ Sutra*, T8, 749c);

"If one sees Me with form or seeks Me identifying Me with sound or voice, that one practices the wrong way and can never see the Tathâgata." (*Ibid.*, T8, 752a);

"No eyes, no ears, no nose, no tongue, no body, no consciousness." (*Prajñâ-pâramitâ Hridaya Sûtra*, T8, 848c).

These phrases, which are so-called "*koan* from inside-the-teaching," are not quoted, however, out of respect for what is written in the sutras or for the purpose of indulging in verbal exposition of the texts. *Chan* rather takes over these phrases and makes them its own, using them as its own occasions and opportunities according to the requirements of the time and place. In this usage, these scriptural phrases are given a treatment completely different from the close, logical reasoning they receive in Indian Buddhism and the textual exegesis and commentaries they receive in Chinese Buddhism. The Indian and Chinese treatments are "inside-the-teaching"; the *Chan* treatment is a living usage "outside-the-teaching." That is, in *Chan* even the scriptural phrases are used as *Chan*'s own unique and direct moments to bring about the Seeing of one's Nature and the attainment of Buddhahood through the direct pointing to man's Mind, which is at once separate from and the source of all the sutra-expressions.

Often, the occasions for the functioning of *Chan* take the form of *mondô* question-and-answer exchanges. A *mondô* question-and-answer exchange is not a dialectical or theoretical dialogue or discussion; nor is it of the question-and-answer mode of daily

conversation. It is a kind of question-and-answer exchange wholly unique to *Chan*, developed for the purpose of bringing about Self-Awakening in the unawakened or, when used by the already awakened, for the purpose of taking the measure of each other's awakening. This kind of question-and-answer exchange is the total Self-hurling, so to speak, of true Emptiness-at-Work. It is the free play of *Chan* functioning, which takes everything and anything for its occasion depending on the time and place. It includes all the functions of man and is not, as is generally the case with ordinary questions and answers, based merely upon words. For example, there are many instances in which the *mondô*-exchange involves the blinking of the eyes, the raising of the eye-brows, the cupping of the ears, the raising of a fist, a blow with a stick, giving a loud shout,⁴² eating a meal, drinking tea, bowing in homage, lifting up a mosquito-driver, and the like. What must be emphasized is that in this kind of *mondô* question-and-answer there is the vivid, dynamic Self-presentation of true Emptiness-at-Work. In short, what is being unfolded in the *mondô*-exchange is the direct, vigorous *Chan* action of having others attain or oneself attaining Awakening, that is, "directly pointing to man's Mind, having them see their Nature, and actualize Buddhahood." The uniqueness and marvelousness of the *Chan mondô* lies in its never being mere talk or silence, sitting or lying, drinking tea or taking a meal, using a stick or shouting; it is always the Wondrous-Working of True-Emptiness. If it were not for this -- and if this is not understood -- the *Chan mondô* would be nothing but exchange of falsehoods, boasts, madness, or at best, wits or riddles.

4. A Blind Spot in Modern Civilization and the Chan Understanding of Man

It is a characteristic of man that the more he becomes involved in complexity, the more he longs for simplicity; the simpler his life becomes, the more he longs for complexity; the busier he becomes, the stronger is his desire for leisure; the more leisure he has, the more boredom he feels; the more his concerns, the more he feels the allure of unconcern; the more his unconcern, the more he suffers from vacuousness; the more tumultuous his life, the more he seeks quietude; the more placid his life, the lonelier he becomes and the more he quests for liveliness.

It is a characteristic feature of modern civilization that everything is becoming more and more complicated, that the degree of busyness increases day by day, and that the mind becomes too overburdened with concerns. Consequently, there is an increasingly strong desire on the part of people to seek simplicity, leisure, freedom from concern, and quietude in order to offset the common trend of modern life.

Recently, in the United States, which has assumed the lead in modern civilization, not only ordinary buildings but even churches have changed their architectural style from a delicate, intricate and grand style to a square and straight, simple and smart modern style. That this tendency toward modernization in architecture is sweeping over not only America but also older cities of Western Europe and, indeed, even Japan, is not simply

because of practical utility, but also undoubtedly because it responds to a natural desire of modern man, who finds himself further and further enmeshed in the extreme complexities of modern life. More specifically, the fact that houses in America are gradually becoming one-storied, simple, and clean-cut, influenced by Japanese architecture, is probably because of the desire to escape complexity and to find serenity. Further, that intricate and involved painting and sculpture have given way to forms which are unconventionally informal, de-formed, or abstract may also be considered to signify a liberation from troublesome complexity, elaborateness, and formality. So too, the change from overly heavy colors to monotone colors in the manner of monochrome *sumi-e* paintings, thus making for a beauty of simplicity, one of the special characteristics of modern art, may also be considered another aspect of this same liberation.

In the same vein, it is inevitable that modern man, thrown more and more into a whirl of pressing concerns, should seek and in fact, greedily demand leisure time, a phenomenon which has found its expression in the current term, "leisure-boom." Indeed, all of the following recent phenomena -- the deep interest in the extremely primitive art of uncivilized people, the popularity of folk songs and of children's songs, the appeal generated by the rustic colloquialisms of the local dialects in contradistinction to the standard language of the cities, the attraction of the free and open world of nature (the mountains, the fields, the oceans) as opposed to the uncomfortably close and crowded urban centers, the marked tendency in recent art toward naïve artlessness, simplicity, and rustic beauty -- can probably be similarly attributed to a longing for artlessness by modern men, who are suffering from the excessive contrivances and artificiality of modern civilization.

Oneness and *manyness* -- or, unity and diversity -- are mutually indispensable moments within the basic structure of man. They must necessarily be one with each other, not two. Oneness without manyness is mere *vacuity* without content; manyness without oneness is mere *segmentation* without unity. Here lies the great blind spot in the mode of modern civilization. The so-called diseases of civilization -- uprootedness, confusion, prostration, instability, bewilderment, skepticism, neurosis, weariness of life, etc. -- are largely due to this blind spot. The greater the multiplicity, the stronger in direct proportion must be the oneness or unity. When on the contrary, the actual situation is a relation of an inverse proportion, then man has no other alternative than to seek to escape into a oneness or simplicity alienated from manyness, whether by turning to the primitive or by simply negatively withdrawing from manyness.

This, however, is no more than a *superficial solution* of the problem of segmented dissociation. Herein may also be found one reason that today, although anachronistic to our time, premodern, non-civilized cults and superstitions still command a following. A drowning man will grasp even at a straw, although objectively considered it is clearly untrustworthy. The attempts by contemporary man to escape from civilization or to return

to the primitive, to the non-civilized, and the non-modern, may be viewed as natural but superficial countermeasures to try to compensate for the lack of unity in modern civilization. To turn from such superficial countermeasures to a genuine solution, there is no other way than by establishing within the multiplicity that oneness or unity which is appropriate to the multiplicity.

If the direction of the development of civilization is toward more and more multiplicity, more and more specialization, then no fixed, static oneness or unity will ever do. The oneness or unity must be sufficiently alive and flexible to respond freely and appropriately to the growing multiplicity. It is not enough that the oneness, while not being alienated from multiplicity, merely serve as the static basis within multiplicity. It must be a *dynamic and creative oneness or unity* which, as the root-origin of multiplicity, produces multiplicity from itself without limit; a oneness that can eternally produce multiplicity out of itself freely and yet remain unbound by what is produced; a unity which while producing multiplicity appropriate to the particular time and place can reach multiplicity to make itself implicit in multiplicity. Only then can the multiplicity, while unlimitedly taking its rise from such a oneness, never lose that oneness, and does the oneness, while producing the multiplicity, ever remain within and unalienated from the multiplicity which it produces.

Multiplicity, in such a case, continuing to contain within itself, even as multiplicity, a oneness or unity, will thus not become disjointedly fragmented. Accordingly, there will be no need to escape from multiplicity to a hollow unity which is alienated from multiplicity. On the other hand, since the oneness even as oneness is the inexhaustible source of, and is never separated from, multiplicity, there will be no need, because of any feeling of *ennui* or because of having fallen into a mood of emptiness or loneliness, to seek for a liveliness within a manyness alienated from oneness. The true oneness is a oneness in manyness; the true manyness is a manyness in oneness. There is a *Chan* expression, "Not having one thing is an inexhaustible storehouse."⁴³

Only when such a relation obtains between oneness and manyness, the two elements of the basic structure of man, will man, however much he/she may diversify toward multiplicity, be free from disjointed fragmentation and, at the same time, in his/her oneness never suffer from emptiness or loneliness. Then can he/she be *at once a unity and a multiplicity without hindrance*, free from all pressure and self-contented, the true Subject eternally giving rise to civilization. Man as such a Subject is Man in his/her True mode of being. Precisely this Man is the human image which is the inner demand, whether or not he/she is conscious of it, of modern man, standing as he/she does right in the midst of a civilization which continues to diversify more and more as it develops. Such a human image is the Original-Subject which, even as it freely and unlimitedly creates civilization and is ever present appropriate to the time and place within the civilization which has been created, is always completely emancipated and never bound by the civilization.

The human image which Chan realizes and forms for itself in the midst of its encounter with modern civilization is supposed to be just like that. It is what I have hitherto been calling "Oriental Nothingness," "Active Nothingness," or "Formless-Self." One should call it the modern realization of the image of Man which Huineng, the Sixth Patriarch, already very early in the history of *Chan* in China, spoke of as "The Self-Nature which, *unmoved in its base*, is able to *produce all things*,"⁴⁴ and, again, as, "Only with *no dharma to be obtained* are *all dharmas to be established*." It is the same image of Man which was referred to when Yongjia, a contemporary of Huineng, said that:

"Walking is also *Chan*, sitting is also *Chan*. Whether talking or silent, whether in motion or at rest, *the Subject is composed*."⁴⁵

The same Man is meant by Huangbo when, in his *Essentials for Transmitting the Mind as the Awakened Truth*, he declared:

"Just the one who the whole day, while not being apart from things, *does not suffer from their delusion*, is called a freedom-abiding person."⁴⁶

5. The Formless Beauty

In that it infinitely creates civilization and forms history, this human image may be said to be humanistic. In that -- even while it is immanent in, as the root-origin of, what is created or formed -- it is not attached to or bound by the created but is always free from them, it may be said to have the religiousness of Linji's "Self-awakened and Non-reliant (Person)," that is, the religiousness of being the truly Emancipated-Subject. Only when they come to be this *Emancipated-Subject*, can they lend themselves to a modern application -- what is spoken of in the *Avatamsaka* teaching as the subject which "returns to and takes rise from Itself" and in the Pure Land teaching as *the subject* in its "going aspect" *actualizes* Nirvâna and in its "returning aspect" "*plays freely* amid the thick woods of what formerly constituted self-agonizing illusions." Of course, by modern here I do not mean anything temporal, i.e. of any particular generation or period of history. Rather, I mean a modern Self-formation-actualization of the Eternal-Subject which is the root-origin of, and beyond all, historical periods, as the expression goes: "Assuming one's form in response to those people whom one meets."⁴⁷ Here there can be established a *newer and higher humanistic religion* which, on the one hand, does not degenerate into the modern type of anthropocentric, autonomous humanism which has forgotten self-criticism and, on the other, does not retrogress back toward a pre-modern, theocentric theonomy completely unawakened to human autonomy.

The realization of such a new, yet basic and ultimate, human image will enable us to do two things. First, it will enable us to turn away from the superficial attempt to cure the disease of modern civilization through an anachronistic, simple-minded, world-renouncing mode of escape to a naïve, pre-modern oneness which is in estrangement from civilization. Secondly, it will enable us to make a more proper attempt at a radical cure of the

modern predicament through the Self-awakening of that oneness which, contrary to being in estrangement from civilization, accords with, and is the source and base of, civilization. Such an *image of man entertained by Chan* will also sweep away every internal and external criticism or misunderstanding of Buddhism which takes it to be world-weary, world-renouncing, and removed from reality, longing for some ideal world in a sphere other than the historical world of time and space. It will, at the same time, be worthy of being presented to the Occident as a new *Oriental prescription* for the disease of modern civilization. For the recent surging of *Chan* interest in the West in such areas as psychology, the arts, the handicrafts, invention, philosophy, religion, etc., is not accidental but derives from an inner necessity of modern civilization.

Chan is, thus, the *awakening* to the above described human image which is beyond time and space, but which *works* freely and without hindrance according to each particular time and place. For *Chan* therefore, this awakening-working is the ultimate active truth, active good, and active beauty, which transcends all limitation; it is the root-origin of every particular -- and therefore limited -- instance of truth, good, and beauty. Although we shall confine our remarks here to beauty, what is said in this regard applies as well to truth and goodness.

This *ultimate beauty* is not a particular beauty belonging to the realm of art in the narrow sense, but is, rather, the beauty of the awakened, working human Self. It is a formless beauty which never becomes an "object" -- either of vision, of any of the other senses or indeed of any mode of consciousness. It is *Active-Subject-Beauty*, that is, the beauty which is the free functioning itself of that which is emancipated from all forms; it is neither merely the concept of beauty nor the idea of beauty. That is, it is the beauty of our being the human Self which is actually awakened and is at work; it is not any objective beauty which arises from seeing or otherwise sensing that Self as an object. It is the beauty which becomes aware of itself only when it becomes the awakened Self itself. In other words, it is the beauty of the Formless Self.

In Buddhism, the so-called thirty-two major and eighty minor physical marks of the Buddha are ordinarily regarded as the perfect features of Buddha. But perfect as the features may be, any Buddha with form is not the true Buddha. As Linji has said, the true Buddha is formless; being without form is the true form. Formlessness is the genuine mark of the true Buddha, and is true beauty. The Buddha beauty which is sought in objects of perception by the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, or consciousness, that is, through shape, voice, smell, taste, touch, or idea, is not the true Buddha beauty. In the *Vajracchedikâ Sûtra* it is written, as already noted, that "If one sees Me with form or seeks Me identifying Me with sound or voice, that one practices the wrong way and can never see the Tathâgata." The true beauty of Tathâgata cannot be sought for through the above-mentioned sixfold mode of sense perception (or consciousness) or their objective referents.

It must never be forgotten that in Buddhism there is an ultimate beauty of form-

lessness which goes beyond the beauty of form to be found in such things as Buddha images, Buddhist music, incense-burning, ceremonial meals, worshipping, verses, the various *mudrâ* expressions of the fingers and so forth. It is precisely this *beauty of formlessness* which is the beauty truly unique to Buddhism, the beauty of the true human Self. Buddhist aesthetics or the true beauty of form in Buddhism must be a formless beauty expressing itself in form, which is then known through the six modes of sense-perception or consciousness -- that is, must be the Self-expression of formless beauty which freely takes on form in any of the objective realms of sense-perception or consciousness. Formless beauty, because it is formless, not only is not conditioned by any already established form but is never conditioned by any form whatsoever. Therefore, it can freely take on any form in Self-actualization. True Buddhist aesthetics is to be found in this beauty of formlessness which freely actualizes itself within form while never being bound by any form.

Accordingly, true Buddhist aesthetics, from the side of the active creation, is formless beauty expressing itself in form; from the side of appreciation, it is the apprehension within form of the formlessness which transcends form -- that is, the apprehension of the form as the expression of formlessness. In short, true Buddhist beauty is none other than the beauty of the human Self awake and at work. Awakened formless beauty, through its working, expresses itself in, so to speak, "*a subtle form-beauty*," the beauty of mere form returning, thereby, to the beauty of formlessness. True Buddhist art is the beauty not of mere form but of "subtle form." It is this latter beauty alone which enables Buddhist art to be directly connected with the true human Self and to have a necessary intrinsic relation with the awakening of this Self; it is this beauty alone which can enable Buddhism to become the backbone for a healthy development of contemporary civilization and to become the eternal source for the creation of future civilization.

(The Japanese text was first published in November 1962, in the *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu*, volume three, pages 11–33. Translated by Richard DeMartino and TOKIWA Gishin, and made public in *The Eastern Buddhist* vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 22–47, September 1965. Revised by TOKIWA, Mar. 2005; Aug. 2012)

NOTES:

1. In this revised English translation the manner and expression of headings for all the five sections follow those of the original Japanese text; diacritical marks are often omitted for technical reasons.
2. In this revised text pinyin is used for Chinese spellings, and the Chinese term "*Chan*" is used instead of its Japanese rendering "*Zen*."
3. *The Discourse on the Direct Lineage of the Dharma (Xuemailun; Kechimyakuron)* says (Taisho Tripitaka, hereafter T 48, no. 2009) :

Between two successive Buddhas there is transmission of mind to mind; no words

are relied on therein.(373b)

In *Essentials for Transmitting the Mind as the Awakened Truth* (*Chuanxin fayao*; *Denshin-hoyo*) Huangbo Xiyun, dates unknown, 8th–9th c., says (T 48, no. 2012):

It is on this very occasion that one knows how Bodhidharma has come from the west, directly pointing to the human mind, and how one, seeing its nature, gets awakened to it [and becomes Buddha]. (384a)

4. See the related note which comes below.

5. Dazhu Huihai, dates unknown, a *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi (709–88).

6. This cursory reference by the author to Rudolf Bultman, a German theologian, 1884–1976, had been omitted in the previous version.

7. T 8, no. 223, 396b (Chapter Seventy–Eight).

8. The *Linjilu*, T 47, 498c, 500ab. Linji Yixuan, –866, a *dharma*-heir to Huangbo Xiyun (dates unknown).

9. The context in which Huangbo made this remark was as follows, according to the *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle eight (T 51, no. 2076, 257c) :

Nanquan: "Concerning the equal study of *dhyāna* and *prajñā*, how do you think of this truth?" Huangbo: "All through the twelve divisions of the day I don't rely on anything."

N.: "Isn't that Senior Monk's view?"

H.: "I don't deserve this."

N.: "Let alone the price for drinks. Who do you make pay for your traveling expenses?"

10. T48 no.2005,293a.

11. In order to accord with the text of *Xuemailun* two corrections are made of both the Japanese text and the English version: from "the Self–Buddha is the True–Buddha" to "the Self–Mind is the True–Buddha" and from "contemplating Buddhas, honoring Patriarchs" to "contemplating or honouring Buddhas" (T 48, 374c).

12. The Sixth–Patriarch Great–Master,'s *Dharma Treasure the Platform Sutra*, ten chapters, T 48, no. 2008, 362a.

13. Mazu Daoyi, 707–86, a second generation *dharma*-heir to the Sixth Patriarch Huineng

14. The *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle six, T 51, no 2076, 246a.

15. T 48, no. 2012B, *Wanling Record*, 385b.

16. Yongjia Xuanjue, 675–713, a *dharma*-heir to the Sixth Patriarch Huineng.

17. The *Zhengdaoge*, T 48, no. 2014, 396c.

18. The Chinese version by Xuanzang, *Banruoboluomiduo–xinjing*, T 48, no. 251, 848c, has : "*xin–wuguawu*; J. *shin–mukeige*," in which the mind is free from obstruction as is meant by the above translation, while in its Sanskrit equivalent, "*acittāvaranah*," which means "having no obstruction of the mind," the mind itself constitutes obstruction.

19 . His historical existence as well as his dates are unknown. The *Baolinzhuan* (compiled around 801), fascicle eight, states he died in 606.

20. For the understanding of the term "Mind of Faith" Prof. Yanagida Seizan refers to its usage in the *Mahayana Treatise for the Awakening of Faith* (*Dashengqixinlun*). Cf. *Zen no Goroku*, vol. 16, *Shinjinmei*, *Shôdôka*, *Jûgyûzu*, *Zazengi*, Chikumashobo, Tokyo 1974. In that case the mind of faith means the mind that has had faith awoken to one's true

nature.

21. A text of one fascicle, in which Shinran gave his "interpretation of essential passages (*mon'i*)" chosen from among the Buddhist sutras and commentaries quoted in the *Yuishinshô* ("Collected Writings on Faith Alone") compiled by Seikaku (1167–1235), a Tendai priest who had close contact with Hônenbô Genkû (1133–1212), founder of the Jôdoshû (Pure Land Shool in Japan).
22. The "*Passage on the Self-Effectiveness, Dharma-Effectiveness, of Attaining Awakening*," is a piece of sermon by Shinran, recorded by Kenchi, a disciple of his; it was included in a collection of Shinran's twenty-two *dharma*-passages, compiled in 1333 with the title *Mattô-shô* ("Collected Writings as the Latter-Days' Lamp").
23. Precisely, *Kenjôdoshinjitsu-kyôgyôshô-monrui* ("Passages that Manifest the Pure Land True Teaching, Practice, and Attainment"), six fascicles in Chinese characters, is made up of quotes from Buddhist sutras, commentaries, and treatises as well as Shinran's own comments on the six main themes: Pure Land true teaching, Pure Land true practice, Pure Land true faith, Pure Land true attainment, Pure Land true Buddhahood, and Pure Land expedient Transformation-Buddhahood.
24. The *Wuliangshoujing*, a Chinese version of the *Sukhâvatîvyûha sûtra*, in two fascicles, by Samgha Varman, who came to China in 252.
25. The *Linjilu*, T 47, 496c: "On the lump of red flesh is a true person of no rank, constantly coming in and going out of each of your face-gate."
26. The *Zhaozhoulu*, first of the three fascicles. Nanquan Puyuan, 748–95, a *dharma*-heir to Mazu Daoyi.
27. The *Zhaozhoulu*, first, and third, of the three fascicles. Zhaozhou Congshen, 79–897, a *dharma*-heir to Nanquan Puyuan.
28. The *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, fascicle fifteen; a case between Longtan Chongxing, dates unknown, and Deshan Xuanjian, 782?–865, his *dharma*-heir.
29. The *Wumenguan*, case 16, and case 21. Yunmen Wenyan, 864–949, a *dharma*-heir to Xuefeng Yicun, 822–908 (*dharma*-heir to Deshan Xuanjian).
30. The *Wumenguan* case 43. Shoushan Shengnian, 926–93, the fourth *dharma*-heir to Linji Yixuan.
31. The *Wumenguan* case 19. Mazu Daoyi, Nanquan's master, distinguished the "*pingchan-xin* (ordinary mind)" from the "*shengsi-xin* (birth-death mind)" in that the former is free from the defilement of the latter. Cf. the *Sijiyulu*, fascicle one.
32. The *Linjilu*, T47, 497c. Linji quoted this story from a Buddhist scripture compiled in the Tang dynasty, *Dafoding Rulai-Miyin Xiuzhengliaoyi Zhupusa-Wangxing Shoulengyan-jing* (briefly, *Dafoding Shoulengyan-jing*, or just, *Lengyan-jing*), ten fascicles. T 19, no. 945, fascicle four, 121b.
33. The *Platform Sutra*, T 48, no. 2008, Chapter One, 349a.
34. The Chinese version by Kumârajîva, T 14, no. 475, 547c, seventh of the fourteen chapters, on "Contemplating Sentient Beings."
35. T48, no.2008, 358C, Chapter Eight.
36. The *Jingde Record of Transmission of the Lamp*, T 51, 219a, third of the thirty fascicles.

37. Also, the *Biyanlu* ("Blue-Cliff Record"), ten fascicles. This is made up of two layers of works : one hundred cases of *koan* collected from preceding *Chan* records with so many verses attached to each of them as comments on them by Xuedou Chongxian, 980–1052, and detailed comments on those cases of *koan* as well as on the verses by Yuanwu Keqin, 1063–1135.

38. Six fascicles. This is a *Biyanlu* of the Caodong school of *Chan*, records of lectures given toward the end of Southern Song at Congrong-an (=hermit) in a temple in Yanjing (present Beijing), together with comments and commentaries added, after the style of the *Biyanlu* of the Linji school, by Wangsong Xinxiu, 1166–1246, a Caodong priest, on the one hundred cases of *koan* and related verses gathered by Hongzhi Zhengjue, 1091–1157.

39. The *Chan School Wumenguan*, one fascicle, a collection of forty-eight cases of *koan* with comments and verses by Wumen Huikai, 1183–1260. This was transmitted to Japan by Shinji Kakushin, 1207–98, a Japanese disciple of Wumen's, and was used only in Japan.

40. Actually this is not a direct quote from the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sūtra*, though, in the form of a *Chan gong'an* (*koan*), it represents the viewpoint of that scripture advocated in its first chapter "Buddhaland." The Buddha in the scripture says, "The land of all the unawakened beings is the Buddhaland for the Awakening beings (bodhisattvas) (T14, tr. Kumârajîva, 538a);" "My Buddhaland is eternally pure like this; only wishing to have those base beings mature, I present to them this false appearance of a much faulty, spoilt land. (538c)"

Historically speaking, Kanzan Egen, ?–1360, founder of the Myôshinji Rinzai-zen temple in Kyoto, is known to have cited a *koan* for guiding practisers, apparently the source of Hisamatsu's quote. It goes as follows : "The Originally Present, Consummate, and Fulfilled Buddha -- Why has He gone astray and become the unawakened beings?" (Cf. A comment by Ikkyû Sôjun, 1394–1481, another Rinzai-zen priest, on Verse no. 551 of his poetry in Chinese, *Kyôunshû*, in the manuscript preserved by Okumura Jûbei, *Chûsei-Zenke-no Shisô*, Iwanami-shoten, Tokyo 1972, p. 364.) And that is considered to be the reason why the Japanese term "Honnuenjô" for "The Originally Present, Consummate and Fulfilled" was conferred on him as the posthumous title for a state master by Emperor Gonara, 1520–57.

Here the problem is how Hisamatsu took the *koan* with the slight change of wording for a quote from the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sūtra*. Hisamatsu in 1915 at the age of twenty-six, after graduation from Kyoto University, practised under the guidance of Ikegami Shôzan at the Myôshinji monastery, and attained Awakening. There he must have been acquainted with the above *koan*. In 1960 he published a book on the same scripture with the title, *Yuima-shichisoku* ("Vimalakîrti in Seven Cases") , and expounded the Mahayana meaning of it with clarity and profundity. Although he did not refer to the *koan* in this book, it must have deeply rooted in his mind as what represented the Buddhaland chapter of the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sūtra*.

In the history of Japanese Rinzai-zen school there have been transmitted a collection of cases of *koan*, compiled and extended among the Myôshinji sect practisers, named *Shûmon-Kattôshû*. According to the recent edition by Kajitani Sônin, Shôkoku-ji

Sôdô, Kyoto in 1982, it contains 282 cases of *koan*, and its Case 183 cites this very *koan* as a quote from the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sūtra*. Kajitani notes that the source seems to have been wrongly cited, and that it can be seen in the chapter on Bodhisattva Vajragarbha of the *Yuanjue (Round Awakening) Jing (Sutra)*. There Vajragarbha asks the Buddha: "The World-Honored One, if all the unawakened beings had originally attained Awakening, why, again, do they have all the ignorances? If ignorances were what the unawakened beings originally had, for what reason do you, the Tathâgata, again declare that they have originally attained Awakening?"(T17, 915b) This question by Vajragarbha well represents Shâriputra's doubt and the Buddha's response in the Buddhaland chapter of the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sūtra*. This scripture, *Yuanjue Jing*, was first introduced by Zongmi, 780–841, as a new translation from Sanskrit, but it is considered to have been compiled in the Tang dynasty as a compendium of Mahayana scriptures in response to the inner quest for the Buddhist truth by the contemporary practisers. One can see one context or another of several scriptures referred to there. This means the source cited in Case 183 of the *Shûmon-Kattôshû*, which must have derived from Kanzan Egen, was very appropriate. Hisamatsu may well have shared the same understanding with Kanzan on this regard. (In writing this note Tokiwa is much obliged to the three persons for their help: Professor-emeritus Yanagida Seizan of Kyoto University, Ms Maeda Naomi, librarian at the Zenbunka-kenkyûsho, Kyoto, and Rev. Hirota Sôgen of Junshin-ji, Rinzai-zen temple in Nishinomiya City.)

41. "*Sifajie*" ("*shi-fajie, li-fajie, lishimuai-fajie, shishimuai-fajie*") is the term invented by Chengguan, 738–839, according to the thought of the *Huayan-jing*. Cf. *Huayanjing Xingyuanpin-shu*, Zokuzôkyô 7-0498b.

42. This does not necessarily mean uttering "he!; ka!"

43. Followed by another line: "Having flowers, having moon, and having towers," this poetic statement is generally attributed to Su Dongbo, 1036–1101. "Within Nothingness" is corrected to "Not having one thing."

44. The *Platform Sutra*, T48, no. 2008, 349a.

45. The *Zhengdaoge*, T 48, no. 2014, 396a.

46. *Essentials for Transmitting the Mind as the Awakened Truth*, T 48, no. 2012, 384a.

47. The author does not cite its source, and the translators were responsible for citing a wrong one. The phrase appears in the following context in which the Four Great Kings uttered their praises for the Buddha, in Chapter Seven of the *Sutra of the Golden Light (Suvānaprabhāsa sūtra)*, tr. Dharmakshema, T 16, no. 663, 344b (In the corresponding verse No. 5 of the extant Sanskrit text it is not explicitly mentioned.):

"The Buddha's body of awakening, like the moon in the sky, Assumes form in response to the people it meets; Like the moon in the water having no hindrance, It resembles an illusion or a mirage. For this reason, Victor Unspotted, we bow to you, the Buddha Moon."

(3 January 2003)

5. Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection¹

I : Sin and Death ; II : Redemption

HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI

Part I : Sin and Death

I *Religious Time*

THESE days I have been thinking of a three dimensional problem concerning man's way of being. Perhaps it may best be expressed in terms of depth, width, and length. By depth I mean probing man as deep as the bottom of his self-awareness and, finally, awaking to the *Formless Self*.

While by form one can mean either physical or mental, what is ordinarily called the "self" has both these forms. Getting free from such a self and realizing the Self that is in both ways formless is what I mean when I speak of the problem of depth. This is of course something which cannot be easily understood by means of theoretical explanation. At this time I do not go beyond what I have just stated.

What I call width has some immediate connection with the Formless Self. For now, however, let me put aside the question of this connection and, about the width dimension, simply say that it is being liberated from the egoism of nation states or races, expanding it to the entirety of the human race, and thus standing on a perspective of *brotherly love for all humanity*, while still paying due respect to the particularity of all nations and races. That is the problem of width. Of course this comes to be the problem of the relationship between the whole and the individual.

Length, the direct meaning of which is chronological, of course also includes spatial extension as well. Length, then, means *forming history* on the basis of the other two dimensions of man's being. Therefore, this kind of length comes to have a different meaning than history in the ordinary sense of the term, because it is length which issues from the first and the second perspective, depth and width. In other words -- speaking from the point of self -- the self reaches its depths, from out of which it moves in width or extension. It is this kind of extension, as extensive as to cover the whole humankind which forms history, that I mean by length. To summarize then, length means *living the life of history while transcending history*. However, it is only when one is free -- even while constantly forming history -- not only from what has been formed but also even from the work of formation itself that we can speak of forming history while transcending history.

Religion is varied in its actual forms, but I think true religion ought to be something that is possessed of the above structure. Therefore, such religion is not a mere religion; it comes to mean history as well as religion, or religion as well as history. In the aspect of its transcending history it is religion, whereas in its aspect of formation, it is history. In

history as ordinarily understood, however, the aspect of transcendence is not thoroughgoing. Of course, relatively one could speak of the possibilities of such an aspect, but not in the ultimate sense.

Religion must of necessity have the meaning of transcending history. But when people speak of transcendence, I think that in most cases they believe that religion transcends what we ordinarily call history so as to cross it transversely. By crossing I mean that religious time of a completely different order from historical time intersects the latter. The intersection itself is actual time, according to this way of thinking. This actual time is the present of religious time; the part before it crosses the present is the past; the part after the crossing is the future. Certainly I do not assert this kind of religious time which crosses historical time to be the true religious time. But this way of thinking is what people usually have in religion.

In Buddhism, for example, we see such a way of thinking. The Buddhists' so-called "three lives" are never the past, present, and future of historical time. They are rather the time originating from somewhere completely beyond history and entering this human world of history, which, after entering, finishes and leaves the actual historical time. They consider this actual historical time to be the present life, the part before entering it the previous life, and the part after leaving it the coming life. In religion such a form of time is established ideationally, and this seems to have its own reason. It is a necessary result of an idea that a Buddhaland or a Pure Land cannot be sought within this actual, historical world of man. When people consider man's originally being a Buddha on the basis of such religious time, they may naturally think of the original Buddhahood in the previous life. On the other hand, they naturally think of attaining rebirth in the Pure Land as a matter of a future life in the course of religious time. Therefore, in religion, apart from what we nowadays call the world of history, we must acknowledge this form of time to be the regular notion.

However, is such a form of time to be accepted as the ultimate nature of time? Is it not a mere postulate or a rationally deducted conclusion? One may possibly conceive of such time by analogy with the causal relationships which are established in historical time. Or it might be that such time was actually separately established, and that then its relationship with historical time was elaborated. In any case, however, such religious time never coincides with historical time; and religion of this kind is isolated and is an escape from the actualities of life. For example, if becoming a Buddha or having rebirth in the Pure Land is a matter of a future life, since it occurs after this actual time in which we live is completely terminated, that is, in the future after death, then to attain it would be absolutely impossible. If attainment be in the future after death, then the religious world cannot but be isolated from the actual world, and this latter will consequently be left behind by religion. This is far from convincing to us. Religious time ought necessarily to be what coincides with historical time. I do not think that religious time is established in its re-

lation to historical time by crossing the latter. I rather think that *historical time is established with religious time as its fundamental subject*. In other words, with Formless Self, or Self without form, as its basis and fundamental subject, historical time is established. Therefore, the length dimension, as I mentioned above, comes to mean a Supra-historical formation of history, a Supra-historical living of history.

II *The raison d'être of Religion*

As I have mentioned above, I am considering the problem of man from the three aspects of depth, width, and length, through which I hope to solve various problems. Here I should like first of all, to consider the first, that is, the aspect of depth, that is, to probe deeply into man's self-awareness. This will be seen to have a connection with the problem of death and sin. While I have taken a keen interest in religion both scientifically and practically, for me the problem of depth has been the problem of religion.

Since there are various kinds, or forms, of religion, it may be dogmatism to take up only one kind or form from among them and call it religion. On the other hand, to look upon all those which are called religion as religion would not be very convincing. Some of them appear to be far from deserving to be so called, often, it must be said, with some reason. One cannot affirm everything that is called religion, although it is not easy to say which to deny. According to the positivistic approach to the history of religion or the science of religion, one must study as many forms of religion as possible, affirming them all to be religion. In such a case the problem of which religion is genuine and which not is not considered. However, when we concern ourselves with the various forms of religion, we really cannot help making judgments and evaluations about them. That is, one must investigate whether or not this or that particular form is a developed religion or a primitive one, and, going one step further, examine whether or not it is really religion.

Especially when one seeks to enter religion, that is, when one wishes to "seek the Way," which religion one should choose should not be a matter of each person's merely subjective opinion. This, the most important problem, is an objective one. Taking a false step in this regard will lead one into serious difficulties. Therefore, for those who seek religion, what true religion is should be a matter of greatest concern. Further, besides the problem of what religion one should seek, problems such as the objective value religion has for us and the *raison d'être* of religion become very important. Those who can feel satisfied with their own firm, subjective belief in some religion may feel themselves safe. However, to seekers of the Way in modern times who are very critical, and who refuse to be persuaded by anything that lacks objectivity, the problem, the true religion that has its own reason, is really a grave matter that can hardly be left unattended.

For me also, as one who seeks religion, if the religion were without a *raison d'être* not merely for me as an individual but for man *per se*, I would not be able to have a firm commitment to that religion. I would readily relinquish it. Should one want to preserve religion and feel obliged to find out some reason for it, that kind of preoccupation would

stand in the way, and one might come to defend religion without reason. This would actually mean one's defending some already established particular form of religion. Looking at the matter from the viewpoint of a free man -- who feels no need to defend religion -- I go so far as to think that if religion has no *raison d'être* at all for man *per se*, it has nothing to do with us.

Where in man does one find the "moment" whereby he needs religion? Where in mankind -- not in a particular individual -- does one find the reason that religion must exist? This is a very grave concern for me. Only when it is settled, can we say that religion has a *raison d'être* for any and all persons. Or rather we had better say that we can call religion that which has such a *raison d'être*. If it has such a *raison d'être* and hence must of necessity exist for man, then it can be called true religion. To tell the truth, that is a very difficult problem. Is there any reason at all why religion ought to exist for man? In other words the problem is: Where in man does one find the "moment" which prevents man from remaining merely man? Where is the objective reason for which man cannot abide at ease with merely being man? If one can find any such objective reason, then one will be sure that man cannot remain a merely ordinary man, that man cannot help going beyond that, and that at this point religion is established objectively and reasonably. In conclusion the problem will be, whether or not man can ever remain simply man.

As for ways of thinking about man, there are many, needless to say, wherein both man and transcending man are spoken of; but it is not clear what kind of man is transcended and in what manner. Inquiring into the problem of what man is is extremely difficult, hardly to be settled easily. However, in our present times, in the modern age of uneasiness in which we stand, perhaps we can say this: When one speaks of transition from the Middle Ages to the modern world, Theonomous men such as those of medieval faith can no longer be called modern men. Let me use the term "Theonomy" here to characterize the medi-eval type of faith which finds its ultimate shelter in the divine law. Certainly it is not that there is no reason for the existence of Theonomy. But in modern times, and in the present age which is its vanguard, man has gotten rid of the kind of man that lives according to such Theonomy. Man has become autonomous. Even more clearly then, types of religion which precede Theonomous religion, such as animism and fetishism, certainly belong to the past, and have no *raison d'être* today. If one calls them religion, it is only by name; they cannot be living religions with their own *raison d'être*.

Concerning religions of the medieval type I cannot afford now to go into detail, but since modern man's autonomous self-awareness has become central, even though such religions exist today, they cannot truly be called present-age religion. Religions of the medieval type have lost their *raison d'être*, and have already died out or are dying. Anyway, I believe that in the present age when man is awake as autonomous man, the medieval type religions can no longer continue to exist, and are going to die out. Even though medieval type religions survive today, this is an age when autonomous man's self-

awareness is the subject. In other words, the present age is *the age of humanism*. If one calls religions of the medieval type theism, the self-awareness of today's autonomous man is humanism. Further, this autonomy is not narrow intellectualism; it is *rationalism in a broader sense*. Today's man, therefore, is a rational man in the broad sense of the term who overcomes bondage to the senses through Reason. Such men of reason, we can in a sense say, are engaged today in forming the world.

Today is an age when the man with humanism or humanistic idealism is coming into control of things, and he will continue to do so in the future. In this regard, we can say that the fields where such humanistic activity is assumed are distinctly realized as science, morality, and art, and that the development or advancement of such fields has become the matter of concern. All this apparently leaves no room for the standpoint of religion, which is spoken of as transcending reason. Even if from the "humanistic" standpoint one may speak of transcending man, one speaks so not from the standpoint of religious faith, but from that of reason. By this I mean that that which transcends man, although not yet actualized, cannot but be thought of as the ultimate of reason, like Idea. Here is a way of life in which, while rationally approving of the transcendent nature of Idea, one goes on working toward its actualization. Thus, to regard as religion the way of life which is considered ultimate as regards the relation between actual life and its ideal -- this can be called the standpoint of "idealistic humanism."

From such a standpoint, however, even if one speaks of religion or faith, the world of such religion or faith becomes only relatively actualized, and will never absolutely become actual. Rather in its never absolutely becoming actual history is thought to be established. Do we not here find the reason why the present age does not find satisfaction with itself? The ideal world is after all never actualized, and the actual world is the one that constantly suffers from the tantalizing glitter of the ideal.

However, it ought to be asked here whether or not this faith or religion of humanism can establish itself firmly. I mean, I should like to consider whether or not the very hope of attaining of such an Idea, or being resigned to its unattainability, has any validity at all. This will also serve as *criticism of humanism itself*, so that it will become criticism of the religion that is established on the ground of humanism. Where can we find the reason why the standpoint of "reason" ultimately becomes untenable?

Our problem now focuses itself upon that of the "moment" in man which necessarily leads him to religion. I should like to clarify this by considering it in relation to the problems of sin and death.

III *The Religious Moment in Man*

In religion -- not primitive ones, but those established out of a highly developed awareness of human nature -- what moment in man is regarded as leading him to religion? In many cases, *death and sin*. Christianity regards Original Sin as the moment in man which keeps him from remaining man, and which inevitably leads him to religion. Besides, since

it is called "original" sin, it is the basic sin, and is considered to indicate something different from ordinary sin. Today, however, for us who attempt to understand original sin, the myth which attributes it to Adam and Eve is completely unacceptable. Therefore, such a myth cannot but be interpreted differently, perhaps, as a symbol. Never can it be accepted literally.

Perhaps there may still be people who accept it as it has been accepted, and in the Middle Ages it may have been sincerely taken literally on faith. Theirs is, however, pre-modern faith, which is unbelievable for modern man. For modern morality, it is unthinkable in terms of individual responsibility that the burden of the sin thus committed by man's ancestors should be borne even today by their descendants. And yet in its emphasis of sin where not only particular individuals but all human beings are guilty, it is considered to have universality.

A direct confrontation with sin is found not only in Christianity but in Buddhism as well, and there too it is seen as a religious "moment" in man. In Buddhism, among various schools, the Jôdoshin (True Pure Land) school emphasizes *contemplation upon man's sinfulness*, considering sin as an important religious "moment" in man. Not only in the Jôdoshin school, however, but in Buddhism at large sin is considered to be a religious "moment" of man. Therefore, we can say that sin is regarded as a very important "moment" which leads man to religion.

Besides sin, especially in Buddhism, death is considered to be the other, equally important religious "moment" in man. Death, in this case, first means physical death. Certainly one cannot abstractly think that physical death is all that death means; it includes mental death. In any case, when death is said to be a religious moment, it is also called into question. In Christianity, death may not be given as much weight as sin, but it cannot be supposed to have been neglected.

These two, *sin and death*, which ordinarily are separately considered, since they are each spoken of as the single or the grave "moment" for religion, can both be said to be the inevitable for man, and to point up man's limitation. In other words, when *the moment for religion in man* is said to be sin and death, this means that sin and death constitute man's limitation, and that they are what man can never overcome. We ourselves face death. There is no one who does not die. Death is negation of life; no man or no living being can overcome it. The same is true of sin. No man can escape or overcome it. We must first separately take them up to consider what each means.

The terms sin and death are taken in various ways. They have a variety of meanings and can never be defined in any single way. However, when one speaks of sin, ordinarily one is likely to think of the term in its moral sense. When there is some sin committed in the moral sense, it is natural to think about avoiding sin. From the standpoint of morality, one must take the direction of overcoming sin. Getting free from sin or overcoming sin can be achieved only by the moral conduct necessary to overcome sin,

not by anything else. Sin, from a moral perspective, must always be overcome by moral means. However, morally speaking, one can only be negative about the possibility of completely overcoming sin. In other words, moral strength is like the limitation of idealism. Although, relatively, one can overcome each single sin, one can never get rid of sin itself, no matter how long one may try.

IV Sin

Ordinarily sin may be considered to belong exclusively to morality. But when we consider it well, *we come to wonder whether we can limit sin to morality alone*. I rather think that sin exists in science and art as well, and not just in morality. Certainly it is not of a moral type, but just as we have evil against good, we have falsity against truth, ugliness against beauty, and defilement against purity. Even if we could get rid of sin in a moral sense, we could not be free from beauty versus ugliness in the world of art, or truth vs. falsity in the world of science. Therefore, *sin ought to be extended to include the problem of reason per se*.

To summarize in a general manner, the concept of sin ought to be extended far enough to the kind of sin which consists in between being rational and being irrational. Meanwhile, the opposition of rational and irrational is basic to the structure of reason, so that to remove what is irrational and to leave behind only what is rational is, one must say, impossible. This becomes clear when one considers the structure of reason itself. For this reason, getting free from sin or being redeemed from sin is, speaking from the standpoint of reason, impossible.

However, by this I do not mean any impossibility of removing what is irrational in the *process* of rationalization. In the process one must promote individual rationalization, and in this respect reason has its own life. It is not that difficulties met with in the process make it impossible to be liberated from sin in the broader sense of the term as indicated above. I mean rather that the impossibility of being freed from sin is indubitably based on the structure of reason itself.

Distinguishing the basic *contradiction, dilemma, or antinomy* which is considered to exist in the structure of reason from the relative contradiction, dilemma, or antinomy which reveals itself in the process of rational activity, we will deal with the former, which is the antinomy inherent in reason itself. This more basic antinomy is an ultimate one which concerns the structure of reason, and, as such, is the ultimate antinomy.

The antinomy in the process of rational activity cannot but be of a relative nature; it cannot be ultimate. Distinguished from that, the basic, ultimate antinomy is no other than the fatal limitation of reason. Here we see the extremity-situation of reason itself. Here we see the ultimacy of sin. In other words, it is here that sin is said to be the unavoidable limitation of man.

This is especially *the limitation of modern man* who today depends on the stand-

point of reason. Even though he has this in the depths of his own being, he is *not aware of it himself and so continues to rely on this antinomic standpoint*. Herein, fundamentally, lies the direction of history in modern times and also the direction of human life. It is in this light that I interpret the easy-going nature of human life in the modern world or in modern history. To think that by relying on the standpoint of reason we can dissolve sin is to consider possible what is really impossible.

Only when sin is seen to be such as I have been explaining, does it become the sin of man which covers the whole field of man; and unlike ordinary transgression, it comes to mean the root of all sins. In other words, sin arises because man has ultimate antinomy in the very structure of his being. Insofar as the basic antinomy is not solved, we are fated never to be redeemed from sin. In this sense, I feel that so-called original sin really does exist (although its myth is far from being convincing to us today). This original sin is that which no one has been able to escape since man's beginnings -- by which I mean since man became highly developed. To remain unaware of this would be nothing but *religious ignorance* -- although ordinarily few will refer to this as religious. This is *man's most basic kind of ignorance*. If one should look for man's darkest spot, perhaps this would be the place to look. Man's fate, the deep chasm from which he cannot escape, *the abyss of man*, lies there.

Realizing this kind of sin differs from the case in which I get obsessed with the idea of my sinfulness because someone else tells me I am guilty. It also differs from the case in which one categorizes each individual transgression and considers it to be extremely wicked. A question from which we cannot escape is, *what makes so-called extreme wickedness possible?* When we speak of original sin, which aspect of man do we point to? No mere dogma or doctrine or words -- arrogant as it might sound to speak thus -- attributed either to Shâkyamuni or Jesus Christ or anyone else, would ever convince me that I have committed original sin. In this very respect one might well insist that I have *karma* accumulated from previous lives or that I have the stains of original sin on my soul. However, I have never been ashamed or worried that I might have such karma accumulation or effects of original sin. I rather think that because I am affected thus the real situation of man becomes apparent and, far from feeling penitent, I take delight in it.

It seems that ordinarily people emphasize relative guilt out of some sentimentality, and taking it as categorical or ultimate feel themselves to be sinful or ultimately guilty. Man's feelings of not being able to keep on living as well as his nihilistic feelings, in ordinary cases, prove, upon careful examination, to be only of a relative nature. Situations in which one is really and ultimately nihilistic will prove rarely to exist if one calmly investigates them rationally. Nowadays, there are said to be a great number of suicides. But there does not seem to be any distinct reason which may have made these suicides inevitable. In most cases relative reasons given too much emphasis seem to have brought them on.

I wonder, however, whether we can approve of such a situation. To consider man to be nihilistic on such grounds seems merely to reflect a very shallow understanding. When man is said to be nihilistic, where should we locate this view? Today people often speak of nihilism, but the basis for that, in my view, is simply in the ultimate antinomy of man. I believe that it is in this ultimate antinomy that the ground for ultimate negation of man is found. I would rather speak of the ultimate antinomy as sin than say that sin constitutes antinomy. That is the way I should like to define original sin. For all the various ways of understanding sin, I should like to think that inevitably all of them stem from this ultimate antinomy.

V *Death*

It is said that man enters religion not only because of the "moment" of sin, but because, apart from that of sin, there exists the "moment" of death. If sin is spoken of not in its ordinary sense but according to the above interpretation, then our next problem is how we should think of death in a manner similar to our treatment of sin. I need not mention here that when one speaks of hating death one has hope in life, and this indicates that death is inseparable from life. There is no death as such alone; death, after all, is not to be separated from life. It is *death as the other side of life*. In this sense, one must say that death is invariably *of the life-death nature*.

From the viewpoint that death is unfailingly of life-death nature, it must be said that there is no life apart from the life of life-death nature. Life of the life-death nature cannot possibly acquire a life which has the nature of life alone. In other words, for life of the life-death nature it may be possible to relatively overcome death but is ultimately impossible to do so. This is true because at the bottom of life there exists the antinomy of life vs. death. It is only in the case of ordinary life that living or dying can become a question. According to my view, one should fear not death but life-death. Then our sharing in the life-death nature comes to be the basic problem of our life. In other words, our life stands on the basis of the ultimate antinomy of being at once life and death. Therefore, *the meaning of death ought to be deepened to the extent that not mere death against life but the very being life-death is death*.

Besides, this life-death nature can be spoken of in relation to all living beings, that is, in relation to all that which is alive. In this case life-death means origination-extinction, which is not necessarily limited to man's life-death.

The term origination-extinction is an all-inclusive one. It applies to man as well as to everything else. However, we must extend the content much further than life-death or origination-extinction, and bring it to the very point of *existence-nonexistence*. In other words, it comes to mean the life-death of man's life in its being-nonbeing or in its existence-nonexistence. Therefore, if one speaks of getting rid of death as redemption from mere death, he is not very exact in his way of expression. Rather it should be get-

ting rid of the life-death nature.

Consequently as regards death, one must say that the very ultimate antinomy life-death is death. This is what I consider to be *ultimate death* or ultimate extinction. This is what is called *Great Death* in *Chan* (*Zen*, in Japanese). Ultimate death, which can also be called ultimate negation, is evidently not any mental negation as an abstract idea; it ought necessarily to be fundamentally subjective.

VI *Sin and Death as Inseparable, and Emancipation*

As I have mentioned above, by sin I think we should mean the ultimate antinomy rational-irrational, which is found in the structure of reason. Nothing else, I should like to say, is the real, ultimate sin. As for death also, it is nothing but the ultimate antinomy existence-nonexistence, which lies at the bottom of life, and which I consider to be ultimate death. That is how I should like to interpret sin and death; or rather, extreme though it may sound, I think *that is the way they really are*. They ought to be so; they cannot but be so. In Buddhism, in the case when death is said to be the "moment" for religion in man, if the death is to be man's extremity-situation, it ought to be deepened to the kind of death I am referring to. The interpretation of sin also ought to be as thoroughgoing as the one which I have outlined above.

In the above I have mentioned separately the ultimate antinomy of life-death and that of the rational-irrational. This may have made them appear separate from and unrelated to each other. But the truth is that these two cases of ultimate antinomy are never two in us; in the concrete, actual man they are one. The ultimate antinomy of life-death and that of the rational-irrational are not separable from one another; they are indivisible. To take up either life-death or the rational-irrational alone, apart from the other, is evidently an abstract matter. In their concrete reality these two are one; there is never one apart from the other. To ask why the ultimate antinomy of life-death becomes pain or suffering in us is already a question based on the judgment of reason. Not only because one feels that pain is detestable but also because *one judges* that it is to be detested, does liberation from pain come to be a problem that is really objective. Further, sin without a sinner is a mere idea; the concrete man who lives to die is the sinner.

Such ultimate antinomy really pressing upon us is the true "moment" of religion. A death or a sin which one can look upon is an abstract one, a mere object of thought. We are confronted by ultimate death, ultimate sin. This ultimate antinomy is the very self-awareness in which existence and value are one; it is not anything to be known externally. It is original to man; it is at once my way of being and that of all human beings.

The "moment" of religion for man ultimately lies here. And any kind of religion should be brought home here, should be pursued to this depth. As for relative religious moments in man, there may be a variety of them. It is only when one goes from relative moments to the ultimate moment that there prevails the ultimate antinomy which is fun-

damentally subjective. It is there that there obtains the true religious "moment." This is so, I believe, whether we know it or not.

In Buddhism when one speaks of sin, one calls into question not only evil or sin but the three antinomies: good-evil, right-wrong, and pure-defiled. Again since death is ultimately of life-death nature, and since liberation from death is liberation from life-and-death, Buddhism regards the kind of ultimate antinomy which I refer to as the "moment" for religion. Further, in Buddhism, when one speaks of the liberated state of man, liberation from origination-extinction is also called "nonorigination-nonextinction," "No-birth-No-death," "birth-and-death as one truth" and so on. Freedom from discrimination of good vs. evil, right vs. wrong, pure vs. defiled, is called "No-good-No-evil," "true-and-false as one truth," "pure-and-defiled as non-duality," and so forth. Here that which has been liberated from the moment of ultimate death, ultimate sin, is considered to be man's true way of being. As remarked by the Sixth Patriarch of *Chan* in China² : "When you do not think of good or evil, ... your original face at the very time." Through and through this is a case of the Not-thinking-either-of-good-or-evil. Also, in the expression by the Sixth Patriarch³: "The face that you had before your parents gave you birth." The self prior to birth from one's parents means the Self without the life-death nature. Such a question the Sixth Patriarch posed to a monk, saying, "At the very time you do not think of good or evil, please give back to me the Face that you had before your parents gave birth to you." This constitutes the basic task of man. Without the solution to this problem one cannot help falling into anxiety and desperation.

Similar expressions are found abundantly among the *Chan gon'an* (koan). Such a problem, which has become one with the person who wrestles with it is the "great doubting-mass" (*dayituan*; *daigidan*) i.e., the self as ultimate negation. Here my whole body and whole mind is one as fundamental subject. Such a basic "great doubting-mass" is itself the ultimate antinomy. Although ordinary doubts are intellectual, this "great doubting-mass," despite the intellectual term "doubting," is no mere intellectual doubt. It means *something total*, in which emotional anguish and volitional dilemma, as well as intellectual doubting, are *one fundamental subject*.

In this regard, the "great doubting-mass" *completely differs quantitatively and qualitatively from the "doubt" in Descartes' de omnibus dubitandum* ("Concerning the necessity of doubting everything"), which served as an important moment in the change from the Middle Ages to modern times. The "great doubting-mass" is all-inclusive, total, and ultimately and radically subjective. Here, *what is being doubted is the very doubter himself, and the one who doubts is that which is doubted; there is no distinction between that which acts and that which is acted on, between subject and object*. This is the *one great mass of doubt* to which all the doubts are reduced and upon which all the doubtings are based. Therefore, clearly enough, this is far from something like a sum total of possible particular doubts.

In *Chan* from very early days there has been a term "great doubt" (*dayi; daigi*). In my view the "great doubt" of *Chan* ought to be what I mean by the "great doubting-mass." If the "great doubt" of *Chan* were to mean, as it has tended to be mistaken in the tradition of *Chan koan* heretofore, a doubt or a *koan* which concerns some particular, individual thing or matter, we must say that it would be unworthy of being called the great doubt.

As for the well-known *koan* of Zhaozhou's "Wu" ("Mu"; "Nothing"), which is presented as the first case of the *Wumenguan* ⁴, even if the *koan* becomes, as Venerable Wumen said, "the doubting-mass (given rise to) with your whole being," should it remain a *particular doubting-mass*, it could never be called "great doubting-mass." Insofar as it is not great doubting-mass, even when it is broken through and awakening opens up, it would be no more than *particular awareness which has form*; it could never be called *Great Awakening* or *Awaking-Mass*, which, Linji said⁵, "Without any form, penetrates throughout the ten directions and right now is working in your presence." Because the doubt is exhaustively thoroughgoing, totally single, and fundamentally subjective, the Awakening also can be exhaustively total and fundamentally subjective.

For the overcoming of this doubting-mass, the bottom of man ought to be broken through. The way of breaking through it is only this -- to be awakened to the True Self, the self in whom the doubting-mass is resolved. Here is a leap. The self in ultimate anti-nomy cannot become the True Self with continuity. Only when the self which is ultimately antinomic breaks up, does the Self of Oneness awake to itself.

Therefore, we must say that there is a leap, a discontinuity. However, this does not mean that one is saved by someone else or that redemption comes from God or Buddha. The self of life-death nature breaking up and becoming the Self without life-death means that the self of life-death nature becomes awakened to its original Self. In this sense the Self without life-death has continuity with the self of life-death nature. In this Self-awakening, like between the doubter and the doubted, there is no separation between the awakened and what one is awakened to. While the doubting-mass breaks and the True Self is awakened to, the former is related to the latter in a very special manner as the darkness of night which is dark through and through is to the brightness which prevails after sunrise.

By the True Self I mean the Self that is not the ordinary self, the Self that has become free, in the true sense of the term, from death and sin, the Self that is not limited by either time or space, the Self that is empty and nothing -- Formless Self, Egoless Self --.

The leap from the ordinary self to the True Self, however, is no mere leap. A special method is established there. Through its application, I believe the theological dispute between the Swiss theologians Emil Brunner (1889-1964) and Karl Barth (1886-1968) also can be solved⁶. The method I refer to is the Self-awakening in no other sense than getting awakened to the True Self. It is not the heteronomous-Theonomous method, which has completely gone beyond the limitation of autonomy. Rather, it is the method of

establishing the Self on the basis of criticizing modern autonomy.

Besides, since this is the original way of being for us human beings, it can be effected no matter where, when, and for whom. Being formless itself, it takes every form and is free. While rationally ultimate freedom is one thing and ultimate freedom as fundamental subject the other, the latter, which may also be called the standpoint of Existence, since it has no form, is Nothingness. This Nothingness is no mere logical negation but the way of being of the Self that comes breaking out through the bottom of ultimate antinomy. This is fundamental subject in the sense that only from this does infinite positiveness arise. Although referred to as fundamental subject, this is not any particular, limited being, but Reality as the most basic, Self-awaking being, emancipated and redeemed.

Moreover, *this being redeemed is the very way-of-being of the Self, not a mere feeling or a state of consciousness*. This Self may well be called Creator because God or Buddha exists not outside but inside the Self and because it is present. In our being this kind of Self we are all equal. *It is not that in the presence of an external God we are equal*, which would be heteronomy. We all have the Buddha-nature; we are originally the Buddha, as it is said: "All beings are of the Buddha-nature."⁷ "Every sentient being is originally the Buddha."⁸ In this respect human beings are all equal. This is the field of "width," the standpoint of all humankind.

As I have initially mentioned, *it ought to be that in the point of depth we become the True Self, emancipated from the ultimate antinomy of sin and death, that in the point of width we solve various problems from the standpoint of brotherly love of humankind, and that in the point of length, i.e., history, the Self of No life-death nature goes on living in the midst of life-and-death, forming history while transcending it*.

Part II: Redemption

I What is Redemption?

SO-CALLED "redemption" is of various kinds and different levels. The question I should like to consider is, What kind or what level of redemption should we regard as ultimate? The problem will be, Who is redeemed from what and how is he redeemed? There is no doubt that it is I who am to be saved. This does not mean that I am the only one to be saved. It should be that when I am saved all human beings are saved at the same time.

As it is said in Buddhism, "In both self-benefit and benefiting others lies the perfection of Awakening and practice."⁹ One's own redemption is not everything, for that cannot be considered true redemption. Instead of being merely subjective and individual, true redemption ought to have an objective validity applicable to any person. Otherwise, as redemption, the saying "In both self-benefit and benefiting others lies the perfection of Awakening and practice" would not apply to it.

Next, a way of thinking which looks upon a particular god as savior cannot lead to

true redemption. Redemption ought to be equally available to all persons. A manner of redemption in which some particular savior saves some particular person can never lead to the true redemption of all human beings. Belief in the existence of a particular savior is a shortcoming peculiar to theism.

Buddhism affords an example of the kind of redemption at which we aim, redemption that is realized on the standpoint of equality. Although Buddhism includes differing viewpoints, from the ultimate standpoint of Buddhism, the savior is not different from the saved. Where is the basis for this deliverance which is thoroughly and equally available to all human beings, with no distinction between the savior and the saved?

According to Buddhism, redemption is already present in every person. *Sentient beings are, without exception, originally saved.* This is the standpoint of Buddhism. From the viewpoint of those not yet saved, Buddhism holds that sentient beings must all be saved. This is expressed most clearly in the Buddhist expression, "All beings are of the Buddha (i.e., Awakened) nature." This means that redemption is not what one is given from outside, that is, a favor by external blessing in the form of revelation from Heaven or of Grace. Rather, all sentient beings originally have the Buddha-nature.

It is Buddhism's view that, although at present sentient beings are not yet awake to their Buddha-nature, it is nevertheless true that they are the Buddha, without any distinction between the savior and the saved. This means that the ground for man's redemption is basically inherent in him. Its presence is the basic or ultimate moment in man, which makes his redemption possible.

I do not mean that in Buddhism there is no view which rejects this point and distinguishes the savior from the saved. Such a view, however, is not Buddhism's basic principle. It is of only secondary or tertiary importance. It is because of this equality of the savior and the saved that we can actually hope for redemption. Unlike the belief that redemption comes only to a particular person or persons, or the belief that redemption comes only from a savior, Buddhism teaches that everyone has the possibility of being saved. The kind of conflict which is seen in the theological dispute between Barth and Brunner does not really exist in Buddhism.

Further, when we consider the person to be saved analytically, we come to the conclusion that his actually not being saved -- by which I mean his not being in his original way of being -- and his being saved should consequently prove to be one. This can be seen from the nondivisibility of the savior and the saved, too. But at the same time one must consider the following matter.

Ordinarily it is thought that when a person is saved a certain conversion takes place whereby the person that existed before redemption is negated to become a saved person. Between the person before redemption and the person after redemption a break is thought to have taken place to sever the continuity. Yet in the case of the unsaved becoming saved, real redemption does not really result from a break, in which the un-

saved person completely disappears and a saved person appears in his place. Unless there is continuity, there will not be a point at which the unsaved becomes saved. Therefore, although certainly there must be a negation of the unsaved, the question arises in what respect he is negated, or rather, what is negated, and what it is that remains. That is, it is the problem of where continuity really takes place and where discontinuity really exists. Speaking from the standpoint of "awaking to the True Self," the True Self constitutes the aspect of continuity. Continuity exists in the sense that the True Self is inherent in the unsaved.

The True Self exists within the unsaved person in the sense that, though unsaved, one has the possibility of being saved and as a matter of fact is saved. From the viewpoint of the unsaved, therefore, the True Self has not yet manifested itself. Consequently, the problem of redemption becomes the relation between the true way of being and the untrue way of being. In other words, although the Buddha-nature or the True Self actually manifests itself on our sensations and consciousness, when one is not in the true way of being one is not awakened to it. When one becomes awakened to it, a relationship of continuity is established by which the unsaved becomes the saved. In other words, redemption comes to mean that the True Self awakens within us, or that we are awakened to the True Self. By our getting awakened to the True Self, we become saved.

It can thus be said that one who has been considered unsaved is in truth already saved. In this sense the notion of not being saved is actually false and being saved is true. For upon getting awakened to our True Self, we can see why we are originally saved. Here we must consider the problem of truth and falsity. Some religions consider the actual human beings are unsaved, that the unsaved human beings are in their true mode of being, and that redemption means going beyond that way of being. Such religions, then, must always expect redemption to depend upon some absolutely "other" power. When one supposes that man is originally sinful, or of life-death nature, redemption cannot but depend on what is "other" to man. Christianity holds this view, and in Buddhism as well, such a notion is not entirely lacking.

But that is not what I mean by redemption. By redemption I mean that human beings are "originally" saved, that they are originally the Buddha or "truly as they are" (*tathatâ; zhenru; shinnyo*). Here lies the great difference. Primarily in Buddhism *it is not the sinful, life-death way of being but the no life-death, no-good and no-evil way of being that is genuinely original*. Here the term "originally," should not be taken in the ordinary sense such as found in the ethical doctrine that man's inborn nature is good. The categories of good and evil cannot be applied to it. It is often thought that while the Buddha-nature is inherent in us, as we live our day-to-day existence, we are completely different from it. In other words, by "inherence" people often mean immanent transcendence, so that with them the Buddha-nature, immanent as it is, is far removed from the actualities of life. However, immanence is not the true way of the Buddha-nature. The Buddha-nature

is neither transcendent nor in the ordinary sense, actual. It is *the constantly awaking, ultimate present*. The awakened is the true Buddha-nature; the immanent is not yet the true Buddha-nature. Therefore, redemption points, more than anything else, to the presence of the saved. It is not a matter of either the future or the past. *One's being saved at the present time is the true way of redemption.*

But as I have mentioned, I do not mean by this the presence of the saved on the basis of the existence of the savior and the saved. Redemption here means the present which is without either the savior or the saved. This I should like to call "*awaking to the original Self*."

Often the oneness of the savior and the saved is understood in a mystic way as the union of the divine and the human. In this view the divine exists and then we empty ourselves and become unified with the divine that exists on the "other side." That is one way of union. With mystics, that is usually the case. But not with all mystics. For example, what of Eckhart (1260-1327)?

Eckhart from the Christian viewpoint is interpreted to mean that God, as an absolute Other, exists, and that man, emptying himself, is unified with Him. Buddhism also has a mode of inner contemplation, according to which there is an objective immanent Buddha, and the contemplator attains unity with it by emptying himself. But I do not think this is Buddhism. The unity between the Buddha and the ordinary being, or the non-duality between the sentient being and the Buddha, exists nowhere else than in awaking to the True Self. In this unity or non-duality, there is no Buddha to be recognized as Buddha, no human to be recognized as human, neither savior nor saved. True redemption exists not where one commits himself to the savior, but where neither the savior nor the saved exist.

In that sense, redemption means Awakening -- awakening to the True Self. In Buddhism, the only religious activity thinkable is the religious activity of "Awakening." I should like to characterize Buddhism not as a faith, nor as a way of contemplation, nor as the union of the divine and the human, but as Awakening. In that sense, the "Buddha" comes to be the "Self." That I am the Buddha and the Buddha is me does not mean emptying myself to become one with the Buddha. It means that he who is awakened to the original Self is the Buddha.

This is a subtle point. When we are truly saved, our way of being ought to be that of the awakened, that is, of the Buddha. This becomes clear when we dig thoroughly and unreservedly into our true redemption. Buddhism in its primary principle has always been in that way. Buddhism is only one example of this to be found in the past. Shâkyamuni's attainment of Awakening also is but one example of it. Because Shâkyamuni attained that kind of awakening, he is regarded as a Buddha. Since there is his example, we naturally feel familiarity with it, and go on shielding and sustaining it. I am not speaking out of arrogance; I am presenting a way of thinking in which the natural flow of things is like that.

So much for the problem of who is saved.

II *Value and Anti-value*

Now I should like to take up the questions, From what and how is one saved? The first, from what is one saved, also becomes the question of the ground for the objective validity of religion. In other words, it is the question of why it is necessary for man to be saved. That is, where does the objective and valid ground for religious redemption lie? Unless this becomes truly clear, the *raison d'être* of religion in man will not become clear. If the *raison d'être* of religion is not clarified, we shall not see any objective or valid reason for our religious practice or religious undertakings. Therefore, this is a very important problem for religion. Nevertheless, it has not been squarely grappled with and so I have been attempting to give it proper consideration.

There seems to be a variety of worries from which we ought to be saved. But now the problem is, what worries can be called religious worries. The nature of most of the worries man suffers from would seem to be relative rather than ultimate. Sometimes one has what seem to be ultimate worries, but upon careful scrutiny they tend to prove to be a *subjective raising of relative worries to the level of ultimate worries* or else relative worries given undue emphasis. What, in fact, are the truly ultimate worries? What are the worries from which one can never be delivered? If religion is deliverance, not from relative worries, but from ultimate ones, or ultimate deliverance from all worries, where in man do the ultimate worries lie? We must look carefully into this.

I would conclude that ultimate worries *derive from the following two which constitute man's actual way of being. That is, first, man is a being involved with values; and second, at the same time, man is a conditioned, time-space being.* As long as we continue to be involved with values, our worries will never be exhausted. And man is a being involved with sense values and rational values. Our values begin with sense values and proceed to rational ones. That is, man's life based on value proceeds from a life of sense values toward a life of rational values. But when one leads a life based on rational values, the opposition of rational and irrational never ends.

This opposition is the basic "moment" of rational life, and its coming to an end will after all mean the negation of rational life. Needless to say, in the rational life these two opposites will never cease to exist. The irrational being overcome by the rational and transformed into the rational is the direction of rational life. Therefore, worries in the rational life lie in the never-ending opposition of these two. The worries of rational life are overcome, that is, we are delivered from them, after all, when the rational has exhaustively overcome the irrational. It is the ultimate of rational life that the irrational be completely exhausted and the purely rational alone remain.

It is only then that we could say our worries have completely ceased to exist. Therefore, when one considers the validity of his rational way of life and goes on living on

that basis, the exhaustion of worries is thinkable only when the rational has overcome the irrational. Although worries from senses always haunt human life, life based only on the senses has a very subjective validity. Objectively it is without foundation. The objective validity which human life is required to have will be impossible in other than the purely rational life just mentioned. In other words, man's worries will not all be dissolved until the irrational is completely overcome. This is what all modern philosophies which base themselves on reason seem to approve of. But the aim of rational life to become purely rational, from the standpoint of rational life, must be said to be contradictory. While rational life inevitably comes to have that kind of ideal, *the very having of an ideal must be said to be the contradiction of rational life*. Because it is a contradiction, the "purely rational life," although it is something constantly hoped for -- to hope is inevitable to rational life -- can nevertheless never be achieved. It must always remain an eternal "Idea."

This means that worries are never really exhausted, never removed. The wish to find the life which is the most objective and valid for us human beings is thus unrealizable. It is in this unrealizability of rational life that the ultimate worries of human beings today -- the kind of worries to which all the relative worries are reduced -- are considered to exist. In other words, *the ground for the ultimate worries*, one cannot help believing, *lies in the structure of rational life itself*. The ground is the contradiction of rational-irrational which is the basic structure of reason, the very contradiction inherent in reason itself. Consequently, in order to be truly delivered from ultimate worries, the resolution of the rational-irrational conflict, which is contained in rational life itself, must be brought out. It must be brought out, however, not in the future as is usually thought to be the case, but at the starting point of rational life. Only then does deliverance from the worries which in rational life can never be resolved become possible.

The worries inherent in reason cannot be resolved in the future of our rational life. Rather at the root of rational life there ought to be a resolution of rational life itself. Here is the reason why the basic criticism of rational life arises -- criticism of the age which regards rational life as the basis of human life, the age which has reason as its fundamental subject. I believe, therefore, that through a criticism of reason, through criticizing rational life itself, there ought to arise an orientation for going beyond rational life. To speak in terms of a historical period of time, there ought to be a change from the modern era which holds reason as its fundamental subject to an era which fundamentally criticizes reason. There ought to be an internal demand not only for a criticism of reason but for a new era which transcends reason or which resolves reason into its source. In fact, I suspect that the deadlock of rational life is already manifesting itself in various fields, though unperceived. From the point of view of rational life, the "moment" in man which leads him to religion, after all, is considered to exist in the basic contradiction lying at the bottom of this rational life.

III *Existence and Non-existence*

Although inseparable from this rational life and unthinkable apart from it, our time-space existence, temporarily distinguished from values in rational life, becomes the problem here. We can say that we are at once rational existence and time-space existence. Rational existence and time-space existence, in the concrete human being, can never be separated. They are to the end one body, not two. Without time-space existence, no rational life is possible; without rational life, no time-space existence is possible.

To take up for brief consideration here the question of time-space existence, *man* cannot avoid *being simultaneously both existence and non-existence, both non-existence and existence*. Man's being alive means that he has time-space existence; and being alive is never being alive alone. Death, its correlate, necessarily accompanies it. Pure life is impossible. So is pure death. In this sense the time-space existence of man must be said to be of life-death nature. In the life-death type of existence the ideal goal of man's time-space being is thus the attainment of pure life, that is, eternal life. In this regard, man must be said to be always aiming at pure life.

When we consider, however, why life is so desirable to man, we realize that if life should remain mere time-space existence without any value judgment passed upon it, life itself would not be found desirable. Therefore, wherever pure life is desired, a value judgment is already inseparably joined to it. Furthermore, even if life be lived for a hundred, a thousand, or tens of thousands of years, it will never become pure life, because *life is inseparably accompanied by death*. Pure life is absolutely impossible for humanity.

Although pure life is desired, it must be said to be eternally impossible. In this impossibility there exists the basic affliction of man's existence. The source of affliction of our life lies, after all, in the life-death nature of life. Therefore, this is not a problem to be solved in the future -- as we have seen in the case of value-based life -- no matter how many years that future may extend to. This is the kind of problem which ought to be solved at the very root of life. That means, unless the problem of life-death existence is radically resolved, the problem of life, no matter how long one may strive, can never be solved. Therefore, the direction of its resolution differs from that ordinarily thought to be the correct one. The usual direction of solving the problem of life, the direction of medical science or the like, is that of attempting to solve it on the temporal plane -- sometime in the future. But this is open to radical criticism. Certainly we do proceed, and cannot help proceeding, in the direction of resolving the problem of life on the temporal plane in the future. Yet it is absolutely impossible to completely resolve it by proceeding in that direction. Here we must see a deep criticism of our ordinary attempt to resolve the problem of life.

As I have explained above, in both aspects of value and existence, man contains unsolvable contradictions in himself at the starting point or basis of his life. Besides, in

the concrete human being, the two contradictions are found to exist in an indistinguishable, inseparable way. In that sense, they are non-dual contradictions, an absolute, ultimate contradiction. That is, they are considered to be ultimate worries, the moment in man which requires ultimate deliverance.

I am convinced that here and nowhere else lies man's truly fundamental affliction. I do not assert this without giving reasons. My assertion does not come out of dogmatic belief, but out of the reasons I have mentioned. And can we not speak of this affliction as the ultimate antinomy inherent in man? Besides, *far from being merely objectively cognized as an ultimate contradiction*, that antinomy comes to be experientially and clearly realized by us as our present existence itself. The actual self is such an ultimately antinomic man. Not a merely subjective, individual man, but every man, without exception, is that antinomic man. And that is man's fatal destiny and affliction. It is never phenomenal, relative affliction, but an ontological, ultimate one. And since it is an affliction which goes beyond our handling, we actual humans are driven into a dilemma which we, as we are, cannot in any way solve. Ultimate dilemma and ultimate agony becoming one constitutes what I am. That way of my being, it must be said, is the basic "moment" in me from which I must rid myself.

Today nihilism has come to stand out in relief in various ways, and attempts have been made to consider its "moment." But what is the real "moment" which makes man nihilistic? It can never be sought except in man's ultimately antinomic nature. From this viewpoint we can consider past religions too. Religions which are too superficial to be called religions, very primitive religions, seem to seek their "moment" in a future resolution of the problem of our sense values. In the rational world, however, these religions are doomed to see their "moment" itself suffer criticism and negation. Therefore, for the modern man who lives a rational life, the kind of existence that seeks its moment in the sense world no longer holds good, for it has lost its validity for man.

In basing himself on his rational life, man proceeds in the direction of solving his problems in a thoroughly rational manner. We human beings belonging to a high level of modern culture are going in that direction. So is modern humanism. But *religion based on humanism*, which is conceived in the process of actualizing humanism, is a religion which eternally believes and postulates that the ultimate ideal aimed at by reason should necessarily be actualized in the future. This is called religion because, although its ultimate goal is destined never to be actualized, it believes that destiny will finally be overcome and its goal finally attained. This may be called a humanistic religion. It may give rational human life a hopeful direction and the strength to live. Without such a belief, rational life cannot but fall into despair. It is a natural postulate of rational life that this kind of religion is in demand as a relief from despair. Immanuel Kant's (1724-1804) exposition of the basis of religion is also to be understood in this way.

Since the above-described relief, a natural postulate though it is, cannot be actu-

alized by man, the natural conclusion is that it must be actualized by some power that goes beyond man. So there comes to be postulated a super-human power to actualize it, or the divine grace of a pre-established harmony. But after all it is nothing but a postulate; it does not know how to deal with *the basic contradictions of rational life*.

The same is true of the aspect of existence. Despite the various considerations aimed at saving man from death, the destiny of man's time-space existence, after all, remains untouched. Remaining ignorant of this destiny must also be said to be the great tragedy of man. His carrying this insurmountable tragedy within himself and *endlessly pursuing the world of empty hope* might emotionally furnish some relief. However, speaking realistically, no such emotional relief will do. Since the objectively valid, basic "moment" that necessitates man's redemption from being man is the ultimate antinomy, there is no ultimate redemption without resolution of the antinomy at its very roots.

It is not that none of the established religions were aware of this. In Buddhism man is said to be the existence not exempted from the two extremes: true vs. false, right vs. wrong, good vs. evil, pure vs. defiled, and so on. This may be regarded as expressing man's ultimate antinomy from the aspect of values. But it cannot be considered to have been understood in the distinct form of what I call "ultimate antinomy." On the other hand, while Buddhism says that man must be liberated not from death, but from birth-death or from being-nonbeing, this may be looked upon as meaning that man's life is ultimately antinomic. But *I wonder to what extent the relationship between the ultimate antinomy of existence and the ultimate antinomy of values has been clarified in Buddhism*. Ordinarily the two are treated as if unrelated to one another. Birth-death has been treated as birth-death alone; true-false, good-evil, and pure-defiled are treated merely in themselves. In other words, while the ultimate antinomy of existence and the ultimate antinomy of values are inseparably related to one another and are actually one ultimate antinomy, the problem is whether that is clearly understood. For example, when birth-death is spoken of, I wonder whether it is inseparably connected with true-false, and whether when true-false is spoken of, birth-death is inseparably connected with it.

While in Buddhism the discrimination of good-evil or birth-death is said to be the basic moment of delusion, if we interpret this discrimination as ultimate antinomy, this discrimination will not be limited to mere intellectual discrimination. The totality of value-based life comes to be of the nature of discrimination. Here we must see the ultimate meaning of discrimination. The reason why discrimination is wrong can be explained only with respect to the ultimate antinomy.

In that sense, it may be possible to interpret or re-interpret the Buddhist concepts of birth-death or good-evil from the view of ultimate antinomy or, rather, from the point of our ultimately antinomic way of being. Unless they are re-interpreted in that manner, the Buddhist concepts of birth-death, of good-evil, and so on will be one-sided, and not fundamental; that is, they will not be interpreted properly. Buddhism gives the reason why

sentient beings ought to become Buddha by saying that man is of a birth-death or good-evil nature. Here certainly we find a criticism of reason; *in order to make the criticism fundamental enough, one must necessarily reduce it to the ultimate antinomy*. Otherwise, no true interpretation will be possible.

Likewise, in Christianity, if sin is considered only on the basis of value it will remain based on man's rationality. It will never point to the source, man's rationality itself. Since, however, original sin is spoken of, there ought to be the objectively valid ground in man – in every human being – for the so-called original sin. Unless the ground for original sin is clarified, it cannot help remaining a mere myth or a mere matter of faith. Therefore, if original sin ought to be objectively valid in man, the understanding of original sin ought to be deepened or re-interpreted to encompass man's ultimate antinomy. While the term is an expression of value, unless original sin comes to be of one body with existential life-death, it cannot be but one-sided. Consequently, I think that original sin also, in the end, comes to mean man's ultimate antinomy. In this way, when we ask, "From what should man be saved?" I think in the case of religion we cannot help concluding that man ought to be saved from his ultimate antinomy.

IV How to be Saved

Next, let us go on to the question, "How is man saved?" I should like to include here both the method by which one is saved and the state in which he is saved. This is a very difficult problem. It constitutes the methodology of religion which requires objective validity. After all, however, it means our turning now from ultimately antinomic men to those who have gotten completely free from the antinomy. It ought *not to be a mere isolation of ourselves from man's actual, ultimate antinomy but an overcoming of that antinomy* and getting completely free from it. It ought not to mean, as it ordinarily does, to die of the antinomy, or to escape to some other world, or to have God or Buddha of the "other" nature lead us somewhere else. It ought to be that antinomic man is transformed into one who is completely freed from the antinomy from within. One that is antinomic himself being transformed into one who is completely free from that way of being – this is the true and ultimate conversion.

Now our problem is the method of transformation from the man of ultimate antinomy to the man who has broken through and become free from it. Since this is impossible on the standpoint of reason, that is, on that of ultimate antinomy, then any solution based on reason ought to be abandoned. Therefore, some new method must be found which is not of the rational nature. What we need is a method by which we become the Self that is not of the nature of value-antivalue or existence-nonexistence. And that will be a so-called religious method. Then the problem arises whether there is any such method. This method is our awaking to our Self that does not possess a value-antivalue, existence-nonexistence nature. Ordinarily we as such Self are not awake. Our not being awake means that we are rational beings. That is, our being rational existences prevents

us from awakening. When we are driven into what I have called ultimate antinomy, our original Self, taking this antinomy as the "moment" and breaking through it, awakens. This is the awakening that breaks through and emerges from the extremity-situation of reason. That is, it is the awakening of that which has not been awake until now.

For one who is not awakened, this may be almost impossible to understand. As long as one remains positive of his rational standpoint, he cannot see the limitations of reason. But when reason is deeply reflected upon and criticized, the ultimate antinomy can be realized at its bottom. It is realized not as anything objective, but as the fundamental subject. While this is self-realization, or the ultimate antinomy realizing itself, what has penetrated through it also emerges as Self-realization.

This awakened state is also we ourselves, but it is neither the self of existence-nonexistence nor of value-antivalue. It is the self of non-"existence-nonexistence," non-"value-antivalue." It goes beyond all definitions, beyond all forms. It is, as it were, the Formless Self. By our awaking to this Formless Self, we overcome the ultimate antinomic self and come to be saved from the ultimate antinomy. This is achieved not by the ultimately antinomic self overcoming the antinomy. Rather *from the bottom of ultimate antinomy, the Self in whom the antinomy is overcome awakens*. Of course the ultimate antinomy serves as the "moment" toward it. But it is no more than the moment. Never is it the "moment" that becomes the overcoming subject. It is by the Self awaking to Itself, which is free from the ultimate antinomy lying at the abyss of the rational self, that the antinomy is overcome. In that case, it is not that the awakened self exists outside the ultimate antinomy, separated from it as some other isolated being. Rather, emerging free from within the ultimate antinomy, casting it off, the Self awakens. In other words, the awakened Self is the Self that has cast off the ultimate antinomy, emerging from it. This comes to be the Self of the ultimate true way of being, man in his true mode of being. To call it "true" does not mean that the Self harbors any opposition between true and not true. It is free even from that opposition. It awakens as the Self that goes beyond right or wrong, beyond birth or death.

Therefore, when we speak of redemption, it is not redemption in which one is saved by an absolutely other God or Buddha. The saved comes to awake from within -- the one that has not been awake awakens. There even the term "to be saved" may not be appropriate, in that it may suggest we are being saved by someone else. Here, however, one is saved by no one else but the Self. By "being saved" I mean that the True Self -- originally awakened though yet not awake -- awakens, and that the ultimate antinomy is thereby overcome. Therefore, concerning the relation between the saved-self and the not-yet-saved-self, it is too delicate a matter to speak of either continuity or discontinuity.

From the aspect of the ultimate antinomy which is the ultimate extremity-situation of the actual man, no step forward from the extremity-situation is possible. Here continuity is considered not to exist. Should one be saved by some God or Buddha of ab-

solutely "other" nature, only discontinuity will prevail. There will be no continuity between the saved and the savior. Redemption will be nothing but a miracle or mystery, and the saved will stand dependent on the savior. Since the one who is saved will thus be absolutely dependent on the savior, man's autonomy or independence will be lost.

"Coming to awake," however, means that the one who is originally awakened but at present unawakened comes to awake, and that is the True Self. In other words, the True Self, by awaking, casts off the rational self, and negates it. Having emerged free from and cast off the extremity-situation of rational autonomy, this is, as it were, *depth autonomy*. Such is the basic, ultimate autonomy that has emerged from and cast off the fatal, ultimate antinomy of rational autonomy. The rational self cannot yet be spoken of as thoroughly ultimate autonomy. This awakened Self, however, is absolutely autonomous. Its autonomy is absolute; it is free from heteronomy vs. autonomy. Therefore, here we need no mythically conceived or piously believed-in absolute other being. Awakening means getting absolutely independent.

We can take an example of such a way of awakening from Buddhism. Although "Buddha" is variously interpreted even in Buddhism, the true Buddha or the Buddha in its true way of being, as the original Sanskrit term "*Buddha*" indicates, means an Awakened one. A Buddha means one who is awake. It never means one who believes in an Other, or one who is saved by an Other. It is not the one who is believed in, not even the savior who stands as the Other. The Buddha is *the one who is himself awake*. He is awake to the Self that transcends birth vs. death and good vs. evil, the Self that has broken through and become free from the ultimate antinomy. One can awake to this only for himself, since this is himself. That is to say, the awaking awakes to itself. Needless to say, *there do not exist the two: the one that is awake and that to which one is awakened*. In Buddhist terms, neither "actor" nor "acted upon" exist. In the terms of phenomenology, this is *an awaken-ing without Noema and Noesis*. Therefore, it is not anything to be taught by others.

In Buddhism too, the Buddha is said to be autonomous, self-abiding, not taught by others, or obtained from without. It is the so-called "Original Face." The Original Face, completely covered because of various obstacles and not awake itself, is the sentient being. When it comes to awaken, the sentient being becomes the Awakened One, the Buddha. The ultimate Buddhist method is neither through consciousness on the sensory-rational level, nor through faith, which is called religious Noesis, but through Awakening.

Chan people have the remark, "Cold or warm, know it yourself." This should be, unlike what is asserted about ordinary experience, only what is applied to Awakening. Other things can be known in many ways other than "Cold or warm, know it yourself." Awakening, however, can be known in no other way. Just as even the self in the ordinary sense, insofar as it is self, cannot be taught by others, so Awakening, though the content differs, since it is Self, cannot awake except by and for Itself.

In connection with this, however, one must say that occasions helping one to attain

Awakening are innumerable. Yet, after all, all these helping occasions can be reduced to the ultimate antinomy. Only when they are reduced to this, and when it is broken through, does the total, radical solution take place. It is a sequence in which the root problem is first solved and the branch problems second. The solution of branch problems alone will not bring about the solution of the root problem. The root problem must be uprooted. Instead of extinction of individual worries one after another, a severance of the root of afflictions must take place. Thus, the Awakening of the Formless Self is, when speaking of afflictions, the extirpation of them all. Otherwise, afflictions will endlessly continue, and there will never be deliverance from them. Religion is the eradication of worries by awakening to the original Self.

That Self, awakened, *flows backward* into the unawakened self and fills it. The original Self becomes the fountainhead, and *the way of being of the ordinary self becomes what has come out of that fountainhead*. Or contrariwise, the ordinary self *returns to the fountainhead*. Thus does positiveness or affirmativeness arise. That direction, which is the opposite of the one toward the original Self, brings about a positive continuity with it. Previously there was *the self-negating continuity from the unawakened self to the awakened Self*. Now, on the contrary, there is effected *the affirmative, positive continuity from the awakened Self to the unawakened self*. That comes to mean *resurrection* or *resuscitation of the self*. It is only here that one can speak of absolute affirmation.

Upon awakening to the True Self there comes an absolute affirmation of the self. *Where the awakened Self affirmatively restores the actualities to true life, there is established true religion*. In other words, the world which has had the rational self as its fundamental subject is converted to the world which has the awakened Self as the Fundamental Subject. That world is not differently located in time and space from the ordinary world. Rather, from the fountainhead of time and space, therein time-and-space is established and therefrom time-and-space arises.

The world which has this awakened Self as its Fundamental Subject is the world which, while transcending reason, freely lives the rational life, and which, transcending life vs. death, lives freedom. This is what should be called the truly religious world. Transcending the negative-affirmative, fatally wrong infinity of ordinary history, it is the standpoint that goes on creating history unobstructedly with ultimate affirmation. It is also the standpoint which criticizes religions which seek an ideal world completely different from the actual historical world, such as Heaven or the Pure Land of Bliss. These are completely different worlds, isolated from actual history.

Seeking such an isolated world is, after all, an escape from the weariness of actual history, and it never effects the redemption of the actual realities. Even if an ideal world should exist somewhere else apart from the actual world, it would have nothing to do with the actual world, which would remain unsaved. Moreover, even if such a world should be affirmed in one way or another in its relation to the actual world, the affirmation still could

not be anything but escape from reality. A world isolated from the world of actual history is no more than a fairy tale or myth.

Thus *the world of the religion of Awakening is what is established through its criticism of religions which isolate themselves from reality and its criticism of the historical idealism of modern humanism*. Such ought to be the redeemed, true world of history. Here, redemption is not a matter of an eternal future life in another world of history. It is *redemption of the fundamental subject of the actual, historical world, redeemed from the bottom of its history*. Only then can we establish a new, creative, fundamentally subjective view of history based on Awakening. And only this enables us to *transcend history within history, and create history* without being removed from the world of history.

While one can say that religion is the ultimate liberation of man, this human liberation implies two meanings: man's transcending the limitations of history within history, and the unobstructed and free creation of history by the transcending, creative, fundamental subject. Buddhism has such expressions as:

"The physical form is void; void is the physical form."¹⁰

"The body and the mind fallen off"; "the fallen-off body and mind."¹¹

"From the non-abiding root, all the forms are built up."¹²

These words have been interpreted in various ways since old times, but only when interpreted as above can they offer a radical criticism of real history and the ground for rebuilding it as well.

V-1 Self, Society, and History¹³

Our human way of being can be understood to have three dimensions: the individual being of the self, the spatial-social being, and the temporal-historical being. These three dimensions -- self, society, and history -- are inseparable from one another in human life. To investigate the problem of how the three ought to be related, we must allow the Great Doubt to arise in us.

As human beings who are awakened in the modern sense, we ought to awaken ourselves to reason in its broad sense, as the way of being of the self. Since we are rationally awakened, we ought to purify reason, to build society and always create history in a rational manner. It is not easy for the self to do this. Many obstacles rise in its path. But we ought to continue to overcome them and go on forming a rational self, society, and history.

While today we meet such obstacles in various forms, it is needless to say that since the beginning of modern times wonderful progress has been made as the result of efforts to realize this rational world. Speaking from the viewpoint of man's progress and development, this is certainly something to be celebrated. But if we reconsider the matter, this very progress and development also constitutes a great threat. Startling developments such as the discovery and uses of atomic power have aroused grave worldwide

anxiety. This poses an unprecedented threat to mankind. Likewise, while the growth and enlargement of the earth's different societies is a pleasing indication of man's development, it is also true that unparalleled social forces or forces of collective bodies constitute a cause for deep anxiety in modern man.

We need not dwell upon the fact that atomic power may at any moment be the ruin of mankind. The dread of such potential disaster is countless times greater than the dread of natural calamities such as earthquakes or typhoons. It produces a contradictory anxiety and fear; man's own discoveries and inventions may destroy him. In the current political alignment, too, the confrontation of the collective forces of East and West is at a point never before equaled in recorded history. No one knows when these giant opposing powers will bring unprecedented misery to mankind. Should they ever resort to war, the most terrible confusion in history would be brought down upon man. With science as its ally it would drive all of mankind, without exception, into the abyss of ruin. *By his own productions man has created such a terrible threat, and he feels that it has gotten beyond his control.*

We may call these the secondary forces of nature. The primary forces are what are usually called simply "natural forces." The forces of science and collective power-blocs have gotten beyond man's control, even though he produced them himself. They have become terrible threats, threatening us from without. They are beyond the control not only of individual persons but of the collective bodies, the nations themselves. Nowadays, they have become such objective forces that although sensing their threat, the whole of mankind is at a loss as to what to do with them. In this respect they may be called secondary forces of nature. This is the gravest event in the whole historical development of modern times. We can see here the peculiar characteristic of the present age, its anxiety and threat. This present age has really become the turning point of modern history, and we may say that the modern era is in crisis.

This unprecedented anxiety and crisis in human history has become such that it has obliged man to curse his civilization. "Such anxiety would not have arisen had there been no scientific progress, no social development." One is tempted to look back to the good old days and condemn the present. Ten years ago (1957-58) when I travelled through Europe and the United States, I frequently met people who held such a view. The number of those who curse modern civilization seems to be increasing.

Generally speaking, religious people may consider that such a crisis is caused by a lack of awe toward God, that with faith in God there would not have been such a crisis, and that faith in God will save man from it. Usually they believe that man can overcome this crisis through theism, that is, through awe of God. I do not believe this will save the modern age from its crisis.

I believe we ought to advance our civilization even more completely and strengthen further the forces of science and society. However, we need also inquire into what

causes those forces to be a threat and an anxiety for us. For modern man it is not a matter of whether or not he believes in God. The cause lies in the fact that modern man is still lacking in rational consciousness, that he lacks a moral consciousness based on the rational consciousness.

While the development of society is something to be proud of, to take delight in, it is regrettably not accompanied by a similar growth in ethical awareness. One moves ahead very rapidly whereas the other does not keep pace with it. Rather, it is going backward. This reveals where the real crisis lies. I doubt if there is any greater need than the purification or strengthening of ethical awareness. It is in this way that we can overcome the crisis of modern times. It alone can be called truly modern. To attempt to overcome the crisis of modern times through reliance upon God is, we must say, a retrogression toward pre-modern ages.

Where the uplifting of morality is concerned, even theonomy, if it had any heteronomous nature, would contradict the independence or autonomy of modern man. Rather, we men of the present age are expected to be already free from such a theonomy. If there remains any trace of heteronomy, we should free ourselves of it. How priceless for the development of mankind is his consciousness of his own autonomy! Any retrogression away from this autonomy toward a heteronomous theonomy would mean degeneration for humankind. We must guard against it.

Christianity holds that the fall of Adam and Eve and their removal from Paradise was the fall of all mankind. However, I should say rather that Adam and Eve thereby became independent and autonomous, that the coming into being of man's autonomy means independence from God, freedom and emancipation from God, and that far from being man's fall, this is man's progress. Therefore, we must make ourselves, society, and history more and more rational.

As regards what is ordinarily called crisis, the large and small crises which we daily experience, it is most desirable and important to overcome them through a rational development of the world. Inquiring into their causes often reveals that they come from the lack of rational consciousness. Those anxieties or threats which arise from the lack of rational consciousness are, from the standpoint of reason, "rational" in character. In other words, the anxieties are "rational" anxieties simply because the non-rational element out of which they stem is to be removed in a rational way. However, such anxieties are phenomenal; they are not basic or noumenal.

Apart from the ordinary view which regards the present age as a turning point within the history of modern times, here we have another view, which sees a far deeper turning point; it sees the present age as *the critical point of the modern era itself*. Instead of a crisis within modern times, one should come to think of a deeper rooted crisis, that of the modern times themselves. I mean that the modern age, insofar as it remains as it is, is itself the root cause of our anxiety. In the present age there seems to be every indication

that the modern era itself is in crisis, rather than the crisis of the present age within modern times. This is what I mean by the basic, noumenal crisis, compared with which the crisis of the present age within modern times is no more than a phenomenal manifestation. To truly understand the real nature of this crisis and to overcome it -- that is religion in the true sense of the word.

This is the crisis which is beyond any kind of rational solution, because the source of worries is not any rational crisis but *the crisis of reason itself*, which goes beyond rational solution. It is this that *Chan* touches, in my opinion.

As the *Chan* expression "Beneath great doubt is great Awakening"¹⁴ makes clear, *Chan* is never theism; however, it is not rational humanism, either. Where is *Chan* to be located? I think it ought to be located in reality itself. Looking for its location in past history will never do. *Chan* is something that must be dug up directly from the depths of reality. The place to dig for it is precisely in the crisis of which we have been speaking. Only when the great doubt penetrates there and is broken through does the truly great Awakening take place.

By the great doubt, therefore, I mean what one may call the ultimate contradiction lying at the depths of reason, that is, the basic antinomy of reason. Besides, it is only when the great doubt is of fundamentally subjective character instead of some objective doubt that there arises the self-awareness of what is called great doubting-mass. Upon the breaking up of that great doubting-mass there is actualized the Awakening-mass, as it were, of the Fundamentally Subjective nature, or *bodhi* (*jue*; *kaku*).

Then, the question of practice, or the problem of how to attain the great Awakening, becomes important. Since this is the crisis, as I have been mentioning, which goes beyond rational solution and which lies at the bottom of reason, that is, since this is the crisis of reason itself, its solution also ought to rely on a method which is not rational. It must break through the crisis of reason. While heretofore in *Chan* various methods have been considered, we must examine what method for Awakening will be most essential.

V-2 The World of Awakening: F.A.S

We modern men ought to be those who follow reason as we independently and autonomously go about forming society and creating history. The norm for doing this should be reason in its broadest sense. Society and history ought to be constructed in a rational way. As I have already mentioned, however, the present age, in the process of forming society and history, is facing a serious crisis. This is largely due to the retardation of moral reason which fails to keep pace with the progress of scientific or collective social forces. It begins with tardiness in the awakening of moral awareness both on the part of individuals and collective bodies. This tardiness causes a vicious circle. It has brought about the worldwide anxieties of the present age. These anxieties flow backward and cause each individual, whether he is conscious of it or not, to give birth to them anew.

Each individual, under the weight of worldwide anxieties, suffers from new anxieties which go beyond individual resolution.

Besides the lag in moral awareness, another important cause is perceivable, and it is not necessarily an ethical one. As civilization has progressed, societies have become extremely complicated. We are being thrown into a kind of civilized jungle. As social structures become increasingly complicated, we are being driven deeper and deeper into that jungle. This means that we are caught in the complicated structure of civilization and society, and we have not yet established control over it. We are driven by civilization, having lost the helm and fallen into an unprecedented state of confusion.

Consequently the self that must be the fundamental subject has come to be used by things, and the controlling ability to use things has gradually been lost. The *Chan* master Zhaozhou said¹⁵, "You suffer use by the twelve periods of the day, whereas I can use the twelve periods." He was quite right. In the present age, far from using them, we are suffering use by the "twelve periods of the day." Besides, the complication of the world-structure and civilization is only increased by the activities of reason. Unless we can learn to live more strongly in complicated realities, even if we strive to form a solid society and a solid history, it will become completely impossible to continue forming them.

Such being the case, improving morality and establishing self-control in man are absolutely essential. Only through the strengthening of these two can the crisis of modern times we now face be overcome. We must do this by every means in our power. Independent, autonomous modern man cannot afford to lose his nerve in this crisis. He must use and keep using the whole twelve periods of the day.

But between *the man who can use the twelve periods of the day* and rational modern man there remains a deeper and still more important gap. It is the crisis lying in the depths of modern man. Unlike the crisis mentioned above, this crisis always hangs on man because of his very nature, irrespective of differences of time and space. I think we can call it *an ontological crisis*, after the manner explained above. Unless we solve this crisis, we can never be free from anxiety in our making society and history. That is to say, without the solution of this crisis there is no firm establishment of the fundamental subjectivity of man.

From such a viewpoint most of the crises are phenomenal and relative; they can never be considered basic. People often mistake such *phenomenal and relative crises* for ontological and ultimate ones. In man's inquiry into the basic source of worries, which are far from phenomenal-relative crises, various misconceptions tend to arise which take the non-basic source as basic. Such misconceptions produce more empty worries. What will be the truly basic worry, the truly fundamental crisis which differs from such relative crises?

I think it is man's life-death crisis. Generally speaking, the crisis based on exist-

ence–nonexistence or being–nonbeing, as long as it is not overcome, always shadows us. No one knows when what is ordinarily called "life" or "existence" may vanish. Nowhere can life or existence be secure. Nowhere does anything eternal exist. All that lives, all that exists, does so in the manner of living–dying or being–nonbeing. This is the natural, basic crisis of all that exists.

Meanwhile, this universal, ontological crisis is for man inseparably connected *with the concrete form* of value–antivalue. The desirability of existence or life proves that it is already connected to value. Death or nonbeing is terrible or loathsome because value is already combined with it. Existence and value are thus inseparably intertwined and constitute *man's essential, concrete structure*.

This concrete structure of man's crisis is expressed by such Buddhist terms as "*transient*" (or "lacking in permanence," *anitya*), "conditioned" (*samskrita*), and "subject to transformation" (*parinâmin*). These are terms which have been emphasized in Buddhism concerning life–death. However, when life–death is said to be transient, it ought to imply value–antivalue at the same time, so as to express man's basic crisis. Unless man becomes aware of this basic crisis in its concrete form and overcomes it, unless thereby there is firmly established in him the Self that is free from both life–death and value–antivalue, he will not be able to live without anxiety.

Here lies our most basic problem. And it is in the Self–Awakening of *the Formless Self* that the fundamentally subjective solution of the problem exists. This Man who is not of the nature of existence–nonexistence or value–antivalue, is in *Chan* called *the man of no–birth–death who is free from the thought of either good or bad*. This is why the Formless Self has to be advocated. In the Self–Awakening of the Formless Self we acquire true life and true value. It is the man in whom this life and this value are one and inseparable who, having overcome the basic crisis, becomes capable of creating a world and history without anxiety. This is the Self–abiding, true Man that acts without being bound by life or death, good or bad. His being alive and active in reality is man's true way of life.

Therefore, the outcome of this method is getting awakened to the Self in whom the life of no–birth no–death and the value without the thought of either good or bad are inseparably one. The awakening attained is, after all, this Self–Awakening, where man becomes *ultimately independent and autonomous*, having overcome the crisis of rational independence and autonomy. The latter is of a birth–death, good–bad nature and cannot be true and ultimate independence and autonomy. True, ultimate independence and autonomy must be that which has overcome the basic crisis lying at the bottom of existence.

Chan, after all, means being awakened to the True Self, the True Man, or Original Face. The occasions in *Chan* for this awakening are varied and without fixed form. Here also, in their being without fixed form, we see the *Chan* freedom. At the particular time and place where man finds himself he takes that opportunity and awakens to the basic

Self.

Since this true Self is the Self that has overcome the basic crisis, every actual existence and non-existence, every value and anti-value is *directly open to the Self*. It is like digging a well. The water of all wells is open to the same underground flow. My being here and now is in the ordinary sense phenomenal existence. From the standpoint of the true Self, however, this phenomenal existence is nothing else than the expression of the true Self. With our ordinary consciousness, we remain phenomenal. But by awakening from phenomenon to noumenon, the phenomenal becomes the noumenal expression, and the noumenon comes to be the master of phenomenon. The phenomenon immediately opening to the noumenon, or the phenomenon immediately awakening to the noumenon, is *the Awakening of Chan*.

The way to be open to it is the awakening to the Self that is not bound or defined by anything at all, either by birth vs. death or good vs. evil. Huiming was asked by the Sixth Patriarch, "At the very time you do not think of either good or evil, what is your Original Face?"¹⁶ He struggled with the question, and got awakened to that which does not think of either good or evil. Only then was he awakened to the True Self that is not bound by anything. Someone asked the tenth century Chinese *Chan* master Dasui, "How is it when life-death arrives?"¹⁷ To struggle with whole body and mind with such basic dilemma lying at the very bottom of man -- this is the method to penetrate into the root source.

But, instead of using different expressions like "not thinking of either good or evil" or "life-death arrives," we can ask ourselves a single question which will lead us directly to Awakening. What kind of question is it? One that any person may ask concerning his very being here and now, asked in such a manner that we cut off every fetter and attain the true, free life, that after dying a Great Death we revive anew. We must have every fetter cut off. We must die a Great Death and come to life anew. Our actual way of being, no matter what it may be, is a particular one, that is, it is something. So long as it is anything, it is a self that is under some kind of definition and bondage. Above all, we must be awakened to the Self that is not restricted by anything. Supposing that standing will not do nor sitting will do, feeling will not do nor thinking will do, dying will not do nor living will do, then, what shall I do?

Here is *the final, Single Barrier* against which one is pressed and transformed, and through which, in being transformed, one penetrates. *Chan* has hitherto had countless numbers of ancient cases of *koan*, not only the traditional "1700 cases." All of them can be reduced to this Single Barrier. It is such that penetration through one point is penetration through all points, that the single Great Death brings about renewed life, that, being Formless, it manifests every form, and that, body and mind falling off, it has the fallen-off body and mind.

Here alone can we have every binding fetter cut off and become *the ultimately Self-abiding Self* that goes beyond every kind of attachment. The Self that is capable of using

the twelve periods of the day is such Self.

We have been speaking of this as the Formless Self (referred to as "F"), that is, the Self that is without any form, beyond all characteristics, unhindered, and Self-abiding. It is this Self that is the ultimately emancipated Self, the Self that is saved in the true sense. When the saved is under the support and redemption of some "other" Buddha or God, it cannot be called true redemption. The truly independent and autonomous Self alone is truly saved. In *Chan* this is regarded as the true way of redemption. Because it is freedom from every binding fetter, it is called emancipation as well. Such Self is the true Buddha. No "other" Buddha is really the Buddha. It is said that, "It is *the Self-Buddha that is the True Buddha*."¹⁸ If there were any Buddha except the Self, it would not be the true Self or true Buddha. The Buddha is never of an "other" nature. He is the completely independent and autonomous Self, the Self that is beyond self and other. Linji's "Solitarily emancipated," "Non-reliant" Self, or his "True Man of No Rank" indicates none other than this. That is why in *Chan* people speak of practice as inquiry into and clarification of the matter of Self.

In *Chan* there are numerous questions such as: "What is the Buddha?" "What was the purpose of the Patriarch [Bodhidharma]'s coming from the west?" "How is the Buddha's pure and clean *dharma*-body?"¹⁹ The Buddha [or Patriarch] thus referred to is the Self, the true man. The Buddha that exists apart from the Self is not the true Buddha, and must be negated. The patriarch that exists externally must also be negated. That is why *Chan* speaks of "Killing the Buddha, killing the patriarch."²⁰ This is where *Chan* differs from religions which regard God or Buddha as possessing the nature of an "other." Ordinarily the self is regarded as completely separated from Buddha or God. When related at all, it is dependent on them. On the contrary, in *Chan* there is no true Buddha apart from the Self; apart from the Buddha there is no True Self. Rather, it is more appropriate to say, apart from the true Self there is no true Buddha.

In *Chan*, the Self that has rid itself of the external "other" God or Buddha is the true Buddha. It is completely unrestricted and in everything acts Self-abidingly, the Self that acts in all things as the master. Here "act" means the wondrous activity of forming the world and creating history. The Self of *Chan* makes such wondrous activity, creating history Self-abidingly, unbound by anything. Hence the Self of *Chan* creates history *Supra-historically* (referred to as "S"). Further, the formation of the world is conducted according to the standpoint of the True Self universal to every person. This means the True Self forms the world *according to the standpoint it takes of All mankind* (referred to as "A"). Therefore, the true Self is the basic subject that truly creates history, the fundamental subject that forms the world according to the standpoint of all mankind. Besides, this is the Self that, while being engaged in creating, is not bound by what is created, that keeps on creating, always freed from creation. The "formless Self" that we speak of is such *Self-abiding, creative, formative, Formless Self*.

Therefore, the fundamental subject is the "F," and the wondrous activity may be indicated in terms of the "A.S." A mere "A.S." without the fundamental subject "F" would not be the true way of being of "A.S." Likewise, an "F" without the wondrous activity "A.S." would not be the true "F." The "F" ought to be joined with the wondrous activity "A.S.," yet not bound by the latter. The man that has the dynamic structure of "F.A.S" is the true man.

This "F" is likely to be forgotten. Usually, in ordinary political movements this "F" is forgotten completely. Even if it is not forgotten, those who undertake these movements are not likely to have overcome man's basic crisis, that is, to have awakened to the "F." Meanwhile, in religion -- and this has been true of Buddhism and the historical *Chan* -- so much emphasis has been laid on the "F" that it has been confined to itself and this has shrunken the wondrous activity, "A.S." This is a point which should be carefully reconsidered in *Chan* as well as in Buddhism.

In *Chan* it is emphasized that the "F" should not become like "silent illumination," or fall into the "ghosts' cave."²¹ They speak of an activity which will not become mere silent illumination. But how should it work? What should be the object of this Self-abiding activity? These are extremely important problems.

Only bringing an individual to the "F," as has usually been the case with *Chan*, cannot be said to be the full, wondrous activity of the "F." Leading an individual to the "F" to have him awake alone would leave him in the end with an "F" beyond which he could not go. The great activity of the "F" ought to work three-dimensionally so that it will not only lead the individual to the "F" but truly form the world and create history. Only then will its wondrous activity become full and its great activity become world-forming and history-creating. That is to say, its activity will have the three dimensions, Self, World, and History, which constitute the basic structure of man, closely united within itself.

If, as has been the case with the historical Chan, activity starts and ends only with the so-called practice of compassion involved in helping others to awaken, such activity will remain unrelated to the formation of the world or creation of history, isolated from the world and history, and in the end turn Chan into a forest Buddhism, a temple Buddhism, at best, a Chan monastery Buddhism. Ultimately, this leaves "Chan within a ghosts' cave."

The kind of belief held by Buddhists or Christians that after death man is to be reborn in a Buddha-land or a Heaven must be regarded as a heartless, seclusive, and narrow view which deserts the world and history and sets them apart as being beyond the pale of the wonderful activity of compassion or *agape*. The Sixth Patriarch Huineng said:²²

“Ordinary, ignorant people are not aware of the Pure Land within themselves and seek for it in the east or west because they do not awake to the Self-nature. To the awakened, however, there is no difference between east and west; every

place is equally the Pure Land. That is why Shâkyamuni said, "Wherever I am, I am in ease and comfort."

Linji also said, "Being master wherever I am, wherever I am is all true."²³ For this reason, in *Chan* the all-out compassionate practice ought to be to have man awake to his original true Self, that is, to the solitarily emancipated, non-reliant, Formless Self, who will form the true world and create true history Self-abidingly, without being bound or fettered by anything. *Without the Self-Awakening of the Formless Self, world-formation and history-creation will miss their fundamental subject. Without true formation of the world and creation of history, the Formless Self cannot help ending in an imperfect practice of compassion.*

Consequently, we may conclude that we should get rid of the imperfect, narrow character of the former so-called "Self-awakened, others-awakening" activity, which disregards the world and history, and which satisfies itself at best by "hammering out only a piece or half a piece." We should awake to the Formless Self ("F"), form the world from the standpoint of All mankind ("A"), and, without being fettered by created history, Supra-historically create history at all times ("S"). Only such an "F.A.S" *Chan* can be really called the ultimate Great Vehicle.

Translated by TOKIWA Gishin

Notes by the Translator:

1. Translated from the original Japanese article included in *Zen no Honshitsu to Ningen no Shinri* ("The Essence of *Chan* and the Truth of Man"), Tokyo, Sôbunsha, 1969, and in *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosaku-shû* (Collected Writings of Hisamatsu Shin'ichi) Volume 2, Tokyo, Risôsha, 1972; Kyoto, Hôzôkan 1994. In the translation the italicized parts except for foreign words and the headings show the words the author himself marked for emphasis in the original text. Translation by Tokiwa first appeared in *The Eastern Buddhist*: (Part I) vol. VIII no. 1, May 1975, pp. 12-29, and (Part II) vol. VIII no. 2, October 1975, pp. 37-65.

The whole translation was checked for revision in the spring of 2005. For Chinese spellings *pinyin* was used. Most diacritical marks as well as Chinese characters in the foot-notes were removed.

2. From the *Sixth Patriarch [Huineng] the Great Master's Dharma Treasure the Platform Sutra*, Taisho Tripitaka vol. 48, p. 349 b (T48, 349b).

3. As recorded in the *Essentials for Transmitting the Mind as the Awakened Truth Expounded by Chan Master Duanji of Mt. Huangbo*, T48, 384a.

4. A collection of forty-eight cases of *koan*, first printed in 1228, it was compiled by Wumen Huikai, 1183-1260. The first case goes as follows (T48, 292c-3a):

Once a monk asked Master Zhaozho (Congshen, 778-897, *dharma*-heir to Nanquan Puyuan), "Do dogs have the Buddha-nature?" Zhou said, "No, nothing." Let me Wumen remark upon this. For the *Chan* practice one must necessarily go through the Patriarch's Barrier. For attaining the wondrous Awakening one needs to exhaust one's reasoning mind to have it extinguished. Insofar as the Patriarch's Barrier is not penetrat-

ed, insofar as the reasoning mind is not extinguished, all will remain no other than ghosts abiding on blades of grass or attached to trees.

Now let me ask: What is the Patriarch's Barrier? Simply put, it is this single "Nothing," the single barrier of our school. Therefore, we call it the gateless barrier of the *Chan* school. The one who has been able to penetrate it will not only personally see Zhaozhou, but will walk hand in hand with the successive patriarchs, one's eyebrows tied together with theirs, seeing through the same eyes and hearing through the same ears. How isn't it a matter of celebration and joy? Why isn't it necessary to go through the barrier? With your three hundred and sixty joints, with the eighty-four thousand pores, with your whole being, give rise to the doubting-mass, and practice on this word "Nothing." Take it up by day, by night. But don't mistake it for voidness; don't take it for negation as against affirmation. Practice on it as if you had swallowed a hot iron ball but could not vomit it up no matter how hard you tried. Exhaust all the wrong knowledges and remembrances you have had. Thus will you achieve final purity and maturity. Self-effectedly the 'in' and the 'out' will become one single piece. Just like a dumb person who is aware of his own dream, you will be aware of all this for yourself. Flashingly Self-awakening will open up; it will surprise heaven and shake the earth. It will be as if you had snatched the big sword from the hand of General Kuan Yu: if confronted by a Buddha, you will kill the Buddha; if confronted by a patriarch, you will kill the patriarch. On this life-death side you will acquire great freedom; in all the six ways of life and four kinds of birth you will enjoy yourself the sportive *samadhi*.

Now, how would you take up this case? Summoning up all your energy and vitality, take up this word "Nothing." If you go on without a break, you will see it is very much like the *dharma* lamp which, upon being lit, will immediately light. Here is a verse:

"Dogs' Buddha-nature!" The total presentation of the right command!

Slightly involved in Have or Have-not, you will lose your whole being.

5. From the *Record of Chan Master Linji Yixuan (Linjilu)*, T47, 498a. Linji Yixuan, -866.

6. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (ed. 1966) Vol. 4, under the heading BRUNNER, (HEINRICH) EMIL has this:

The close link between Brunner's theology and that of Barth was broken early in their theological careers when in 1943 Brunner wrote a monograph entitled *Natur und Gnade; Zum Gespräch mit Karl Barth* ("Nature and Grace: In A Conversation With Karl Barth").

Brunner held that while God's saving revelation is known only in Jesus Christ, there is a revelation in the creation; this revelation is reflected in the "image of God," which man bears and which is never wholly lost. This provoked a vigorous reply from Barth, who attacked Brunner's view that the image of God remains formally but not materially in man after sin has entered. Brunner replied, insisting upon the sense of responsibility as the "point of contact" between sinful human nature and the divine.

The discussion with Karl Barth was published under the title *Natural Theology*, with introduction by John Baillie (1946). A critical review of this discussion is given by Baillie in *Our Knowledge of God* (1939).

7. From the Mahayana *Nirvâna Sutra (Niepan-jing* No. 374) 4-4, T12, 405b; (No. 375) 648b,

et al.

8. From the *Zazen-Wasan* ("Hymn in Japanese to the Sitting *Chan* Practice") by Hakuin Ekaku, 1686–1769, a Rinzai-zen priest in the Edo period.
9. In the *Xiyilun* (*Shakugiron*; "A Treatise Which Resolves Doubts") by Monk Shizi (Shishi-biku) from the Western Region abiding at the Great Cien Temple (Daijionji) (in Chang'an; Chôan), fascicle one, Questions on the Buddha, III, the monk mentions and explains as follows; "The Buddha means *jue* (*kaku*). This latter has three meanings: *zi-jue* (*jikaku*; Self-awakened), *jue-ta* (*kakuta*; Awakening others), and *juexing yuanman* (*kakugyô-enman*; Awakening-practice being perfect and fulfilled)." T53, 798a.
10. From the *Prajñâ-pâramitâ-hridaya* (*Heart*)-*sûtra*, tr. Xuanzang, T8, 848c.
11. From the *Fukan-zazengi* and the *Shôbôgenzô* 12, *Zazen-shin*, respectively, by Dôgen, 1200–53.
12. From the *Vimalakîrtinirdesa sûtra*, tr. Kumârajîva, T14, 547c.
13. Divisions supplied by the translator.
14. Dahui Zonggao, 1089–1163, *dharma*-heir to Yuanwu Keqin, said (*Yulu* fascicle 17, T47, 886a): "Nowadays Way-practisers mostly don't doubt themselves; instead, they doubt others. That is why it has been said, 'Beneath great doubt certainly is great Awakening (*dayi zhi xia biyou dawu*).' Now tell me what one awakes to." After a silence he said, "I dare not make little of you; you will all be attaining Awakening."
15. From the *Zhaozhou-lu* (no. 28, in the Akizuki Ryômin edition, Chikumashobô, Tokyo 1972) : A questioner: "Throughout the twelve periods of the day how should I apply myself to practice?" The Master said, "You suffer use by the twelve periods, whereas I can use the twelve periods. Which periods do you ask about?"
16. Cf. Note 2.
17. Dasui Fazhen, 834–919, *dharma*-heir to Xiyuan Daan: *Jingde Record of Transmssion of the Lamp*, XI, T51, 286a; *Guzunsu-yuyao*, Chûbun-shuppansha, Kyoto 1973, 176ab: A monk said, "How is it when life-death arrives?" The master said, "Coming to tea, take tea; coming to a meal, take a meal." The questioner stepped forward and said, "Who should receive offerings?" The master said, "Put away the alms bowl."
18. By the Sixth Patriarch Huineng. From the *Platform Sutra*, T48, 352a.
19. *Yunmen-guanglu*, T47, 552c. A question which a monk asked of Yunmen Kuangzhen, 864–949.
20. From the *Linji-lu*, T47, 500b
21. Both terms "*mozhao*; *mokushô*" and "*guikuli*; *kikutsuri*" derive from critical remarks by Dahui Zonggao, in his letter addressed to one of his disciples, *Yulu* XX, T47, 895b: "Present-day Way-seekers, either monks or lay, all suffer from two kinds of serious disease. One is that they learn plenty of words and sentences with a thought of wonder in them. The other is that, unable to see the moon and forget the finger to indicate it, they gain awakening in words and sentences, and that, on hearing that neither the Buddha-*dharma* nor the *Chan-dao* lies in them, they discard words and sentences as useless, knit their brows and close the eyes all along, assuming the appearances of the dead, and consider this to be the calm sitting practice, mind-contemplation, and silent

illumination. More than that, they induce ignorant, mediocre people to this wrong view of theirs, with a comment: 'One day's calm sitting is one day's *Chan* practice.' How sad! They don't know this is all an attempt to make a livelihood in a ghosts' cave. Only when one can remove these two kinds of serious disease, can one take part in the *Chan* practice."

22. From the *Platform Sutra*, T48, 352a

23. From the *Linji-lu*, T47, 498a

(Jan. 3, 2008; Jan. 2012)

6. True Sitting & the Fundamental Koan:

A Discussion with HISAMATSU Shin'ichi*1/*2

Hisamatsu: During a *sesshin*-retreat, various doubts or problems are bound to arise. For your practice it is essential to raise them and have them resolved, so today I will speak in response to your questions. Anyone should feel free to speak up and, by discussing together, we'll find a solution. That said, I'm sure there are many questions you want to ask, but let's begin with those regarding sitting in *zazen*.

Ishii: Sitting and trying to focus on what the formless self is, I find that even though I'm trying not to think, a kind of thinking remains nonetheless. Thus, a tremendous conflict occurs between concentrating on the *koan* and sitting in *zazen*. Doesn't everyone more or less have this problem? I'd like to ask you about this.

Hisamatsu: The *koan*, after all, is to awaken to the formless self. That is why I say sitting and *koan* are one, different though the terms may be. There's a tendency to think of sitting and *koan* as two separate and distinct methods of practice -- after all, there is "just sitting" in Soutou Zen, and *koan* practice to attain *satori* in Rinzai Zen. At bottom, though, these are none other than awakening to the formless self. Here's a passage expressing the spirit of true sitting attributed to Bodhidharma, though it's certainly not limited to him since many later *Zen* masters have expressed the same sentiment:

"Outside all externals put to rest,
Inside let not your mind stir.
Make yourself as a wall,
And thus enter the Way."

"Outside all externals put to rest" means to be unconcerned with things outside, not to be caught by or drawn to externals. "Inside let not your mind stir" means not to be pre-occupied with mental phenomena, or internals. In short, don't let yourself be caught up by anything, internal or external. "Make yourself as a wall" is a metaphor for no-mind (*mushin*); be empty and free of discrimination like this, "And thus you enter the Way." In other words, "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir. Make yourself as a wall" is to "enter the Way."

In *Fukan-zazengi*, [Dogen] says much the same thing when he speaks of sitting as "putting an end to all dualistic discrimination," but it all comes down to this freeing yourself of all inner and outer entanglements. When you succeed in "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir," that is achieving no-mind, that is true sitting. Sitting usually connotes physical sitting or mental composure; either way it's assumed that the body or the mind is sitting. Such sitting, however, is not the sitting of [Dogen's]

"body-mind fallen away." Sitting mind and body engaged, thinking, for instance, "Here I am sitting at Senbutsuji Temple," cannot be called true sitting. And sitting with the intention to become no-mind only exposes a restlessness in yourself: It amounts to "Inside, *letting* your mind stir." Of course without a mind intent on sitting you'll not be able to sit at all; you have to be intent on sitting, yet being conscious of sitting is not it. Being physically engaged in sitting is not it either. This might be a difficult problem for everyone.

At the outset though, you must have the determination to sit through, no matter what: Even though your legs throb or your entire body is racked with pain. In the beginning, such great resolve is crucial. As it's said, "*Zen* practice has three essentials": The first is called great faith; you must have this great root of faith to give yourself over to truly sitting, a great conviction to sit through anything. The second is great determination; you must have great tenacity of purpose. The third essential is great doubt, which I'll talk about later in connection with the *koan*, but you need great faith and great determination too. When you sit through to the very end then you'll know, but obstacles will assail you within and without. So you need unwavering determination to sit through it all, stolidly, like a rock. Throwing your whole self into it like this is extremely effective preparation to begin true sitting. Discouraged or distracted by little things, you won't be able to go on. Interrupted, you're unable to "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir." A mind constantly distracted cannot see out the practice to the very end.

I think this is true with our ordinary affairs as well.*³ We need great faith and great determination to do anything thoroughly. But how much more so with sitting! Throw yourself into sitting through those hindrances, and "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir." In the beginning you try to push away external hindrances, strive to remain undisturbed by them, and try to suppress the waves of thought that arise within. Such attempts to suppress reveal a restlessness, that "Inside your mind still stirs." Pursue further though, and you'll come to where you won't have to try and suppress anything: Externals are naturally put to rest, inside your mind naturally does not stir. Having realized this myself, for me it's an actual fact; proceed in this way and I have no doubt that all of you will realize it as well. And with that, the formless self will be clearly awakened. Then, sitting as formless self is no longer restricted to a specific time or place -- there is no place to sit at, no time to sit in. Ordinarily one sits on a certain cushion in a certain place, but now one is no longer tied to such sitting. You awaken to the self that is utterly unrestricted.

Thus, awakening doesn't obtain only when sitting in full-lotus, or whatever; you come to be that way all the time. For instance, when you rise from sitting, the standing itself becomes sitting at work. Sitting does not end when you rise to your feet; on the contrary, it's ongoing. This sitting is the subject, and this subject stands, so it's not that one rises from sitting to standing; rather the sitting itself stands. [Dougen's above-

mentioned *Fukan-Jazengi* states that when one goes from the seated posture to stand, one should rise quietly and slowly. If that is so, it is like moving from sitting to standing: Sitting becomes a state separate from and prior to standing. I would say that is not true sitting. There's no shift from sitting to standing; the sitting itself must stand. It is not a specific state. If it is, then there would be a shift from sitting to standing, and then to walking, and so on. True sitting is not like that: It's the subject, the self, so it is this very sitting which stands. Otherwise it can't be called true sitting.

When you've truly sat through, it will certainly be like this. Then it's no longer necessary to rise quietly. Jump up or even leap out of your sitting and it's still just the working of your sitting. If you must rise quietly so as not to lose it, that's merely one particular state. Such sitting is not yet oneself, not the subject itself. What we call formless self is thus precisely what is spoken of [in Yongjia's *Poem on Actualizing the Way*] as:

"Walking is *Zen*,
Sitting is *Zen*,
Talking or silent,
Working or at rest,
The subject is composed."

This true sitting is nothing but *Zen*. The word *zazen* (坐禪) consists of the characters for "seated" (坐) and "*zen*" (禪). But from the standpoint of true sitting, the sitting must itself be *Zen*, *Zen* must itself be sitting. If not, it's not real *zazen*. A particular posture or state of mind is not true sitting. When everything you do -- walking, sitting, silence, speaking, thinking -- is itself sitting, then for the first time your sitting will be authentic. If you sit thinking about this or trying to become like this, then you're sitting with a goal in mind and that's not it. Once again, true sitting is "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir." It's not a matter of sitting trying to become like this; the way of sitting in which one is like this is crucial.

The *koan* also finally comes down to this "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir." For instance, with the *koan* "Your original face before your parents gave birth to you," this original face refers to what we now call the true self. And that is "before your parents gave birth to you," in other words, it's the self of body-mind fallen away. And this self in which body-mind has fallen away is your original face before your parents gave birth to you. Being born is, of course, a physical and psychological fact. So, to speak of something prior to that does not mean prior in the temporal sense; it's what is actually present here and now. In other words, the self in which body-mind have fallen away is what is prior to the arising of body-mind.

Again, "before birth" is not meant in the usual sense; rather it is prior to anything arising right here. There is no time, no before or after, for it is right here and now, prior to anything arising. This is where the true self is. It's the original self in which body-mind have fallen away, prior to all physical and mental phenomena. Conceived temporally, one

might think that this "falling away" occurs after we've acquired body and mind. But returning to what is prior to one's birth means that the very body-mind born and alive at present falls away; thus, it truly is prior to anything arising.

Koans like this "[Your original face] before your parents gave birth to you" are the same as true sitting: They amount to "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir." This is the point of the *koan* as well, so any *koan-samadhi* that is not like this is not genuine. With any *koan*, whether it is "[Your original face] before your parents gave birth to you," "Not thinking good, not thinking evil," "Going beyond the four propositions [is, is not, both is and is not, neither is nor is not] and the hundred negations [of logic]," or "Neither speech nor silence, thinking nor not-thinking, standing nor sitting will do" -- when you get free from all such relative states and penetrate the self that is free, then it's a real, living *koan*. Otherwise the *koan* is turned into something relative, with a specific, delimited form. That is what usually happens with it. But the *koans* I just mentioned were devised to lead one from the relative and delimited to that which is unlimited.

Nevertheless, commonly-used *koans* such as Joushuu's "*Mu*" [Zhaozhou's "*Wu*"] or Hakuin's "Sound of the single hand" have become things that practitioners cling to, although such was not their original purpose. They have been reduced to particular *Mu-samadhi* or single hand-*samadhi*. At some places practitioners are even made to yell "*Mu! Mu! Mu!*" in order to enter *samadhi*. Granted this is not "*Mu*" or 'Nonbeing' as the negation of 'being,' but *Mu* as the 'Not-being-Nonbeing-either.' Thus, everyone nowadays knows what *Mu* is, and thinks that simply yelling "*Mu*--!" will do. That's what it's turned into.

The real standard by which to judge whether it is the ultimate *Mu* of body-mind fallen away is to examine whether it is the formless self or not. If *Mu* is really the formless self, then it must be free from the very voicing of "*Mu, Mu, Mu.*" *Mu* is nothing like a voiced *samadhi*. Being formless self, it is free from any limitation. In this way true sitting also must be free and unrestricted. Standing, sitting, whatever one's doing, must be such sitting. And we call this sitting the formless self: The fundamental subject or root source of all, and it's active without being delimited. Here there is no such thing as body-mind, nor is there life-death, good-evil. This is complete emancipation: Genuine, root-source freedom and unhindered independence. No obstruction whatever -- everything is unhindered!

The *Heart Sutra* says, "No hindrance, free from all fear." Fear is only one small part of it though, so there really isn't even such a thing as freedom from fear: Free even of freedom from fear. Simply not having fears will not do. "Free from all fear" is actually freedom from pleasure-pain, fear-fearlessness -- being the self which is not limited or determined by any such thing. Even if there's something good, if it's determined, then fear cannot be avoided. "No hindrance, free from all fear" can only be realized when we are active without form. Be the formless self, and whatever you do is unhindered.

The same is true of *koan* practice: As long as it's some kind of a special ex-

perience or specific problem-question, it's not a real *koan*. For a *koan* to be genuine, it must be universal. Take Joushuu's *Mu*: Shouting "*Mu*!" -- with all of your might and becoming this *Mu* -- is said to be it, but it's not. Practicing like that, let me say, would never do. Nowadays real *koan Zen* is lost in such practice, which only adds more shackles and chains. Genuine *Mu* must be without form. Only by being the formless self can one really break through the *koan*. Breaking through a particular problem-question, resolving a specific matter, even having a very unusual experience -- for example, you weren't able to become *Mu*, but now your self, your body, and the whole world have become *Mu* -- these are all nothing but particular experiences. Whatever *koan* you're working on at present -- *Mu*, the single hand, the cypress tree in the garden, or whatever -- if you merely fall into becoming one with that *koan*, you actually end up losing your freedom.

That's why I insist that breaking through a *koan* actually be awakening to the formless self. Unless you've gotten there, you haven't broken through. Once you have, though, you are truly without form and can express it independently. Preparing to sit, it might be good to keep this in mind rather than sitting with some preposterous misconception. But if you remain preoccupied with such knowledge when sitting, then all for naught. Everyone, how is it when you're sitting?

Ishii: That's why I'd like to ask about the dualistic mental composure that I have -- not the kind in which sitting itself stands, but the kind that gets disturbed when I rise....

Hisamatsu: There is a way. If you gain composure when you sit, but start to lose it when you rise then lose it completely when you run, that won't do. Authentic composure is not lost even when you're turned head over heels. That's the way it is: Even in death you are composed. Not composure because you're resigned to die, but composure even unto death. Otherwise, it's not authentic.

People sometimes say things like they are free from life and death, or there is no living and dying. But right now if you were on the brink of death and you were able to remain undisturbed, that's not freedom from life and death at all, though it's often misconstrued that way. If you were terminally ill, yet able to remain calm and unshaken in your last moments, wouldn't that be just a matter of your mental or psychological state?

On the contrary, death itself must be composed. It's not to be calm though you face death* 4; death itself is "free from all fear" [as mentioned above]. Saying "I'm not afraid, I'm not afraid" -- that's not real freedom from all fear. Truly be the formless self, and you are totally free of fear.

Dougen stated that this very life and death is the true self; dying is also the self, living is also the self: "The coming and going of life and death is itself the true human body." Unless you've penetrated to that depth, you can't say you've really passed a *koan* or sat all the way through. That's why I advocate the formless self rather than things like passing *koans* or so-called sitting. Now with the formless self as the *koan*, does someone have a question about that?

Abe: I think Mr. Ishii was asking if concentrating on a *koan* is a form of thought; so, when concentrating on the formless self as a *koan*, does that concentrating itself have some kind of form?

Hisamatsu: When you really concentrate on or struggle with a *koan*, it's prior to anything arising, body-mind fallen away, returning to the source. That's why in *Zen* one is often asked who or what is it that thinks, that feels, for there is a source prior to thought that does the thinking. That's also why I speak of "collecting thoughts," having them return to their source, prior to the arising of anything at all, before body and mind. It's the same as "before your parents gave birth to you," and, when it comes down to it, it's none other than "Outside all externals put to rest, Inside let not your mind stir."

Hikosaka: I can understand that working with a *koan* such as the sound of the single hand or *Mu* is not just becoming that particular *koan*. But do you first become that particular *koan* and then break through the form of the *koan*, or is there some other way? I'm asking because I don't understand how to concentrate on the *koan*.

Hisamatsu: I have proposed the FAS Society's *fundamental koan* to avoid those kinds of problems and abuses. In a word, it's penetrating to the freedom of being nothing whatever; if you want to call it a *koan*, it's the *koan* to realize *that*. It's the basic and essential *koan*, it's breaking through to what we now call the free and formless self. For example, in the formulation "neither speech nor silence will do," what will not do tends to be limited to the words: speech-silence. The point, however, is the self that is nothing whatever. The way opens up when you are utterly trapped in a corner, at wit's end with back against the wall: You can neither be this nor that -- you are nothing whatever. Thereby there you penetrate ... (striking the table), where it is "prior to anything arising"; not just prior to something like good and evil, but prior to the arising of anything at all.

As far as I'm concerned, good and evil, or not thinking good, not thinking evil -- they're still something particular. But if it's genuinely "Without thinking good, without thinking evil, right now show me your original face," everything is included in this formulation. It's not just a matter of good and evil, it includes everything; nor is it merely a matter of thinking, but includes all our activities in their totality: Not using your hands, or feet, even your sense of touch. To formulate it: None of that will do; now what? That's what we call *the fundamental koan*.

Hikosaka: I try to hold the *koan*, "Neither standing nor sitting will do: Now what do I do?" in mind during *zazen*, but it's like I'm chasing after something.

Hisamatsu: If you're chasing after something objectively, that won't do. You must drive yourself to the ultimate dilemma in a fundamentally subjective manner. In short, you must be hopelessly cornered, driven to the last extremity, where you "Die the one great death, then you are revived." This fundamentally subjective, absolute negation is also called the great doubt block, for it's the ultimate, fundamentally subjective doubt.

Abe: About the *koan* of Joushuu's "*Mu*," it's clear: Being made to repeat "*Mu! Mu!*"

and concentrate on this voiced form or idea of *Mu* is not the true *Mu koan*. It's not a voiced *Mu*, or any form, concept, or idea of it. It's *Mu* itself. And because one can't deal with this in any form whatever, we cannot but completely discard such a way of dealing with it. We can only be forced back to *Mu* as *Mu*, that is, to "prior to anything arising." Thus, even when struggling with this *Mu koan*, if we just work that way, we will also return to the source....

Hisamatsu: After all, rather than use some specific form of mediation -- in this case *Mu* -- it's better not to use any form at all. That's the most appropriate way in this situation, isn't it?: Drive yourself up against the wall without having anything to hold onto. As the method for penetrating the true body-mind fallen away, to the true self, isn't this the most ingenious way? As a matter of fact, such a way did appear early in the history of Zen, assuming particular forms such as "Going beyond the four propositions [is, is not, both is and is not, neither is nor is not] and the hundred negations [of logic], say what the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west is." With "Go beyond the four propositions and the hundred negations," it can't be negated, it can't be affirmed. If you say something it won't do, if you don't say anything it won't do, either.

Now, "What is the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west?" This refers to Bodhidharma's crossing from India to China and has been used often in *mondou* [a question-answer] exchanges, which have come to be called *koan*. Put simply, it is the same thing as *Zen*, or the self for that matter. As to "the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west," once I wrote on the exchange Kanran had with his teacher Laoan, one of the disciples of the fifth patriarch. Kanran asked "the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west," and was told, "Why don't you ask the meaning of your self?" The meaning of your self, not the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming! Why don't you just ask directly about the meaning of your self?

At any rate, the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west is, in the words we use, nothing but the true self. When you can neither negate nor affirm, neither be silent nor speak, how do you answer about your true self? That is what is meant by asking the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming. How do you answer when neither silence nor speech will do? When you come to this point, that is the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west. It won't do just to addle your brains thinking what possible meaning his coming could have. Instead, right where you can neither keep silent nor talk, you find your way through and get free. That (striking the table) is the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west.

It's not a matter of reflecting on the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west; it's penetrating to where neither silence nor speech will do. Reach that point and you realize the meaning: Where neither silence nor speech will do you penetrate your self (striking the table). Then and there you grasp the meaning of the founding patriarch's coming from the west. There is no other meaning than this!

Here I would like you all to ask of yourselves, in terms of a *koan*: "*Whatever I am, whatever I do, will not do, now what do I do?*" In terms of life and death, "Neither living nor dying will do, what do I do?" This "*What do I do?*" is *extremely important*, it demands action. If it's just the self in which neither living nor dying will do, that's only the negative side of its own way, and no activity will emerge. "Whatever I do will not do, *what do I do?*" This "*What do I do?*" creates *positive activity*. I consider this the root, the source, of all *koans*. You can always ask this of yourself. When walking: Walking won't do, what do I do? Bending over the toilet: Bending over won't do, what do I do? We are always something, but if being something -- anything -- won't do, what will we do? I say such things because the true self is what truly is, the genuinely formless self.

Normally we abide only in what has already taken on form; but our true abode is at the source, at the root of it all. Since small children don't yet possess the discriminating mind, they are thought to be at the source. Sayings such as "Be like a child," or, going further, "Be like wood and stone," suggests our original abode. But we all come to abide in the world of discriminated forms, so even when we try to become one we cannot do so. Thus, everything must be absorbed into the source, returned to one. As long as you remain with what has already taken on form, however hard you try you can only go outside yourself but cannot return to one. Thinking is also a matter of going outside yourself. You'll never become one that way, it's impossible. Becoming one is found in returning to the origin. But this is not a matter of becoming a child again -- it's right here and now, wherever you are. Because it's you yourself -- that's where the "one" is.

So it's not just something to work on in *zazen*, it's going on always and everywhere. That's why it's spoken of as "immediate." Realizing that our sitting in *zazen* here and now like this won't do, and that more than just sitting, everything is included, then our being one ceases to be anything particular. If it's just a matter of your sitting won't do, then you can just stand up. But you'll never realize the source that way. If your sitting won't do, immediately then and there nothing whatever will do. Though it would seem to assume some particular form, it's not. It's all one whole.

I often use the analogy of the water and the waves. Take one wave as an example. It's a *particular* wave, but directly below it is connected with the whole sea. As a wave it assumes different shapes, but no matter what the shape, it's water, and all water is one. Instead of going horizontally in the direction of the waves, if the individual wave -- though not just an individual wave -- goes vertically, straight down, it finds itself leading to the whole. We could say the particular or individual is that into which the whole is drawn; the particular penetrates the whole, the individual itself mediates the whole.

Likewise with *koans* such as Joushuu's "*Mu*" or the single hand: They cannot be limited just to that particular form. Even if *Mu* is voiced, it's not limited to that voiced *Mu*; it is the single hand and yet it's *not* the single hand. If in becoming the single hand one gets stuck in that form so that everything is not included, well then that's still something

particular, isn't it?

In terms of *samadhi*, there are particular *samadhis* and then there is the sovereign *samadhi*. Sovereign *samadhi* is total, hence its name. Thus, (striking the table) it's completely one, universal and total; in a word, it's what we've been referring to as formless. Sovereign *samadhi* is total, and yet if that totality isn't the root source of the individual, then it's no more than an abstract universal. Sovereign *samadhi* must be the root source of all particularity, the root source of all activity, a freely working root source. Body-mind fallen away refers to nothing other than this sovereign *samadhi*. Conversely, it becomes "fallen away body-mind" as *positive-active time*. How do you respond to this?

Translated by Jeff Shore in collaboration with Fusako Shore,
as well as with TAKAHASHI Nobumichi and TOKIWA Gishin

Notes:

1. The discussion took place at an FAS Society meeting on January 25, 1964 at the Senbutsuji Temple in Kyoto. First made public in the journal *FAS* no. 57, issued in May 1965; then in *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu* vol. 3, pp. 649~665.
The three questioners' names are: ABE Masao, HIKOSAKA Teiichi (Soukyuu), and ISHII Seishi.
2. First translation by Jeff Shore in collaboration with NAGASAWA Fusako appeared in the *FAS Society Journal*, Autumn 1984; then in *The Eastern Buddhist* vol. 31, no. 1, 1998, translated by Jeff Shore in collaboration with Fusako Shore, TAKAHASHI Nobumichi, and TOKIWA Gishin. A revised version was prepared by the translator through help from Takahashi and Tokiwa in spring 2000. What follows is this version with corrections offered by Tokiwa and accepted by the translator (November 2007).
3. Two lines, 12th and 13th, in the upper column of the Japanese text, *Chosakushuu* p. 652, which precede this sentence, are left untranslated for the sake of consistency.
4. This rendering follows the corrected Japanese expression: "*shinu nowa osoroshikunai to yuunja nashini*," corrected upon translation according to the context of the author's utterance, where the *Chosakushuu* text (p. 659, the upper column line 9) goes: "*shinu nowa osoroshii to yuunja nashini*" ("It's not a matter of fearing death").

7. "On Mutually Going Into The Matter Of Self"

HISAMATSU Shin'ichi * 1

For many years in the FAS Society I have been advocating a manner of *Chan*-practice named "mutually going into the matter of self" (*sougosankyuu*), which has been looked upon as something peculiar to the Society. In this regard you must have your own views, and I would like to talk on how I think about it, waiting for your critical responses.

As for the basis of my argument for "mutually going into the matter of self," in a term of the FAS Society, it is the true self or the formless self. This is original to humans, for no one's self is excluded from it. It is far from being anything possessed or awakened to by a particular person alone. In that sense it is original to man. Buddhism has expressions which correspond to this, such as:

Man originally has the Buddha-nature, and no one is lacking in it.

Sentient Beings are originally Buddhas (i.e., awakened).

This means that such self really belongs to everyone, that it is originally common to every person. Mutually realizing this originally common self is what is truly meant by mutually going into the matter of self.

Chan people often speak of "sucking and pecking being simultaneous." It refers to the manner with which a young bird is believed to hatch: As it sucks from inside, the hen at no wrong moment but simultaneously pecks at the shell from outside, and the chick emerges from the broken shell. The latter then becomes the same bird with the parent. One by sucking and the other by pecking, the two become the same birds. The pecking hen and the sucking – hatching chick are originally the same birds, far from different, and that makes it possible that, as one pecks, the other hatches out. That can be an illustration for our mutually going into the matter of self. Those who are originally the same ones mutually become what they originally are. In our becoming what we originally are lies the true meaning of our mutually going into the matter of self.

When mutually going into the matter of self is a one-to-one confrontation, such as between master and practiser in a closed room as with the case in traditional *Chan*, the master is expected to develop the practiser's original self. That also can be a case of mutually going into the matter of self. But, basically speaking, as I have already mentioned, it means nothing but everyone's true self, everybody's formless self, becoming the same formless self. This means that its occasion takes place at any place at any time, not limited to any particular place or time. For that reason, where the true self awakes in one another, there and then mutually going into the matter of self is established.

During my visit to the U.S.A. and Europe some [ten] years ago I heard from people

that the trouble with them was they had no guiding masters there, so that for *Chan* practice they had to go to Japan, and that they wished I could arrange things to have masters go there. That led me to this thought: It would be too one-sided a situation if *Chan* practice -- by which I mean getting awakened to everyone's formless self -- were impossible without their going to Japan or having masters go there from Japan. It couldn't be helped if awakening were to be attained by particular persons. But it means getting awakened to everybody's original self. Never is it anything you could have another teach you or hand over to you. There ought to be a possibility that one gets awakened to what is one's original form, original mode of being, at any place at any time. That is why I say it is possible, far from difficult, that one attains to this awakening even alone, wherever one may be.

To say more radically, being awakened, for anybody at any place at any time to be being awakened, is the true mode of the formless self. Newly getting awakened is a matter of secondary significance. The true mode of being is being awakened as one is. That being the case, I wonder if it is not rather true that anyone, being alone, can get awakened before having another develop one's true self or help one get awakened.

Then I have come to think that there ought to be a method through which anyone at any place at any time can get awakened for oneself. Instead of any solution to be given or taught by others, without waiting for having others develop it for you, for you to get awakened to it for yourself, and for you who have got awakened to your true self to have yourself verified, that is, to get awakened for oneself and to verify that awakening for oneself -- there ought to be some such kind of way or method, which is rather the basic method.

Now, for example, when you think you've got awakened and ask others to confirm your awakening, there may possibly be cases when the very confirmation is wrong. Resting on others' confirmation as final validation is, essentially speaking, not the true mode of getting awakened to the formless, true self. When one gets awakened to the true self, no matter who might say what, there ought to be one's own confirmation in that. Otherwise, one cannot be said to have truly been awakened.

In that sense, it should be that, while being alone one gets awakened, and that this awakening is authenticated not through others but through oneself. That is why I believe there has to be established such a method, my so-called basic one. This basic method is what one applies to oneself as a task, a problem one asks of oneself and which one can solve for oneself. Such a method has to be established. No other method will be satisfactory for awakening. About what kind of method it is, I would like to take another occasion to clarify it. Anyway without such a method at base, there will be no establishing of attaining awakening in relation to others, that is, through mutually going into the matter of self.* 2

As for your apprehension about mutually going into the matter of self, among

those unawakened if it will not turn out to be a blind one leading another one who is also blind, such a fear seemingly sounds reasonable. But being blind is not how the original self is. As I have been repeating, the original self presents itself at any place at any time with any person. Its being present is its true mode of being. Being blind is not anyone's genuine mode of being. Being sighted is how man in the genuine mode of being is. For that reason, there is all possibility that this genuine mode of being as awakening will unfold itself on any occasion at any opportunity. Blind people taking one another by the hand thereby getting sighted is, to tell the truth, not so much a possibility as the true mode of being. Those who go hand in hand are actually not blind but genuinely sighted humans. Here mutually going into the matter of self truly finds itself.

Chan records on occasions of awakening cite not a few cases in which without attending any master, with something as a moment, on some occasion one abruptly gets awakened. Those cases reveal that a guiding master is far from an inevitable moment for one's attaining awakening. I would rather take one's genuine self for one's guiding master. The formless self is one's true master. When this master and oneself become one, that is, when one gets awakened to one's genuine, formless self, there and then an ultimate relationship is established between master and practiser. Getting awakened to the true self means that the one before awakening, i.e., the practiser, accords with oneself in awakening, i.e., the master. Herein lies the true, ultimate awakening.

We know common references to the term "Attending no master, one gets solitarily awakened" (*mushi-dokkaku; wushi-dujue*) in the derogatory sense that it goes against true awakening. Properly speaking, however, that should be ultimate awakening. In this case it is the true self that is the master. Never does the master lie anywhere else. The true self is the master, the ultimate one.

Thus by the term "Attending no master, one gets solitarily awakened," I mean no ordinary sense. Shâkyamuni is said to have attained awakening under the *Bodhi* (tree). For his awakening really he had no master. None of those he had served as his master before that led Shâkyamuni to his awakening. The master for his awakening under the *Bodhi* was his very awakening. When Shâkyamuni attained awakening, a legend says, he made the utterance: "Grasses, trees, and lands have all attained awakening." That seems to mean that what is original to all is their own master, and that it is one's true self that is the master.

It is the very awakening that is one's true master. With Shâkyamuni, his awakening was his master. In other words, the awakened self is one's master. Apart from getting awakened to that master, there is no awakening. Here the practiser and the master are of one body, not two. Instead of having others verify or confirm one's awakening, one does so for oneself. Of course in this case the self that is verified and the master who does verification are undivided. In their being completely identical is the autonomous, independent, or ultimate nature of the authenticity.

Meanwhile, when the master as well as master-practitioner relationship are not like that, they cannot help ceasing to be authentic; they fail to be ultimate. That is the same with mutually going into the matter of self in its genuine mode of being. When one and the other get awakened to their respective root-source, i.e., formless self, then mutually going into the matter of self finds its own mode of being. Here, one becomes the other, and mutually ceases to be either one or the other. That is truly mutually going into the matter of self. And that, after all, is nothing but getting awakened to one another's original self. For *Chan*, originally, that is truly mutually going into the matter of self. In other words, getting awakened one another to the original self ought to be truly mutually going into the matter of self.

As I have been suggesting, what is meant by "mutually" does not concern anything numerical, such as among two or three persons; it concerns all human beings. "Mutually among all human beings" is what is truly meant by the word "mutually." Therefore, it is in the original self that mutually going into the matter of self has its basis. It has its basis in that all human beings have the Buddha-nature. That is why mutually going into the matter of self excludes no single person. Properly speaking, everyone is mutually going into the matter of self. In terms of mankind, the whole humankind is considered to be mutually going into the matter of original self. It is not among members of particular groups or of monasteries, but among the whole mankind, which is originally linked up in one, that mutually going into the matter of self finds its place. In that sense, the mode of being of the genuine self where the whole mankind is linked up ought to be the true place for mutually going into the matter of self. In this genuine self's mode of being is established the relationship that is inseparably interchangeable between one and many. Infinite in that sense are occasions for mutually going into the matter of self as well as the number of those who are doing so now; for this concerns all human beings.

Thus the ultimate meaning of mutually going into the matter of self lies in that all human beings are in the direction of awaking to one's own genuine self. In that sense I understand that mutually going into the matter of self is actually all human beings' original mode of being, instead of anything peculiar to the FAS Society.

To sum up: In the self awaking to the original self is the basis for mutually going into the matter of self. In the simultaneity of sucking and pecking, the pecking hen is really the true self of the young bird; it is not anything strange but the chick's genuine self. The sucking chick that emerges from within the shell is of one body with the hen. Likewise, in the way of thinking that some master pecks the practitioner from outside, and that the latter thereby hatches out, there is established a strangers' relationship between master and practitioner. That kind of thinking results in various abuses or wrong views. What is to be one's master is always one's ultimate self. When one awakes to this ultimate self, the awaking one seemingly is distinguished from the ultimate self. But actually the awaking one cannot be other than the ultimate self. There is no distinction between the

two. The genuine self getting awakened ought to constitute the true, ultimate relationship between practiser and master. Therefore, apart from the genuine self there is no master. Besides, apart from *awaking* to the genuine self there is no verification of the practiser by the master. The two ought to be completely identical. That is how things truly are.

Placing the master outside brings about various evils and wrongs. As a *Chan* term, "going into the matter of self for clarifying it" (*koji-kyuumei: jishi-jiuming*) suggests, one's task -- the matter being the task -- should not be anything imposed upon oneself by another but something emerging *from within*. The utmost depths of this "within" should be the true, formless self. If -- as it is liable to happen -- the master abiding outside imposes an old-case *koan* on the practiser, that *koan* will remain something separate from the practiser. In that case the task, instead of that which has come out from the genuine self, will remain something imposed by another. Thus it will cease to be related in any way to oneself. The practice tends to fail in going into the direction of the genuine self, but to end in the solution of some particular matter. That will be going into the matter of others instead of self for clarifying it.

Let me take a rest here, and wait for another occasion to go into and clarify further problems.

Translated by TOKIWA Gishin

Translator's Notes:

1. This is a translation of the lecture given at the author's residence in Kyoto, on 15 December 1968, for attendants of the FAS Society's *sesshin* retreat. The original text is contained in the author's collective writings, *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushû* Volume Three, pp. 594~603, Risôsha, Tokyo 1971; Hôzôkan, Kyoto 1994. In the *FAS Society Journal* 1997, pp. 106~113, the present translator offered his tentative English rendering of the same article with the title "On Mutually Sharing Direct Self-Investigation." The present translation (October 2007) is a completely new one. The translator expresses his thanks to Ms. TSUKUI Akemi for her suggestions for improving the translation.
2. Readers are recommended, in this connection, to read the author's next-coming, final work, "*Zettaikiki to Fukkatsu*" ("Ultimate Crisis and Resurrection" in Tokiwa's translation. See B5 above.), composed and written by the author himself, and made public in a book, *Zen no Honshitsu to Ningen no Shinri* (The Essence of *Chan* and the Truth of Man), a comprehensive research work of the FAS Society, a collection of articles contributed by both members and non-members, Sôbunsha, Tokyo 1969, pp. 138~195.

(Jan., Aug. 2012)

8. "Memoirs of His Academic Life"*1

by HISAMATSU Shin'ichi*2

*1 The original article, "*Gakkyuuseikatsu no Omoide*," first appeared in the magazine *SHISOU* ("THOUGHTS"), Iwanami-shoten, October 1955, and was included in the *Chosakushuu* ("Collection of the Author's Writings") vol. I, pp. 415–434.

This is a new translation by TOKIWA Gishin in collaboration with TSUKUI Akemi. (Previous English translations are: "Memoirs of a Student Life," by Christopher Ives, *The Eastern Buddhist* vol. 18, no. 1 (Spring 1985); "Memories of My Student Life: An Autobiographical Essay," by Jeff Shore, *The FAS Society Journal* summer 1985.)

*2 Hisamatsu Shin'ichi, 1889–1980, was born in a farmer's family in Nagara Village, Gifu Prefecture, as the second son between Ohno Sadakichi and Yukino, and at age seven, was adopted by HISAMATSU Seibei, grandfather on the father's side, who served as chief of the village, and Koito, grandmother.

Concerning the personal history of the author, the present translator follows the chronological record made by KITAHARA Haruyo, included in the fourth volume, *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Bukkyou Kougai* ("Lectures on Buddhism by H.S. "), four volumes, Hozokan, Kyoto, 1991.

I

It is quite doubtful whether he* had anything like an academic life, as ordinary scholars do. What is meant by a scholar would be one who devotes oneself to purely academic pursuit, considering it one's primary aim, and producing scholarly achievements. In that sense he has no pretensions to scholarship. His prime concern all through his life seems to have been in living absolute truth, that is, living the so-called religious life, rather than in being a scholar. Not knowing what absolute truth was by studying it as in philosophy as a science, but living absolute truth was his chief concern. Therefore, for him, rather than becoming a scholar proper, becoming a man of religion was his aim. Concerning religion, too, instead of being a scholar of religion, he wanted to be a religious man. His learning, if there were any, was not for purely academic purpose, but for living absolute truth. His concern like this seems to have gradually developed, helped by the perfuming he had received from the religious atmosphere of his home in his childhood. Of course there were moments of deviation from the original path, but they were passing fancies. The heart desire to be a man of religion was consistent in him since childhood.

* Throughout this article the author keeps referring to himself with the pronoun of the third person, singular, male "he (*kare*)."

His parents who were concerned about his infirmity opposed his wish to go on to a higher grade. Meanwhile, his grandmother supported his wish most powerfully and substantially. She had wanted him to be a physician. But she kept silent about it for fear of binding him on his free will. Only after he graduated from university she let him know it as a funny story. She said, "At first I had been thinking of making you a doctor." It struck him with surprise. But, even if he had heard it from her, it would have been impossible for him to be a doctor. Among his friends in the middle-school days, largest in number were doctor-aspirants; next came soldier-, businessman-, and teacher-aspirants. An aspirant of a man of religion, unless from a Buddhist priest family, was looked down upon as a weak-minded or a lunatic. Nevertheless, he had no inclination to become a soldier, a businessman, a teacher, or a scientist. Only political concern shook him at times. At the time of peace negotiations of Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), anger inflamed him so much that he swore to become a diplomat to the tutelary deity of his locality. When he dreamt of a political revolution, under the illusion of the fate of imprisonment he collapsed in tears at the mother's knees. But they were passions of the moment. Religious concern kept latent in the depths of his heart.

Religious concern, so-called, was quite passive in his childhood, lacking in spontaneity, for it depended on merely external influences from his home. He was born and brought up in the orthodox faith of Joudo Shin ("Pureland True") sect, not only of his devout parents but especially also of his grandparents. A youth of adamant faith, he aspired to be a priest to the extent of expecting admission into the Bukkyou Daigaku ("Buddhist College," predecessor of the present Ryukoku University) in Kyoto, founded by the Nishi-honganji Temple. As he moved up to a higher grade in the middle school, he had improved his scientific knowledge, and came to feel his former faith contradictory with it. He began arousing various doubts on the Joudo Shin sect doctrine.

He sought resolution of these doubts in the very scriptures of Joudo Shin sect or in the writings by Maeda Eun,^{*} a person of noble character whom he respected and admired. But the doubts gradually became so complex and deep that around the fourth grade of his middle school he did not know what to do with them. The adamant faith, of whose inviolability he had been so proud, easily collapsed. It seems that, in the hindsight, his faith was a mere trust in the Other's hands which alienated doubts, and that his doubts were not so serious as to be fatal. For him in those days, however, the doubts constituted *aporia* (unsolvable problems), but this *aporia* was an inevitable, necessary wall against which any modern man cannot help bumping, if they have been baptized in the knowledge of natural science in the narrower sense, and in human nature in the wider sense.

^{*} MAEDA Eun, 1857-1930, born in Ise, a scholar-priest of Joudo Shin sect, one of the two compilers of the *Dainihon Zokuzoukyou* (the continued series of the Chinese tripitaka compiled in Japan in 1905-1912), he successively became president of Touyou Daigaku in Tokyo and Ryuukoku Daigaku in Kyoto, both private Buddhist universities.

Hisamatsu, the present author, suffered from a serious illness of pleurisy and had to absent himself from school from September 1904, at his third year-grade of the middle school, his age fifteen, to April 1905, and around these days he read MAEDA Eun's writings, according to Kitahara's chronological record.

He experienced a change from the religious life of a medieval type of naive faith, which alienates rational doubts, to the critical life of modern man, which is based on the autonomous judgment of reason and experiential substantiation. To him what was most certain was not the Buddha or Pure Land that was believed in through giving up "*hakara*" (man's intention) and renouncing doubt. It was self-awakened humanity as the subject of reason or the real, historical world grounded on reason and substantiated by experience. While the rational awareness of sin deepened in him, and liberation from it was keenly desired, neither did he think of being damned in future nor aspire after being saved from hell and get rebirth in the Pure Land. No longer, therefore, was he inclined to look for the Buddha to save the one destined to hell by picking him up to the Land of Ease, for such a Buddha was nothing but a falsehood, a roof over a rooftop.

Then his urgent problem was how to come out of himself of such mythical nature and make a quest for humanity through reason. Finally he was determined to part with religion and turn to philosophy based on reason. In a way this was the first step towards his philosophical, academic life. In those days he had the idea that philosophy formed the basis of religion, and that what religion failed to resolve would be solved through philosophy. What he meant by religion then, it might be needless to say, was the Joudo Shin sect, as it had passed current, or at least what he had come to understand as such through years of contact with sermons and sacred teachings, while what he meant by philosophy was no more than the learning which might radically solve the problem of life in a rational way. What attracted him to philosophy primarily was its rational nature. It was quite natural for him, for he had become a sceptic of religion, and could not help taking a further step towards rejecting religion.

Upon graduating from the school of his enrolment, Gifu Middle School, he enquired of the principal, HAYASHI Hachizou, which university he thought was better for the study of philosophy, Tokyo U. or Kyoto U. Principal Hayashi was corpulent, a bit stooped and tall, of formidable appearance, with strong glasses, and with a long, beautiful beard already mixed with white growing from cheeks to chin, a man of sturdy physique, quiet, and of composed character. A graduate from Keiougijuku (in short, Keiou) University in Tokyo, Principal Hayashi may have been a direct disciple of FUKUZAWA Yukichi,^{*} personally receiving instruction from the latter. At the middle school Hayashi taught morals for the fifth grade students, and lectured on his "ten meanings of personality." To his question the principal said in answer, "How about going to Kyoto University?" The reason for his recommendation was as follows: Tokyo University, with its old history, a good staff of veteran authorities, and full equipment, had an established reputation, but its detriment

was its lack of freshness. Kyoto University, on the other hand, though founded not long before, not well-equipped, and still in the preparatory stage, had the faculty of professors young and energetic, full of vigour, and of great promise. Hayashi further referred to Professor KUWAKI Gen'yoku of Kyoto University, highly renowned as a leading philosopher of the day, who was held in high esteem as the head of the philosophy department. The principal also referred to "a philosopher of genius named NISHIDA Kitarou (Hayashi wrongly pronounced the personal name as "Ikutarou"), with uncommon features of a hermit," and commented on him in various aspects, emphasizing this:

"Though not yet well known in the world, you know, this is a person whose prospect is worthy of seeing."

* FUKUZAWA Yukichi, 1835–1901, founder of the Keiougijuku, a private school for Western studies. The school was opened in Edo in 1858, and given the name in the fourth year of Keiou, the first year of Meiji, 1868; it later became a university. Towards the end of the Edo period, Fukuzawa visited the U.S.A., accompanying the mission of the Tokugawa government, and in 1861 inspected countries of Europe.

He also had heard of KUWAKI Gen'yoku, but "NISHIDA Kitarou," the name of the hermit philosopher he had never heard of before, was deeply impressed in his ears. In hindsight, it is a wonder eternally unforgettable that the first person who had let him know about NISHIDA Kitarou, to whom he owed great obligations for learning, was the principal of his middle school. For all that, he wondered how Principal Hayashi could predict the future of NISHIDA Kitarou so exactly in the days when there had been no publication even of the *Zen no Kenkyuu* (A Study of Good), the first of his books. If it had been a merely accidental hit or hearsay or an inspirational divination, it would have been nonsense. If it had been his conclusion after reading Nishida's writings before the book, "*A Study of Good*," his keen eye must be said to have been worthy of admiration. Principal Hayashi, after retiring from the Gifu Middle School, is said to have returned to Keiougijuku University, and later settled in Hokkaido. It is regrettable that he was never heard of again thereafter.

II

He decided to follow HAYASHI Hachizou's advice. After graduation from the middle school, with the intention of entering Kyoto University, and for the purpose of preparing himself for the entrance examination of the Third Higher School, a preparatory course to the university, also located in Kyoto, he went up to Tokyo.

Before that time he had never travelled alone; he did not know even how to buy a train ticket, so that he had to ask his father to buy one for him. In his lodging-house in Tokyo he charred *sukiyaki* beef, which invited derision from others. A rustic, he had never eaten beef before. Nevertheless, since this was the first study far away from his home, he had the high hopes of "a boy who had left his native place to realize his aspiration." He wrote a motto of his study with gold paint on a roll of dark blue paper, "Guiding people of good nature is the cause for my birth in this world of affliction." He concealed the paper deep in the bosom.

His middle-school days' classmate and close friend, KAWAJI Toshiaki, had earlier come up to the capital, and they encouraged each other for entrance exam. As the result, he could scrape through it; they were admitted, as desired, into the Third Higher School.* In those days the name of the school, linked with its liberal spirits, echoed throughout the country. Indeed, the whole school was influenced by the virtue of the principal, ORITA Hikoichi. Those days, perhaps, marked the climax of the school's liberalness. Ever since the time when Principal Orita retired and was replaced by SAKAI Sao, the school morals were braced, students' military discipline was strengthened, and the school's liberalness was made to be clad in armour. Thus preparations for the First World War had been being pushed forward unawares.

* Hisamatsu and Kawaji, whose father had come from Tokyo to serve as Governor of Gifu Prefecture, stayed in Tokyo for two months from April 1908, and were admitted into the Third Higher School in September of that year. Hisamatsu was nineteen years old.

(Kitahara Chronological Record).

At the Third Higher School he learned English from KURIYAGAWA Hakuson, SHIMA Kasui, HIRATA Tokuboku, YOSHIMURA Yuuki and others, German from NARUSE Mugoku, HIRATA Genkichi, HASHIMOTO Seiu and others; laws and politics from NIO Kamematsu, and economics from KANBE Masao. It was around those days when KURIYAGAWA Hakuson (1880-1923) gave lectures on his "Modern Literature in Ten Lectures" as extracurricular activities.

As a Higher-School student he enjoyed reading on philosophy better than attending fixed lessons. Long before a German primer was finished, at the attached library he attempted to read Windelband's *History of Philosophy* in the original, constantly looking up a dictionary. With his poor knowledge of German and understanding, naturally he had extreme difficulty. As he spent much of his time trying to read it, however, he gradually began to feel he had come to have a faint idea of philosophy. In January 1911 "*A Study of Good*," a book by NISHIDA Kitarou, the very person of whom HAYASHI Hachizou had spoken so highly, was published by Kodokan, Tokyo. He immediately purchased a copy at the fixed price of one yen, and was immersed in it.

As he was then at the final, third year-grade of the Higher School, through repeated readings he had come to understand the gist of the book. His interest was focused on the fourth section, "Religion." Here he found that, unlike the kind of religion which had been made to crumble by reason, there was a religion which did not contradict reason, but which could be convincing even for reason. After four to five years, thus, there was interest in religion restored in him. At the same time there began sprouting a spontaneously philosophizing mind, slightly as it was, in himself. But the concept of "pure experience," which was said to constitute the thought-basis of the book, in spite of repeated readings, was left beyond his comprehension. He could not help waiting for a time when he was ready for it with better understanding. The aim of his Higher School life

was then to cultivate himself better and acquire education as rich as compost, as well as to have knowledge preparatory to lectures of the philosophy department, which he might take without difficulty when he was admitted into the university.*

* In September 1909, at age twenty, Hisamatsu had a relapse of pleurisy, suffering from pulmonary apicitis. He went back to Gifu for medical care and a rest cure at home until the next year's summer. In September 1910 he returned to school, and was admitted into the second year class of the Third Higher School.

During almost five years between the second year of the Higher School (September 1910, 21 years old) and the time of graduation from the university (July 1915, 26 years old), he lived in a four-and-a-half-mat room facing north east, on the third floor of a lodging house named Rakuyoukan, adjacent to the eastern wall of the Shougoin temple.* Since part of the north-eastern ground of the temple belonged to Prince Kaya's palace, in early spring the grand princess was seen coming out to the paulownia field within the enclosure, with her lovely grandson and granddaughter to pick up horsetails. In those days in the area spreading from around there to Yoshida to north-east there were many plowed fields for the noted Shougoin radishes and other vegetables, with scattered cottages. The low land below the precipice of Kagura-oka (also called Yoshida-yama) was a spacious marshland which fishes inhabited, on which water fowls flew down, and which in summer was a good fishing place for children. The north window of his room commanded a distant view of Mt. Hiei with northern mountains; the east window, good views of Mt. Daimonji and Mt. Nyakouji beyond the tower of the Kurodani temple. He could see beautiful views all through the seasons: fresh green in spring, red and yellow leaves in autumn, and white snow in winter.

Among his classmates of the Higher School Class B were: OMODAKA Hisataka, NAWA Toshisada, and NAKAMURA Naokatsu, whom he later unexpectedly joined as colleagues of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, WATANABE Hiroyuki, who entered the business world, MANABE Masaru, who became a member of the House of Representatives, TAKAKURA Teru (Terutoyo, then), who became a novelist, OHBA Yonejirou, now professor at Ohtani University, TAKAKURA Chikai and INAZUKA Takeshi, who died young, and others. TAKAKURA Chikai, who had set his mind on philosophy, contended with YAMAUCHI Tokuryuu for the top seat in the class. So regrettable was his early death. In Class C of the same school year were TAKIGAWA Yukitoki, KAWAHARA Shunsaku, and others. Thinking of them now makes his nostalgia almost unbearable.

III

It was in the third year of Taishou (1912) that he passed full of hope through the gate of Kyoto University, which stood opposite the Third Higher School. He specialized in philosophy in the Department of Philosophy, College of Literature (the present School of Letters). His matriculation was in the fifth year after the founding of the Department of Philosophy. Other students of philosophy course in the same year were: OIKAWA Eizaemon, a

unique one who became a disciple of UCHIMURA Kanzou after graduation and who died at middle age, and MORIMOTO Kouji (now, Shounen), who practised Zen at the Shou-okuji monastery, Kyoto, first under HASHIMOTO Dokuzan, then under YAMAZAKI Daikou, long, and who finally became a Buddhist monk. In the philosophy course were two students senior to him by one year: YAMAUCHI (Nakagawa, then) Tokuryuu* and KATSUBE Kenzou. Students senior to him by two years were also two: NOZAKI Hiroyoshi, a bright boy who died a premature death, and KUBO Yoshio. KANETSUNE Kiyosuke, of the first year's philosophy course, and AMANO Teiyuu and ABE Seinosuke, of the second year's, had already graduated. OKANO Tomejirou and SHINOHARA Sukeichi were admitted and took the course in the year next to that of his matriculation. In those days the number of students of philosophy course until around the tenth year of Taishou (1921) were no more than two or three. The situation was the same with other courses.

* YAMAUCHI Tokuryuu, 1890–1982, professor emeritus of philosophy at Kyoto University, and one of the close friends of the author throughout his life, referred to his visit to the author's residence in the Shougoin lodging house, during his talk in a meeting to talk about the author held in the year after the author's death, 1980, describing it as follows:

"When Mr. Hisamatsu entered the Third Higher School and lived in a lodging house near the Shougoin temple, anytime I visited, I saw his room swept clean, provided with a fireplace in the corner like a tea-room. A wild man I had difficulty in sitting properly, though I tried doing so in front of him." (*BUDDHIST* No. 9; vol. 3 no. 3, 1981, published by Touhou-kai, Tokyo & Osaka)

The professoriate of the College of Literature, when he was admitted into it, were really dignified, for prominent scholars, young and energetic, occupied their chairs. In literature course were UEDA Bin, FUJISHIRO Sadasuke, FUJII Oto'o, NAITOU Konan, SHINMURA Izuru, SAKAI Ryou saburou, and others. In history course were UCHIDA Ginzou, HARA Katsurou, SAKAGUCHI Takashi, KUWABARA Jitsuzou, OGAWA Takuji, YANO Jin'ichi, and others. In philosophy course were KUWAKI Gen'yoku, KANO Naoki, MATSUMOTO Bunzaburou, MATSUMOTO Matatarou, TANIMOTO Tomi, FUKADA Kousan, NISHIDA Kitarou, YONEDA Shoutarou, and others. All of them were distinguishing scholars of marked individuality both in scholarship and character.

First by attending the prescribed general lectures and also hearing the optional special lectures, for the first time he perceived the atmosphere of the university as the highest seat of learning, and was quite satisfied. As every lecture was given pretty fast, inserted with new technical terms, taking notes of them troubled him. Nevertheless, his experiences at the Higher School of reading some books on philosophy were a great help for rearranging his notebooks by comparing them with reference books and gaining understanding from them.

The head professor of the philosophy course in which he specialized was KUWAKI Gen'yoku. An assistant professor, TOMONAGA Sanjuurou, was staying abroad to pro-

secute his studies. NISHIDA Kitarou, an object of his long-time adoration, was an assistant professor who taught ethics. His appearance exactly corresponded with the story HAYASHI Hachizou once told him; Hayashi must have seen him somewhere. Although still as young as forty-three years old, Nishida had a cropped hair, a high forehead bald in front, piercing eyes which glittered through the strong glasses, a thick nose, standing ears, and tightly drawn lips; he was always ill-shaved, slipping a discoloured, crested *haori* (i.e., *kimono* half-coat) on Japanese clothes, worn by a body as lean as a withered tree or a cold rock. He used a stick, stepped firmly in shoes, and walked around, thinking of something. He looked exactly like a hermit or an *arhat* (an early Buddhist saint). This character of his, simple and indifferent to his appearance, so worthy of a philosopher, as well as his bottomlessly abstruse lectures, being peerlessly unique, never failed to captivate the students. In the second year of Taishou (1913) he became professor, held the chair of the science of religion, and lectured on religion. The lectures of that year on the science of religion were recorded in the additional volume four of his collected writings.* They became the only lectures given in his life on the introduction to the science of religion, for in the next year (1914) KUWAKI Gen'yoku was transferred to Tokyo University in succession, they say, to Koeber's post,** and Nishida took charge of the first chair of philosophy and the history of philosophy, so that there were no lectures any longer given by him on the science of religion.

* In the collection of works by Nishida, *Nishida Kitarou Zenshuu*, nineteen volumes, published by Iwanami-shoten, these lectures were included in the fifteenth volume, 1952, together with lectures on philosophy; the editor of the lectures on religion was HISAMATSU himself.

Nishida's first book, *Zen no Kenkyuu* (*Zenshuu* vol.1) was translated into English by ABE Masao and Christopher Ives: *AN INQUIRY INTO THE GOOD*, Yale University, New Haven 1990.

** Raphael Koeber, 1848–1923, a German philosopher-musician; he was a lecturer at Tokyo University between 1893 and 1914.

After entering philosophy course, he listened to various lectures by every professor, and nurtured general, common knowledge prescribed for a student of philosophy course, while for himself he read classics and new books on philosophy and religion, endeavouring to take in mental food. But, during the three years of his school days, what aroused his strongest and deepest concern was the lecture on the science of religion given only at that time. That lecture moulded a plastic image for him with somewhat well-defined features out of the foetal clay of inner needs which theretofore had been dormant for many years in the innermost recesses of his heart in a chaotic state but persistently. The philosophical concern for religion, which had been awakened several years before through reading the book, "*A Study of Good*," was concretely and more vividly brought to life again from the tongue, or rather, from the whole body of the author who had acquired

sharp philosophical thought and deep religious experience. Through this lecture he had his eye of religion opened philosophically.

However, on the eve of his graduation he came to face various kinds of living problems, which obliged him to make a self-examining criticism on whether, eight years after setting his heart on philosophy, the expected aim was achieved or not. After taking up the study of philosophy, he acquired a habit of thinking things not individually but generally, not in minor details but radically. For him, for good or for evil, individual problems he faced became turning points which successively left their trails. Finally individual problems were deepened to the universal root-source of all problems, while problems were internalized from what was objective to what was subjective. He came to the point where philosophical cognition, however profound, was completely powerless insofar as it remained objective cognition for the solution of that subjective problem at hand, where there was no other way than to reform himself subjectively, radically. There his grave concern was neither to seek for truth objectively nor to have objective cognition of his own true way of being, but to reform himself existentially, through religious practice.

IV

In that way, he came to despair of philosophy for its being powerless in the matter of his original desire. He became so indifferent to graduation that, after submitting his graduation thesis* to the university, he neglected it at all. Days and nights he confined himself indoors to the third floor room of his lodging house, sunk deep in thought. His conduct in those days apparently seemed abnormal to other people, to the extent that even a senior of his from the same province, who was serving with the medical department of the university, sent a telegram to his father in Gifu that he looked showing signs of mental derangement. Although fatally abnormal, his mind was not of the nature for which the so-called psychiatry diagnosis and treatment were available. He kept wondering how to solve that subjective problem, and finally made up his mind to go to Zen (*Chan*),** so as to break through that *aporia*. At that time, not to speak of giving up its solution, forgetting the *aporia*, turning his attention to anything else, killing himself, or giving himself up to despair, not even seeking redemption from God or Buddha -- none of them interested him. They were even detestable. Although despairing of reason, he could not go back to what could not stand against the criticism of reason. By "going to Zen" was meant spontaneous working from within of the knowledge of Zen teaching and Zen way of life gained through occasional reading on Zen and listening to Zen talks since the Higher School days, as well as of the Zen-like influence received from NISHIDA Kitarou, all corresponding with his mental attitude at that time. For him, who parted with the so-called theistic religion and who despaired of the philosophy of objective knowledge, the path to be chosen had to be neither mere religion nor mere philosophy but the subjective knowledge which was of the nature of religious practice, the religious practice which was of the nature of subjective knowledge. As something like that, he chose Zen.

* The graduation thesis, "Time and Space," which the author presented at this time, and which was accepted later after oral examination, has been included in the author's collection of writings, volume one. It takes up the time-space views by John Locke, David Hume, Immanuel Kant, A. Riehl, and Paul Natorp.

** In the present translation of the author's two autobiographical notes as well as his brief chronological record, the Japanese "Zen" was preferred to its Chinese equivalent "*Chan*," with consideration for the author's personal contacts.

As a place of religious practice he chose Oubaku, Uji, a location of quietude far distant from the urban noises. On the sixteenth of June, the fourth year of Taishou (1915, 26 years old), with a firm resolve to go to Oubaku, he slipped out of the lodging house at midnight. On his way, with the thought of telling his resolution only to Professor NISHIDA Kitarou, the head of the department, who was the most understanding person for such a matter, he called on him. Nishida's abode was in Tanaka Village in a suburb of Kyoto, just to the north of SAIONJI Kinmochi's villa, Seifuusou. It was a two-storied, oblong house with many rooms, facing south in the middle of fields. His study was a most west-side room facing south on the second floor. Surprised at the reason for the unnoticed call, Nishida admonished him of his impatient conduct, saying;

"Your state of mind is understandable; but the oral exam for your graduation thesis is just ahead. It won't be too late to leave after finishing it. The Way should be sought after calmly. Being thoughtlessly impatient isn't normal. As for the place to go to, also, if your choice were wrong, you won't be able to achieve your aim."

Being baffled at the start, dispiritedly did he return to the lodging house. On the next day he quietly reflected on his conduct. Two days after, he wrote the following letter to Nishida, complaining of his mental state:

"I deeply appreciate your kindnesses, in spite of my unnoticed call the night before last, on no day for reception, for giving your consideration to my personal matter.

"At that time you told me you wondered if I was not in a morbid excitement. I felt it might be disastrous if that were true, and spent that night composing myself, thinking quietly. But the more I became calm my feelings and engage in intimate introspection, the more clearly does the scream of awareness ring that my life past has been false. Every time I hear it, I feel horrible and ashamed of myself, and cannot help shuddering. I entered the university to pursue learning and cultivate character; I wanted to study philosophy, and have been studying it. But now I wonder if I could definitely say so. I have spent a rigorous, so-called moral, life. But, did this arise from the free cravings of my inmost heart? Was not impure blood circulating within the veins of my acting hands? Was not the Satan of Vanity thrusting out a red tongue behind my clothes, cap, and belt? For what purpose do I fix my hair, shave myself, and bathe and wash my face? I possess a hand mirror inside my desk; for what purpose was it purchased? Weren't there

cases when I failed to offer a seat in a tramcar to the aged or the weak, though feeling sorry for them, for fear that others might look upon me as displaying good conduct, while on other occasions I did display a good deed in front of others?

When my daily conduct, including such trifling deeds, was analyzed in a test-tube, I wonder if there were any single action that did not show poisonous reaction.

"Alas! What a horrible matter! Unless I removed this poison completely from the components of my conduct, I couldn't gain even a moment of peace. Haunting me without a moment's separation is this horrible poisonous matter, which is the motive of my deed, the Devil, my false self with the black hands. It has confined my true self in the depths of an old well. Iron chains have bound my true self hand and foot. Freedom for action with me has almost been lost. Only the tongue is free, scoffing, reviling, remonstrating, and scolding. And now even this tongue is about to be gagged. Soon the loss of freedom on the part of my true self would leave the false self to behave outrageously. I must by every means get rid of the chains of this horrible restraint and regain new breathing in a free realm.

Otherwise, I would have the spider of sin choke my throat gradually with its sticky threads it spins out, and would find out my wretched end in a prison. Now I am incessantly stung with a poisonous fang, am benumbed, and the heavy tread of death is heard approaching. What a shame this is! Without a moment's delay I must devise a way to escape its scythe.

"It was when the scream of grief of my true self reached its peak that I paid you a call. My affliction was more than I could bear. I thought over graduation. But at that time for me it was not recognized as anything valuable. Was I to listen to the pressing appeal of my true self, or to reject it, or to wait for the time of examination? But I couldn't find any good reason to wait. I made up my mind just to forsake all of my past and obtain everything new and true. And even on that occasion the false self shadowed me. It happened that, my Respected Teacher, your words helped this false self. Again I smothered up the appeal of my true self.

"Yesterday I paid a visit to the chief priest of the Senjuin temple (UEMURA Hourin) to whom you had introduced me. From him I rather only heard his view on decency, ethics, and morality. I would like to get rid of such a state early; I would like to have the very life that I live today issue out from the clear water of my true self. On that occasion, everything I do -- from the trifling daily acts like putting on clothes, wearing a cap, to doing moral conduct, engaging in social service or humanitarian work -- all of them will come to have a new and true meaning, enabling me to live in a noble world of brightness. Unless I gain freedom, every act of mine will remain a sin. 18 June"

Soon he was called upon to come by Prof. Nishida, who advised him to read Zen writings so gradually as to prepare for Zen practice. A few days later he sent a brief letter like what

follows to Prof. Nishida:

"Dear Sir,

Thank you for taking your time to give me advice the other day. Besides, on my leaving for home you were kind enough to lend me an umbrella. I must beg your pardon for my delay in returning it to you. The sky of that night was like my inner world. Dark clouds of self-afflicting passions flew fast east and west. Violent winds blew hard up and down. Spears of rain came down in every direction. The lighting of sin flashed in the four quarters. The thunder of agony shook mountains and fields. The road was pitch-dark for stepping ahead. It was far from the kind of weather a fragile umbrella could shelter me from. Rather, one might say, clinging to an umbrella deprives one of the freedom of action. An umbrella is, indeed, useful only in peace time. According to your advice, on the next day I bought a whole collection of Hakuin's writings, and read the *Orategama* ("My Handy Kettle")^{*} and some other articles from among them. I also bought the *Zenmon-hougoshuu* ("A Collection of *Dharma*-Words belonging to the [Japanese] Zen School).^{**} On reading them I came across expressions I had never heard or thought of, and which were very helpful. 23 June"

^{*} *Orategama* is a well-read collection of sermons addressed to different people, written in the *kana*-style, by HAKUIN Ekaku (1685–1768), a Rinzai-zen priest in the Edo period. It includes five letters; the first three were published in 1749, and the remaining two letters in 1751.

^{**} The *Zenmon-hougo-shuu*, three volumes, all in the *kana*-style, compiled in 1895 and 1921. Its second volume includes Hakuin's sermons.

He gave up going to Oubaku. But, having been thrown out in the roadless wilderness, he had to wait for directions from Prof. Nishida, spending hollow days thereafter. His diaries of those days had running entries such as these:

"The fire of sin burning, the summer of mind causes this heat."

"Waiting for the moon to come out, shelter from shower I took in a deity's hall on earth."

It was in the autumn of that year [when he graduated from the university] that NISHIDA Kitarou, through his respected friend, UEMURA Hourin, of the Senjuin temple located in the western part of Kyoto, with whom Nishida had shared his own noviciate at the Myoushinji Zen monastery, entrusted him to the care of the then monastery leader of the Myoshinji, named IKEGAMI Shouzan.^{*} Nishida, as is well-known, had his lay Buddhist name, Sunshin ("HEART"); he was a long-time lay Zen practiser, who had visited Zen masters one after another, such as [KOBAYASHI] Kokan of the Myoushinji, [SUGA] Koushuu of the Daitokuji, both in Kyoto, [MICHIZU] Setsumon of the Kokutaiji in Etchuu (mid-Hokuriku), and others. Well-informed of the then Zen world around Kyoto, Nishida was cautious, deliberating on whom he could be entrusted to for Zen practice. Nishida recommended Shouzan to him,

saying,

"Among Rinzai-zen masters in Kyoto, worthy of note are TOYOTA Dokutan and KOUNO Mukai of Nanzenji, TAKEDA Mokurai of Kenninji, BESSHO Kyuuhou of Toufukuji, HASHIMOTO Dokuzan of Shoukokuji, TAKAGI Ryuen of Tenryuuji, KAWASHIMA Shouin of Daitokuji, and IKEGAMI Shouzan of Myoushinji. Of them all, either Shouin or Shouzan is good. For you, however, Shouzan seems preferable."

* According to Kitahara's Chronological Record, Hisamatsu shifted his residence in September from the lodging house in Shougoin to a temple named Yougen'in in the compound of the Myoushinji Head Temple in Hanazono Village.

Shouin was like a treasured sword so sharp as to cut a driven feather, while Shouzan was like a big hatchet with the blunted edge. The discerning eye and leadership of NISHIDA Kitarou really deserved admiration.

Finally on the fifteenth of November, through the introduction of UEMURA Hourin, accompanied by UEKI Giyu, he met IKEGAMI Shouzan at the Myoushinji monastery.* First as a mere tryout he was granted attendance to the master's *teishou*-lecture given by citing passages from the *Daiou Goroku* ("Recorded Words of Master Daiou").** The first impression he received from Shouzan was something indescribably complex and of extremely deep significance. He was seated on a cushion, like a lump of lead gripping in it, looked hardly affected by anything, carefree, detached, quiet, unconstrained, artless, leaving no traces of learning as a cumulative process or of good of the artificial nature. He showed the warm friendliness which overflowed from within the inviolable dignity and the beauty of dull finish like rusted gold. It was Shouzan's original face which had given him such an impression on the first meeting that was the longed-for Idea he had described in his mind. He saw the actual existence of this Idea concretely before his eyes. But, to be satisfied with merely objectively looking at it, viewing it, admiring it, longing for it, faithfully following it, or imitating it, he was too much fundamentally subjective, autonomous, and independent. And that happened to accord with the original intent of Zen of not seeking for the Awakened truth or the Buddha outside the self-mind. Nothing else than he himself becoming the actual existence in whose presence he was, that is, attaining Awakening to Shouzan's original face in his own self, had to be his great desire to actualize by risking his life.

* The author wrote an article, "A Reminiscence of Shouzan *roushi*," for a collection of reminiscences of the *roshi* compiled and published by the Myoushinji *soudou* (Zen monastery) in 1952. In that article, the author described the person and way of thinking of the *roushi* with deep admiration. The passage in which the author describes how he practised under the guidance of Shouzan *roushi* there completely matches the present article, only with the difference that there the author uses the first person singular instead of the third person to refer to himself. That article is included in the third volume of the author's *chosakushuu*. The present "Memoirs" was made public three years after that.

** Nanpo Joumyou, 1235–1308, a Rinzaï-zen priest, first practised under a Chinese master at the Kenchouji temple, Kamakura, named Lanxi Daolong (1213–1278), then, possibly by Lanxi's advice, went across to the Song China and practised under Xutang Zhiyu (1185–1269). With the latter Nanpo attained Awakening, returned to Japan, and raised excellent practisers under his guidance. He was posthumously entitled Entsuu–Daiou Kokushi ("State Master").

Zen people's so-called *teishou*–lecture, which he had never heard before, was a novelty for him; its manner of presentation as well as its contents was quite different in character from the university lectures. Giving a *teishou*–lecture, unlike the university lectures with their objective explanation, is expressing Zen fundamentally subjectively with the use of citations from Zen recorded sayings. The true face of Shouzan, who vividly expressed himself fundamentally subjectively with citations from the *Daiou Goroku*, never failed to shake up his true nature, which was dormant in the depths of his being. Immediately after he heard this *teishou*, he wrote down his state of mind as follows;

"On the fifth of November, at the Myoushinji monastery, through the introduction of the two priests, UEMURA Hourin and UEKI Giyuu, I attended to the *teishou* lecture by Master Shouzan with citations from the *Daiou Goroku*. I have been lost in the ascent of life's great mountain, got caught in the thorns that filled the road, have had the way barred now by a towering shield-rock and now by an unfathomable ravine, have gone to the left and come back to the right, have advanced and retreated, have hung back, hesitated to move forward, and long felt perplexed. Now, with blood drying up, the heart getting weakened, death is near at hand. At this very moment "the gate of no-gate"* presents itself before me. It's a pity that my introspective power is still shallow and weak. When I want to cross the threshold, the temple gate suddenly vanishes. Instead, there appears a bottomless abyss at my feet. Now let me exert my whole energy, plunge myself into the abyss, break through the temple gate, dash forward to the Buddha Hall of the other shore, kill the priests and the Buddha therein, ascend the throne to pick up a stick of incense to burn, and let the smoke go up through the cosmos, and contain the whole universe within it!"

* The term "gate of no-gate" is from the *Daiou Goroku*. Therewith Hisamatsu seems to have meant Shouzan himself.

However, remaining a listener to the *teisho* was a matter of regret; for him it meant having an itch that he couldn't scratch. He was unsatisfied with the slow developments. Then there came the big *Rouhatsu-sesshin* (zazen meeting from the first day through the eighth day morning of the twelfth month).

On the first day of December he was finally admitted to have a personal interview with Shouzan as well as to sit in the zazen hall. Shouzan in the personal interview was completely different from the person of ordinary times. Now Shouzan was as difficult and dangerous of approach as an unfathomable precipice. He was struck with admiration by

Shouzan's remarkably thorough way of adaptation to the different situation.

It was the first time for him to do zazen in the monastic manner and to concentrate on practice according to the same rules that monks followed in the zazen hall. Besides, it was the period of practice severest in the whole year. No wonder the pain he suffered physically and mentally was what he had never experienced before. The extraordinarily rough, strange kind of strain, unimaginable anywhere else, inside the hall, the constant spurring by the relentless monk on duty, and the chilly wind blowing in through the windows left open, made him shudder extremely. Pain in the legs unaccustomed to the lotus posture and stiffness in the neck, shoulders, and waist only increased moment by moment. With distorted face and clenched teeth he could hardly hold his sitting posture. Such physical difficulty often absorbed his attention to practice.

Meanwhile, for the approaching personal interview with the master, conducted either independently by a single member or successively by all the members, the mind was driven to making preparations. Thus, both physically and mentally he was cornered more and more. On every occasion of personal interview Shouzan transformed himself to an inapproachable silver mountain/iron wall, and the one-eyed Shouzan's pure white glare became a deadly ray to him.

On the third day he became an endlessly black mass of doubt throughout the whole body, without a way out even of a needle's eye; he was driven literally to the last extremity. Neither was it that, trying to solve some particular problem, he reached its limits, nor that after he failed to solve some universal, general problem objectively it kept haunting his mind. It was he himself that was totally transformed into a big mass of doubt. By a mass of doubt is meant that in which what is doubted and what doubts are one and that which is his whole being. Like a mouse that entered a coin tube to find no way out, or like one who has climbed up a pole one-hundred feet tall to find oneself unable to make progress or regress, he was completely cornered, unable to move.

To his surprise, however, as a saying goes: "When cornered, one is transformed, and, when transformed, one gets through",^{*} the mass of doubt that he was suddenly fell to pieces and melted away; the unwavering silver mountain/iron wall that Shouzan was also collapsed completely, and between him and Shouzan there ceased to be any space even of hair-breadth. Here for the first time he could realize the formless and free, true self; at the same time he could first meet Shouzan's true face. Here he knew Wumen did not lie when he said, "He will go together hand in hand with the foregoing masters, and, fastening the eyebrows together with them, will see and hear with the same eyes and ears."^{**} As a saying goes, "One cut means cutting all; one achievement means achieving all",^{***} all the problems he had for many years been unable to solve were solved with the eradication of sources of evil. He attained a great stage of delight he had never experienced, for now he realized the self that was of no birth-death and that went beyond

being–nobeing, the self that did not think of good or evil and that went beyond value–no value. The following verses are expressions he gave in those days to this scenery of his own:

"Ever the brighter the moon shines in the sky

Especially after rainy clouds cleared away."

"So intimate, after a sheeting rain stopped,

Is the sound of rapids that breaks the still night ."

* Possibly quoted from the Case 10 of the *Biyān-lu* ("Blue Cliff Record"), a collection of one hundred cases that express *Chan* (Zen), compiled by Yuanwu Keqin, 1063–1135, where the compiler cited it as a quotation by his contemporary *Chan* master.

The latter's source is a commentary on the *Yijing* ("the Book of Changes").

** From Case 1 of the *Wumenguan* ("Gateless Barrier"), a collection of forty-eight *Chan* cases, compiled by Wumen Huikai, 1182–1260.

*** From an old saying quoted in the foreword of Case 19 of the *Biyān-lu*. It goes like this: "In the case of a twisted thread, one cut means cutting all [strands] and one dyeing means dyeing all [strands]."

In this way he came out of the medieval religion of faith, as it were, into the modern philosophy of reason, and further, having broken through the limitation of rational philosophy that was of the nature of objective knowledge, got awakened to the true self that was free from all hindrances and unrestricted. Ever since that time he seems to have devoted himself to what follows: To live the life of this true self; by living thus, to practise in the manner of fundamentally subjective knowledge; by practising thus, to express himself in every aspect; by making doing so its contents, to found "*the religion of Awakening*"; and to establish "*the philosophy of Awakening*" through the true self getting objectively conscious of itself, objectifying the self, and gaining the objective knowledge of the self. This accomplishment of the religion of Awakening and the philosophy of Awakening is for him the first concern and the eternal mission.

The above is a reminiscence by this nonacademic scholar before he established the religion of Awakening and the philosophy of Awakening. Of the long-time process since then until today, he could not afford to mention anything here.

9. After the Academic Life^{*}

by HISAMATSU Shin'ichi

^{*} A translation from the Japanese text in the *Chosakushuu* vol. I, pp. 435–438.

It originally appeared in the *Asahi Newspaper* in July 1966, eleven years after the "Memoirs of His Academic Life."

Here the author uses the first person singular to indicate himself, instead of the third person which he used in the foregoing article.

Translated by TOKIWA Gishin in collaboration with TSUKUI Akemi.

No matter whether clearly aware of it or not, human beings never stop seeking after what is ultimate. That is why since ancient times anytime anywhere there have been philosophy and religion. Philosophy wants to know ultimately, and religion wants to live ultimately. For the whole man, however, both are one and not two; they are inseparable. The religion isolated from philosophy falls into ignorance, superstition, fanaticism, and dogma, while the philosophy with religion estranged from it cannot but be deprived of life. Both religion and philosophy in their present conditions seem to expose such faults.

I was born and raised in a devout family, and since childhood had access to books on Buddhist teachings, listened to sermons, and had my faith subjected to examination; all that made me feel even proud of the firmness of my faith. When, however, I was in the fourth or fifth year grade of the middle school, that firm faith easily collapsed. That was due to the awakening within me of a free, critical power and an autonomous spirit which, together with the scientific knowledge I had been successively gaining, quickened the awakening of modern humanism to develop in me.

Such a crisis of religious faith cannot be confined to my case alone; it is the crisis possibly any person or any nation must necessarily experience when and where animism, fetishism, or a heteronomous religion that depends on either God or Buddha encounters modern humanism. As a matter of fact, in the West there took place a religious reformation, far from thoroughgoing as it was. In Japan also, during the period of less than a century of modernization, no one knows how many pre-modern faiths easily went to ruin, or, otherwise, were reduced to formal ceremonies, works of art, or cultural properties appropriate only for museums, and have lost their faith! However solemn their outward appearances may be, they are nothing but fake religions which continue to exist from mere force of habit or under a mask of religion; they are destined in due time to face criticism in the light of modern humanism.

It was quite natural that the course I wanted to take after giving up hope in faith was

modern philosophy, for it was free to question and criticize the religious scriptures, dogmas, churches, and even God or Buddha that were considered sacred and inviolable. Upon my graduation from the middle school, the principal named HAYASHI Hachizou recommended me to enter the philosophy department of Kyoto (Imperial) University on the grounds that it had young and spirited professors, and cited the name, above all, of NISHIDA Kitarou, who, although not yet well-known, was an unworldly genius philosopher. The first edition of his book, *Zen no Kenkyuu* ("A Study of Good") was published while I was a student of the Third Higher School (of the old system), and, though difficult to understand, I read it over and over again with deeper appreciation. Coming in touch with Nishida's profound thought which overflowed from between the lines, I admired him greatly, and also highly thought of Principal Hayashi's acute discerning eye.

While I was a student of the philosophy department at Kyoto (Imperial) University, through the lectures by young and energetic professors I was blessed with learning various kinds of fresh knowledge of the philosophy Oriental and Occidental and of other fields. Above anything else, however, on my encountering Professor Nishida, I had ample demonstration that his philosophy was not mere speculation by a person of wide information or of objective knowledge, but a complete fusion where knowing and living ultimately were one and undivided. I strongly felt that the kind of philosophy I had been seeking ought to be like that.

At the same time I saw through it that in the so-called academic approach not only philosophy but even the studies of religion almost always had a tendency toward objective studies, isolated from living, and had no appeal to and no immediate use for those who wanted to live ultimately.

Then I gave up that kind of academic philosophy, and, following Professor Nishida's deeply sympathetic instructions, paid a visit to Master IKEGAMI Shouzan at the Myoushinji Zen monastery. For me, who had despaired of pre-modern religion and academic philosophy, the visit was a fervent search for truth, so as to live in unity with knowing ultimately; it was not because of reactionary concern with traditional Zen or any objective, intellectual interest in Zen.

Here, however, I struck the fatal crisis of human nature itself which no modern humanist who was aware of the autonomous or scientific nature of man could get rid of. That is the fundamentally subjective, ultimate crisis of man, the very root-source in which man's all contradictions, dilemmas, and agonies are one and inseparable; it is man's internal, inevitable "moment," which obliges man to go beyond, negate, and convert man himself.

That very going-beyond is true religion; it actualized itself with me as the Awakening of the absolutely autonomous, universal, and basic Self, that, being formless Itself, manifests every form ("F"). The Awakened Self is the self-awareness of the "Postmodern" human revolution that comes immediately upon the break-through of the crisis of mod-

ern self-awareness. It is the fundamental subject of the conversional, as it were, true formation of the world ("A" for "All mankind") and creation of history ("S" for "Supra-historical history"). Here is the actualization of resurrection, which is neither myth nor mere postulation; a new life which lives through emancipation from original sin or birth-and-death, the attainment of the absolutely autonomous going-returning aspects. The so-called absolute negation or absolute affirmation should be, instead of any objective, philosophical idea, the life of the Awakened Self.

As for the modernization of religion, also, instead of stopgap measures like the self-defending, external reinforcement or modern repainting of pre-modern religion, or modern, humanistic, theological interpretations, it should be casting off towards the "Postmodern" in a drastic manner with the fatal crisis of modern humanism as its "moment." The so-called ecumenical movement cannot be radical unless it is a unification based on this casting off rather than a simple collusion of the greatest common denominator among religions.

By this year (1966) I have lived the F.A.S. up to the worldly age of seventy-seven; irrespective of the worldly age, however, I shall continue living forever. Here are my impressions in verse:

"Having spent zero year seventy-seven times, I wonder,

For what merit is one celebrated as at the Age of Joy?"*

(In terms of "*Kenchuutou*". [the final of the "Five Ranks" of *Chan*,

i.e., "Having arrived at the non-duality of nirvana and its function"])**

"Getting awakened to the formless self, dying with no-death,

Born without birth, one sports throughout the triple world."

(On attaining Awakening, Nirvana, and Birth)

* A Japanese term "*kiju*" ("celebration of the age of joy") is applied to one's 77th birthday since the Chinese character for "*ki*" (also pronounced *yorokobi*: joy, delight, pleasure), when written in the grass style, appears as if made up of the characters which represent seven, ten, and seven, respectively.

** Cf. Note 30 in *Critical Sermons of the Zen Tradition: Hisamatsu's Talks on Linji*, translated and edited by Christopher Ives and Tokiwa Gishin, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire and New York, 2002.

10. SELECTED VERSES OF HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI*

(Selected from the author's *Chosakushuu* Vol. 7, a collection of verses, and translated freely by Tokiwa without knowledge of the rules of prosody; exceptions are two verses, one English and one German, made public by the author himself.)

CONTENTS

- I. Going Abroad and Back Home (seventeen two-line verses)
- II. "On being informed of Dr. Paul Tillich's death" (three verses)
- III. "The All-Bearing Empty Sea" (a twenty-seven line verse in English, translated by the author and Richard DeMartino, plus a two-line verse translated by Tokiwa)
- IV. "Extolling Prof. Martin Heidegger who Counts the Age of Eighty" (two verses: one in German translation by the author, and the other in English by Tokiwa)
- V. "Broken Straw Sandals" (a seven-line verse)
- VI. On Various Subjects (thirteen two-line verses and a seven-line verse)
- VII. On Buddha Shakyamuni (four four-line verses, two three-line verses, and two two-line verses)
- VIII. "On the Death of Ms. MURATA Kinue (three two-line verses)
- IX. "My Last Words in Verse" (five two-line verses)

I. Going Abroad and Back Home*

(In the fall of 1957 the author gave lectures on "*Chan* and *Chan* Culture" at the Divinity School, Harvard University. In 1958, after talks with Dr. Paul Tillich on *Chan* autonomy and Tillich's theonomy, the author met several scholars, including Martin Heidegger and Carl Jung, and visited several places on his way back to Japan.)

- 1. "Equipped for travel to the U.S.A." (1957 Vol. 7, p. 118, photo 111):
A sputnik, with a black mantle, white *tabi*, and sandals,
Is to tour the earth, a super-anachronism.
- 2. "Harvard University" (1957, p. 291):
Buried under big maple trees, some in sight,
Stand aged buildings of Harvard University.
- 3. "On the Jungfrau of the Alps, Tea was Served to the Maiden Peak"
(1958, p. 118, photo 110):

The instant I made tea for Zhao and Kyuu,*
The maiden summit in snow cleared up wide.

* (Zhaozhou Congshen, 778–897, is a *Chan* master in China who was well-known for his reply, "Go and take tea." in response to a question that implied the ultimate contradiction of life. Sen Rikyu, 1522–1591, is a man of Tea in Japan who brought to

completion *wabi-cha* (Recluses' Tea). In a letter addressed to the members of Shincha-kai (ASSOCIATION OF THE MIND TEA) from Europe, dated May 17, 1958, the author wrote, "Reaching the top of Mt. Jungfrau, Switzerland, by the mountain trolley, I took out the tea-caddy Kenzan, tea-spoon Byakuren, and tea-bowl Manparou (Mengbalang), made tea out of the virgin snow of the Alps, offered Uji-grown tea and Toraya-made cake to *Chan* master Zhaozhou and Tea-master Rikyuu, and, sharing tea together with Mr. Tsujimura and Mr. Fujiyoshi, I prayed for the quiet stability of the Shincha-kai."

Cf. Vol. 8, p. 146; for tea-caddy Kenzan cf. Vol. 5, bookend plate 37; for tea-bowl Manparou, Vol. 5, bookend plate 68)

4. "On Leaving India" (1958, p. 163):

What a waste for the Bhagavat's* land !
Centuries behind on culture level.

* (Bhagavat, the "World-honoured one," here refers to the Buddha, Shakyamuni.)

5. "Back Home at the Hakone Checkpoint" (1958, p. 163):

In all countries turn customs houses
Into single stone-posts like at Hakone.

6. "At Buddh Gayâ, India" (1958, p. 118):

Nobly exalted in the transient life:
Golgotha cross hole and Gaya *bo* tree.

7. "On Mount of Olives, Jerusalem, a Trace for Rising to Heaven" (1958, p. 118):

Impressing a step deep into the great earth,
Jesus rose to Heaven, from Olivet.

8. "On Mount of Olives, I Recalled the Story of a Single Shoe Left in an Empty Grave on Mt. Xiong'er" (1958, p. 120):

Jesus and Dharma left their marks:
Olives' footstep; Xiong'er's single shoe.

9. "At the Church of Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem" (1958, p. 120):

A hole for the cross of the human son,
In the holy grave, august !

10. "At Buddh Gaya" (eight verses, 1958 Vol. 7, p. 249; Vol. 3, plate 1):

- 1) On my way to Buddh Gaya before dawn
Stars were bright to the east above the site.
- 2) My heart throbbed at its foot, a rocky hill
Kashyapa is said to have crouched in.
- 3) In the Neranjarâ's morning mist
Red, white, yellow sari, maids carried jars.
- 4) Over the Neranjarâ shining silvery
The day was beginning to break.
- 5) In the thick forest a path antique
Ran through under the *bo* tree.

6) Sitting under the *bo* tree, I saw the world

Boundless, neither Buddha nor myself.

7) When to the *Vajra** Seat tea was served,

Gautama smiled, sublimely reserved.

(A Sanskrit term "*vajra*" originally meant a thunderbolt, and referred to "*prajñā*" or insight so penetrating it crushes any delusion.)

8) To the golden statue of Great Tower

Flowers I strewed and five vows I made.

II. "On being informed of Dr. Paul Tillich's death"

(three verses, 1965 Vol. 7, p. 294; Vol. 8, p. 114):

1. Lonely will be Harvard, our encounter site,

On fallen leaves evening rain falling.

2. In the rock garden with ultimate concern,

For a while you lingered in silence.

3. On your back, lying, to praise the dragon on the ceiling,

The only person who did so was you.

III. "The All-Bearing Empty Sea"

(1961 Vol. 7, pp. 336–338; plate 298):

"On May 15, 1958, I went to see Prof. Carl Jung personally at his home in Zurich, Switzerland, and talked with him on his 'collective unconscious' and Chan's '*wuxin*' (*mushin*; No Mind). Recently he passed away, leaving a *koan* unsolved. My respect for him and regret for his early death being so deep, I dedicate the following words to his memory. Hôseki, in the summer of 1961"*

* (The original Japanese verse follows. Below is the English translation made public by the author in the *FAS* No. 53, October 1963 p. 14:)

THE ALL BEARING EMPTY SEA

Translated from the Japanese

by Hoseki S. HISAMATSU

and R. DEMARTINO

Boundless in width

Bottomless in depth

The vast Sea.

Its waves without number

Large and small

From the beginningless beginning
Disappearing as soon as they appear
Appearing as soon as they disappear
Endlessly, ceaselessly
Their rising and falling.

But Who is it Who knows

That

In Its Self

Ever fulfilled and undisturbed

The Sea bears not the slightest trace of a wave,

That

Formless

It is *presenting Self right now*

Where there obtains

Neither past, present, nor future

And is *presenting Its Self right here*

Where there obtains

Neither east nor west

Neither above nor below ?

All bearing yet non-bearing

Un-bearing yet bearing all.

How wondrous !

All bearing empty Sea.*

* (In the *Chosakushuu* vol. 7 the Japanese text of the above is followed by a line of verse as follows in Tokiwa's translation. *Alcopley, Listening to Heidegger and Hisamatsu*, published by Bokubi Press, Kyoto 1963, cites the whole verses both in German by TSUJIMURA Kôichi pp. 40–41, and English from the German by Joseph Freeman p. 42.)

In the Vast Sea with no bottom, deep and formless,
Waves rise, large and small, trusting to fate.

IV. "Extolling Prof. Martin Heidegger
Who Counts the Age of Eighty"

(1969 Vol. 7, pp. 302–303; plate 273):*

* (The author sent his handwritten verse of celebration in German to Prof. Heidegger.)

Segen

*Ein durchsichtiger Edelstein; Er zählt achtzig, bleibt doch ohne Zahl;
Jahr für Jahr; Jedes ist vollrundet, braucht keines Schleifens.*

Hoseki S. Hisamatsu*

(A translucent gem of wisdom, he counts eighty while surpassing counting;
Year after year, each is fulfilled, going beyond carving and polishing.)

* (The author's *Chosakushuu* vol. 8, p. 115, above the photograph of the same plate, cites two lines of verse in Chinese characters with two Hs, possibly for the two persons' surnames at its head, which in translation goes as follows:)

Travellers H and H, who go in the night ten thousand miles long,
In broad daylight alike see a narrow piece of iron path extend.

V. "Broken Straw Sandals"

"Written on the Occasion of the Publication of my Collected Writings"

(1969 Vol. 7, p. 177; Vol. 8, plates 1 & 2):

Broken straw-sandals these are,
Cast off on the roadside by a pilgrim with nothing, who,
Scooping up fresh water from the spring of bottomless depth,
Tackling cliffs of a thousand feet high,
Going through jungles tens of thousands of miles long,
Penetrating checkpoints, going beyond nation-states,
Endlessly continues the journey of life.

VI. On Various Subjects

1. "Setting a Bunch of Flowers of *dokudami* (*Hottuyinia cordata* or Poison-counteractor) for an alcove (*tokonoma*) Floral Decoration"
(around 1940 or 41. Vol. 7, p. 114):
On a Poison-counteractor blossom
Cruciform flowers purely white.
2. "A Hymn to a Poison-Counteractor" (1967, p. 124; plates 117, 118):
Flowers cruciform and leaves of a *bo* tree
Grow on one stem, St. Poison-counteractor.
3. "Life and Death" (three verses, 1966, p. 208):
 - 1) Good on blooming, good on not blooming,
Aged cherry trees of Mt. Yoshino
Are best on blooming as if not blooming.
 - 2) Why d' you praise Arashiyama in blooming alone ?
On rafts, how blossoms are scattered !

- 3) Blooming to fall, falling to bloom,
Never permanent is the flowers' life.
4. "Onions" (two verses, 1967, p. 345):
- 1) Every time peeled, onions get rejuvenated;
Where's the core ? Lo ! True Void is it.
 - 2) Grown from the True Void core,
Layers of peels make onions full.
5. "Spiders" (1968, p. 128):
Spinning their worlds in order, themselves free,
Spiders control every corner to sit at ease.
6. "Cobwebs" (1969, p. 352):
Cobwebs, hanging high against the vast sky,
Formless originally, with fluids from belly.
7. "Silkworms" (two verses, 1968, p. 128):
- 1) Gorgeous silk cocoons they spin; self-bound,
Doomed into mummies, poor worms are.
 - 2) Mummies as they are, silkworm nature endowed,
They'll break cases someday to fly into the sky.
8. "The F.A.S. Human Image" (1969, p. 59):
Every time it spins, up, down, and to the quarters,
In boundlessly widening is the eternal top absorbed.
9. "The *Dharma*-Wheel" (1969, p. 62):
With the hub of Void for its axle, flexible, unhindered,
Eternally turns the *dharma*-wheel throughout the world.
10. "A Top that Rejoices in Solitude" (1969, p. 178):
Like a huge rock alone sits the top,
Alone stands, alone walks,
Not relying on the buddha, not on the god,
Alone getting free from birth and death, from pain and pleasure;
In solitude it rejoices;
On its happy longevity
Congratulations !

VII. Celebrating the Birth of Buddha Shâkyamuni (1: six verses),
Awakening Attained (2: a verse), and Parinirvâna (death 3: a verse)

- 1-1. "A Verse for the Buddha's Birthday, on the Tenth Anniversary of the Gakudô
Dôjô (later F.A.S. Society)" (1954 Vol. 7, p. 201):
In our training centre for buddhas already for ten years,
Buddhas have we anointed year after year;

Stop wondering how many buddhas were born.

Prior to birth, who should not be a buddha !

1-2. "For the Day of the Buddha's Birth" (April 8, 1959, p. 17):

In conflict with the three poisons day by day,
All the heaven and earth flare up, when
From the bottom of hell the Bhagavat leaps up,
And in one voice cry "F.A.S."

1-3. "For the Buddha's Birthday in the Year 1960 when the F.A.S. Society was Started" (Vol. 7, p. 395):

Ever since pregnant with an Awakening child,
How many years of prenatal care taken !
A monstrous baby kicked off the womb,
Leaping out, loudly cried, "F.A.S."

1-4. "For the Buddha's Birthday" (1968, p. 130):

Resolutely kicking off the space-time womb,
Suddenly leaps free, the Formless Self,
The Solitarily Honoured, Master of all,
With indomitable great compassion, A. and S.

1-5. "On the Buddha's Birthday" (two verses, 1969, p. 130):

1) Under the Ashoka tree on birth,
Calling himself the Solitarily Honoured,
Gautama was our original Self.
2) As for the Solitarily Honoured,
How could Gautama alone be like that ?
Millions of people's naked, original face is that.

2. "On December the Eighth" (1965, p. 296):

Getting awakened to the formless self, dying with no-death,
Born without birth, one sports throughout the threefold world.

3. "On the Day of the Buddha's Death" (February 15, 1969, p. 130):

Entering then coming out of the golden coffin under the salas,
Gautama eighty years old did betray his age.

VIII. "On the Death of Shingatsu, Mrs. MURATA Kinue" (a verse)
and "In Praise of the Supporter-Bodhisattva Murata Shingatsu's
Devotional Affection and Protection" (two verses, 1974 Vol. 7, p. 66)*

* (Mrs. MURATA Kinue came to Kyoto in June 1950 to take care of the author, who had to lie in bed for the cure of cholelithiasis until November of that year. On January 26, 1974, Mrs. MURATA died of cancer at the age of sixty-six; she had been taking care of the author, who was eighty-five years old, weak in bed. She used to explain to visitors,

including the present translator, that she was a cousin of the author, and that she had come after having done with her own family. -- Nobody knows how; I hear she had no children.-- In May after her death the author shifted his residence to Gifu to live with his younger sister and the family of his nephew, where he died in February 27, 1980. "Shingatsu (Heart-Moon)" was Mrs. MURATA's Buddhist name posthumously given by the author.)

1. While suffering herself from a serious disease,
Holding calm features, she passed away suddenly.
2. Shouldering the burdens of attendant, cook, host, and treasurer,
In a woman's being the bodhisattva has protected me.
3. Graciously for me, an ordinary being, she has provided care,
No matter how humiliating, Shingatsu the bodhisattva.

IX. "My Last Words in Verse" (five verses Vol. 7, p. 313):

1. Getting awakened to the formless self, dying with no-death,
Born without birth, one sports throughout the threefold world.
(The above verse VII. 2. "On December the Eighth")
2. Who should speak of me as dying,
Of me, who is originally unborn ?
3. On my death, no use for guiding words, services, or funeral.
Cremate the remains; don't pick up any bones.
4. My monument be in the azure built,
Where I'd deeply carve "F.A.S."
5. Why need to come, if you die a great death ?
Now where you are, as you are, you meet me on my deathbed.

(Translated by TOKIWA Gishin, August 2, and corrections were made in accordance with precious suggestions from Ms. TSUKUI Akemi, Aug. 25, 2010; again corrected, January 30, 2011. On August 1, 2011, two copies with important suggestions for corrections arrived from Prof. Christopher Ives, U.S.A.: "Selected Verses" and "*Chan* and *Chan* Culture." Tokiwa owes much to these two persons' dedications, but is responsible for the whole translation work.)

C. A Brief Chronological Record

HISAMATSU Shin'ichi His Brief Chronological Record*

* The source of the present chronological record is a revised edition by KURASAWA Yukihiro of the record compiled by the same person and attached to the **BOKUKAI: HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI NO SHO**.

A translation from the *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu*, an enlarged edition, vol. 9, published by Hozokan, Kyoto 1996, pp. 597–603, slightly corrected by conferring with the *Nenpu* (Chronological Record) by KITAHARA Haruyo, included in the *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Bukkyou Kougi* vol. 4, Hozokan 1991.

Translated and edited by TOKIWA Gishin in collaboration with TSUKUI Akemi.

- 1889 Born on 5 June in a farmer's family, devotee of Joudo Shin sect, in Nagara Village in the suburbs of Gifu City (later incorporated into the city).
- 1907 at age 18: Through modern thought and science, faith collapsed, and set his heart on studying philosophy.
- 1908 19: Graduated from Gifu Prefectural Gifu Middle School. Heard the name of a philosopher NISHIDA Kitarou from Principal HAYASHI Hachizou. Was admitted into the Third Higher School; Searched and read Western philosophy books. Because of sickly constitution, began trying the hygiene recommended in the book *Yasen Kanwa* ("Idle Talks on the Nightly Navigation") by Hakuin (1685–1768).
- 1911 22: Was absorbed in reading NISHIDA Kitarou's ***Zen no Kenkyuu*** ("A Study of Good") in the first publication. Had difficulty in the understanding of "pure experience," a central term in the book.
- 1912 23: Was admitted into the department of philosophy, College of Literature, Kyoto Imperial University.
- 1913 24: Attended the lectures by Professor Nishida on "An Introduction to the Science of Religion." Was deeply impressed by his personality and learning.
- 1915 26: Despairing of the academic philosophy of objective knowledge, graduated from Kyoto Imperial University while cornered fundamentally subjectively, totally, in life. Through Prof. Nishida's advice, participated in the big year-end eight-day zazen meeting under the guidance of Master IKEGAMI Shouzan at the Myoushinji Zen Monastery. Got awakened to the formless self, original to humans, resolved the deadlock, and entered into a new life.
- 1918 29: Shifted residence to the inside of the Shunkouin temple, in the compound of Myoushinji Head Temple.
- 1919 30: Employed by Rinzaishuu Daigaku (later developed into Hanazono University), ap-

- pointed to professorship, and took charge of the philosophy of religion until 1937. During that period, guided the students' association for learning the Way of Awakening named "Ichirankai" (One Billow Society).
- 1920 31: Held the post of Lecturer at Ryuukoku Daigaku, and gave lectures on the philosophy of religion.
- 1927 38: Received the title "Houseki-an" (A Hermitage of the Rock-Embracing) for his residence from NISHIDA Kitarou.
- 1929 40: Appointed to the post of professorship at Ryuukoku Daigaku, and continued to take charge of the philosophy of religion.
- 1932 43: Received part-time engagement as a lecturer at Kyoto Imperial University until 1933.
- 1935 46: Appointed to the post of lecturership at Kyoto Imperial University, took charge of the studies of Buddhism, and gave lectures on "*Sokumuteki Jitsuzon*" (The Existence That Is At Once Non-Existence).
- 1936 47: Gave lectures on "The Philosophical Problem in the *Kishin-ron* (*Dasheng Qixin lun*; "A [Buddhist] Treatise on the Awakening of Mahayana Faith," a Chinese version by Paramartha).
- 1937 48: Resigned from the professorship at both Rinzaishuu Daigaku and Ryuukoku Daigaku. Appointed to the associate professorship at Kyoto Imperial University, took partial charge of the studies of religion and of Buddhism. Gave lectures on "The Philosophical Problem in the *Kishin-ron*" (continued) and on "An Introduction to the Studies of Religion."
- 1938 49: Gave lectures on "The Zen-Moment in the Culture of Japan." Organized a Kyoto University students' association for zazen, "Shinnin-kai" (Society of True Man).
- 1939 50: The first edition of a collection of articles entitled ***Touyouteki-Mu*** (Oriental Nothingness) was published by the Kobundo-shobo, Tokyo.
- 1941 52: Founded the Kyoto Daigaku Shinchakai (a student association, "Kyoto University Mind Tea Society").
- 1944 55: Founded the Kyoto Daigaku Gakudou-Dojou (a student association, "Kyoto University Seat for Learning the Way of Awakening").
- 1945 56: NISHIDA Kitarou died. The Second World War ended with the defeat of Japan.
- 1946 57: Appointed to the professorship at Kyoto Imperial University, occupied the chair of the studies of Buddhism. Gave lectures in an intensive course on the history of Buddhist philosophy for the chair of oriental philosophy, at Hiroshima University of Humanities and Sciences, in Hiroshima City that had suffered from an atomic bomb air raid.
- 1947 58: Was granted the degree of the Doctor of Literature. Had the first edition of the book ***Kishin no Kadai*** ("Problems posed in the *Qixin lun*") was published by Kobundo-shobo, Tokyo.

- 1948 59: Had the two books published: **Zettai-Shutai-Dou** ("The Way of Absolute Subjectivity") and the Atene library edition **Cha no Seishin** ("The Spirit of Tea"), by Kobundo-shobo. Reorganized the Kyoto Daigaku Gakudou Doujou into the Gakudou Doujou.
- 1949 60: Retired under the age limit from Kyoto University. Took office as a professor at Hanazono University. Received a part-time engagement as a lecturer at Ohtani University.
- 1950 61: Started a newsletter of the Gakudou Doujou, "*Gakudou*" (later renamed "*Fuushin*" (Seasonal Wind), "*FAS*", "*Postmodernist*", and again "*Fuushin*"). Suffered from cholelithiasis. MURATA Kinue came for nursing, and continued to attend on him.
- 1951 62: Had two books published: **Hontou-no Jiko ni Mezameru** ("To Get Awakened to the True Self") in the Hanazono Library edition by Hanazono University Press, and **Ningen-no Shinjitsuzon** ("The True Existence of Human Beings") in the Hozo new library edition by Hozokan. Began expressing a series of lectures on "The Vow of Mankind" through the activities of Gakudou Doujou.
- 1952 63: Resigned from Hanazono University professorship, and accepted part-time engagement as a lecturer. Appointed to professorship at Kyoto Municipal Fine Arts University, took charge of philosophy and the studies of religion. Accepted part-time engagement as a lecturer with Bukkyou University, and with Kyuushuu University (until 1954).
- 1953 64: Served concurrently as Director of the Library attached to Kyoto Municipal Fine Arts University.
- 1956 67: Served as the editorial supervisor of the **Sadou-koten Zenshuu** ("A Complete Set of Classics on the Way of Tea"), and compiler of its fourth volume, **Nanbouroku** ("A Record by Nanbou"). Reorganized the Kyoto University Shinchakai into the Shinchakai. Started the *Shincha*, organ of the Shinchakai.
- 1957 68: Invited as a visiting professor to the department of theology, Harvard University, USA, and gave lectures on "*Chan* and *Chan* Culture."
- 1958 69: On his way home from the USA, visited countries in Europe, Egypt, Jordan, Iran, India, etc., during which period gave lectures at the Universities of Freiburg and Hamburg, Muenchen Volkskunst Museum, Musée Guimet, etc. Engaged in a dialogue with various university professors: in the USA, Tillich, Sorokin, Niebuhr, Buber, Northrop, Turner; in Europe, Heidegger, Bultmann, Heiler, Jung, Marcel, and so on, and attempted an encounter between Oriental and Occidental cultures. Had the book **Zen to Bijutsu** ("Zen and the Fine Arts") published by the Bokubi-sha.
- 1960 71: On the basis of the FAS idea for the times that should come after the modern ages, re-named the Gakudou Doujou the FAS Society. Had the book **Yuima Shichisoku** ("Seven Cases from the Vimalakirti Sutra") published by the FAS Society.
- 1961 72: Awarded a Purple Ribbon Medal.

- 1962 73: Shifted residence from the Shunkouin, Myoushinji, to Sagaru (Down Southward), Nakadachiuri, Muromachi, in Kyoto.
- 1963 74: Retired from Kyoto Municipal Fine Arts University. Appointed to the professorship at Hanazono University. Served as an editorial advisor for the compilation of the **Zusetsu Sadou Taikei** ("An Iconographical Outline of the Way of Tea"), Kadokawa-shoten. Had a dialogue with Heidegger, **Kikinagara Egaki-nagara** ("Alcopley: Listening to Heidegger and Hisamatsu"; "Alcopley: Heidegger und Hisamatsu und ein Zuhoerender") (with pictures by L. Alcopley) published by Bokubi Press.
- 1965 76: Awarded the Third Order of Merit with the Sacred Treasure. Suffered from prostatitis.
- 1966 77: Suzuki Daisetsu (Daisetz Teitarou Suzuki) died.
- 1968 79: Served as an editorial committee member of *Suzuki Daisetsu Zenshuu* ("A Whole Collection of Writings by Suzuki Daisetsu"), Iwanami-shoten. The September number of *Risou* made up a special edition, "*Hisamatsu Shin'ichi no Zen no Tetsugaku*" (Hisamatsu Shin'ichi's Philosophy of Zen).
- 1969 80: With Nishitani Keiji as a co-editor, had a collection of articles, "**Zen no Hon-shitsu to Ningen no Shinri**" (The Essence of *Chan* and the Truth of Human Beings), as the fruit of comprehensive studies of the FAS Society, published by Soubunsha, Tokyo. Had the first volume of *Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu*, **Touyouteki Mu** (Oriental Nothingness), published by Riso-sha.
- 1970 81: Had the fifth volume of his *chosakushuu*, **Zen to Geijutsu** (*Chan* and Arts), published.
- 1971 82: Had the third volume of his *chosakushuu*, **Kaku to Souzou** (Awakening and Creation), published. Had the English translation, **Zen and the Fine Arts**, published by the Kodansha International.
- 1972 83: Had the second volume of his *chosakushuu*, **Zettai-shutai-dou** (The Way of Absolute Subjectivity), published.
- 1973 84: Had the fourth volume, **Sadou no Tetsugaku** (Philosophy of the Way of Tea), and the sixth volume, **Kyouroku-shou** ("Excerpts from Buddhist Scriptures and *Chan* Records"), published.
- 1974 85: Murata Kinue died. Shifted residence to the native place, Nagara, Gifu City. Frequented by callers from east and west, which changed an outlying region into a path for literati. In the **BOKUBI** ("The Beauty of Sumi-Ink") no. 242 appeared a special edition "*Hisamatsu Shin'ichi*." Had the eighth volume of *chosakushuu*, **Hasouai** ("Broken Sandals"), published.
- 1975 86: Had the German version of *The Characteristics of Oriental Nothingness*, **Die Fuelle des Nichts**, published by Neske-Verlag.
- 1977 88: In the exhibition marking the opening of the National Museum of International Arts, "*Nihon no Bi*" (The Beauty of Japan), a handwriting "**MU-AN**" (Nothingness-

Hermitage) was on display.

- 1978 89.: In a picture gallery in Ginza, Tokyo, an "Exhibition of Hisamatsu Shin'ichi's Tanzaku (a strip of fancy paper on which usually a tanka or a Japanese verse is written)" was opened.
- 1979 90: Started the *Buddhist*, a magazine of co-editorship in Japanese by the FAS Society and Tohokai. Began publication of the reprinted edition of a book in his possession, *Daichuuji Zen Shitsunai Hisho* ("A Treasured Book on the Indoor Transmission at the Daichuuji Zen Temple").
- 1980 91: On 27 February, died in his house in Nagara, Gifu City.
For the verses he left for death, see the last part of "Selected Verses" above.
Actually, according to his will, there was no funeral service held, nor gathering of ashes. His last handwritings went as follows:
"No funeral service, no call of condolence, by request."
"Calm extinction is my delight."
His last single term:
"Slay the Buddha; slay the God."
A memorial special edition appeared in the *Risou*, April Number; *Zenbunka* No. 97; and *Daijou Zen*, July/September Number.
In April, the seventh volume of his *chosakushuu*, *Ninnunshuu* (a collection of verses, entitled "Let Fortune Go Its Way") was published.
A German translation of the article, "Lectures on Dongshan's Five Ranks" was published by Neske-Verlag. A dialogue, *Kaku no Shuukyoku* ("The Religion of Awakening") was published by Shunju-sha. A magazine *Koukindai Taikyuu* ("The Postmodern Practically Inquired Into") was started.
- 1981 A special edition on Hisamatsu Shin'ichi appeared in *The Eastern Buddhist* vol. 14 no. 1. A *Hozo-sensho* ("Selected Books of Hozokan") *Mushinron* ("Atheism") was published by Hozokan. *Zen and the Fine Arts* in paperback edition was published by Kodansha International.
- 1982 *BOKUKAI* (The Sea of Sumi Ink) *HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI NO SHO* (Handwritings)*, was published by Toueisha. An "Exhibition of Handwritings Left by Hisamatsu Shin'ichi" was opened in the annexe of Kyoto Kaikan in celebration of the publication of *BOKUKAI*.
- 1983 An "Exhibition of Handwritings Left by Hisamatsu Shin'ichi" was opened in the Gifu Prefectural Fine Arts Museum, and an "Exhibition of Sumi-Ink Handwritings by Houseki Hisamatsu" was held in the annexe of Ehime Prefectural Fine Arts Museum. The first meeting for presenting tea to Hisamatsu Shin'ichi sensei was held at the Shoukokuji Zen Monastery (, which continued until 1994 every summer). *Kishin no Kadai* ("Problems posed in the *Qixin lun*, Treatise on the Awakening of Mahayana Faith") was published by Risosha. A collection of articles in Japanese by

- twenty persons under the late Hisamatsu's teaching, ***Hisamatsu Shin'ichi no Shuukyou to Shisou*** (The Religion and Thought of Hisamatsu Shin'ichi) was published by Zenbunka Kenkyusho.
- 1984 In the Shibunkaku Fine Arts Museum, in Kyoto, an "Exhibition of Three Philosophers of Kyoto (meaning Nishida Kitarou, Hisamatsu Shin'ichi, and Yamauchi Tokuryuu)" was held.
- 1985 A collection of reminiscences dedicated to the memory of "True Man Hisamatsu Shin'ichi," ***Shinnin Hisamatsu Shin'ichi***, was published by Shunjusha.
An Enlarged Edition : ***Kaku no Shuukyou*** was published by the Shunjusha.
- 1987 A critical biography, ***Zensha*** (A Person of *Chan*) ***Hisamatsu Shin'ichi***, was published by the Hozokan. Other publications: One of the Touei Selected Books, ***Wabi no Sadou*** ("The Recluse Way of Tea") by Toueisha; ***Touyouteki Mu*** and ***Sadou no Tetsugaku*** ("Philosophy of the Way of Tea"), from the Academic Library of the Kodansha.
- 1990 ***Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Bukkyou Kougi*** (Lectures on Buddhism), vol. I entitled "Sokumuteki Jitsuzon", vol. II entitled "*Bukkyouteki Sekai*" ("The Buddhistic World"), vol. III entitled "*Gensou no Ronri*" ("The Logic of the Return Aspect"), were published by Hozokan.
- 1991 Vol. IV entitled "*Jiji Muge*" ("In Everything Without Hindrance") was published. An Enlarged Edition ***Shinnin Hisamatsu Shin'ichi*** was published by Shunjusha.
- 1994 The distribution began of The Enlarged Edition ***Zouho Hisamatsu Shin'ichi Chosakushuu*** by Hozokan.

AN INTRODUCTION TO HISAMATSU SHIN'ICHI'S RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Translations edited by TOKIWA Gishin in collaboration with TSUKUI Akemi.

Prepared for the website of the F.A.S. Society, Kyoto, Japan, October 1, 2012.

英文『久松真一の宗教思想 入門』

編集者 常盤義伸。編集協力者 津久井朱実。

F A S 協会ウェブサイト用作成、2012年10月1日。

F A S 協会事務局 郵便番号：601-8465 京都市南区唐橋花園町6-2 大薮方

[http: // www.fas.x0.com/](http://www.fas.x0.com/)