THE ESSENCE OF BUDDHISM

BY

DAISETZ TEITARO SUZUKI

Revised Edition

KYOTO
HOZOKAN

THE ESSENCE OF BUDDHISM

BY

DAISETZ TEITARO SUZUKI

Revised Edition

HOZOKAN
KYOTO

First edition, August 1948.
Second edition, April 1968.

PREFACE

Being commanded by His Majesty the Emperor, two lectures on the essence of Buddhism were given by the author at the Imperial Palace on April 23–4, 1947. The lectures were soon after rendered into English, and Mr. Christmas Humphreys, editor of *The Middle Way*, took it to London and published it early this year.

To tell the truth, the author was not quite satisfied with the translation, and this spring he began revising it. While engaged in the work, the thought came to him: why not amplify it so that readers of the West may understand it better; and the thought was put into effect.

The general ideas presented in the original lectures were preserved, and some new materials—notably, an expository translation of a short Kegon treatise on the Golden Lion, were added. Further, the Buddhist doctrine of distinction and non-distinction, or of discrimination and non-discrimination required a far more detailed exposition than was at first outlined. The doctrine is a very important one in Buddhism, but somewhat difficult to understand for those who are not familiar with the Mahayanist way of thinking as it prevails in the Far East. The revised lectures have grown almost twice as large as the first ones.

The author wishes to express his deep appreciation of the kindness of Mr. Lewis Bush and Professor R. H. Blyth who have carefully gone over the MS. He is especially thankful

for Professor Blyth's helpful criticisms and suggestions.

Daisetz Teitaro Suzuki

Kamakura, Japan
April, 1947

LECTURE ONE

Before I speak about Buddhism, I wish to say a few words about religion in general. For Buddhism is a religion, and like other religions, is often considered as having no direct contact with life itself, and many think that they get along quite well without it. Some go further and say that it is mere superstition, and that whether or not heaven and hell exist is no concern of theirs. Some have gone still further, and describe religion as an opiate for the masses, a means used by capitalists and bureaucrats to make the people blindly obey their will. If this is what is thought of Buddhism as a religion, there is no understanding of the role which religion plays or should play in our daily life.

In the ordinary way of life, most of us vaguely assume that there is a world of sense and intellect and there is a world of spirit, and that the world we actually live in is the former and not the latter, and, therefore, that what is most real and intimate to us is the former while the latter is merely imaginary if not altogether non-existent. The world of spirit is thus relegated, though we may somehow assume it, to the imagination of poets, visionaries, and the so-called spiritualists; but from the genuinely religious point of view, the world of sense is an intellectual or conceptual reconstruction of what is immediately revealed to the spirit itself. What is more real, therefore, is the spiritual world and not the sensuous world. That this is so we realise only after hard and desperate thinking, that is, after many a vain attempt to reach

ultimate reality, which we fail to discover in the world of sense.

The world of sense is a realm of multitudes, where everything is subject to constant vicissitudes, and with this we are never satisfied. We somehow desire to penetrate through the ever-changing world. The so-called reality and intimacy of the sense-world seem ever to drive us away from it instead of drawing us towards it, for it fails to respond to our inward yearnings which evidently rise from the so-called visionary world which is completely concealed from the senses. What is assumed to be visionary cannot after all be pronounced visionary; it is a most concrete, real, and substantial thing, and it is after this and no other that we find ourselves so fervently yearning.

The sense-world of multitudes is meant for intellectual analysis, or we may reverse the order, and say that it is the intellect that constructs the sense-world. When we think we understand the world, this means that we understand it as far as it is subject to intellection. But as intellection does not exhaust life as we inwardly live it, we always feel something in us which is not quite pacified by the intellect and looks somewhere else for a fulfilment. This is why our ordinary life is full of contradictions and conflicts. Most of us, however, ignore them, and it is only when we become somehow alarmingly conscious of the fact, that we sit down for the first time and begin to grapple with the situation in earnest.

As we thus go on searching after the truth, we finally come to the spiritual world, or rather the spiritual world breaks upon this world of sense-intellect. When this takes place, the whole order of things changes: the logical is no more logical, and rationality loses its significance, for now

the real equals the not-real and the true the not-true. More concretely stated, water does not flow in the river, flowers are no more red, and the willows are not green. This is a most startling event that could ever happen in the realm of human consciousness—this spiritual world's breaking upon the world of sense and intellect, upsetting every form of standardised experience which prevails there. But this is not all, for here takes place another most startling event along with it, which is that these negations or contradictions, in spite of their all-smashing blow, do not at all annihilate this sense-intellect world of our everyday experience; for water continues to flow and the mountains remain towering above us.

This, however, being the unique way of the Zen master when he gives expression to the world-view gained from his spiritual insight, it is not easy for most of us to grasp the meaning fully. Let us resort to our common phraseology, and we shall see that what the Zen master means is that our daily experience acquires its true significance by being related to the spiritual order of existence, and that so long as we are not in touch with this order, what we conceive to be real is not at all real, as it cannot then have any more reality than a merely dreamy existence, it is only when the spiritual world impresses itself in a most lively manner upon this world that the latter gains a new value, making our life worth something.

A warning is needed here, as these frequent references to the spiritual world are apt to lead us to think that there are really two separate independent worlds, the spiritual and the sensual-intellectual. But we must remember that these are two phases, intellectually distinguished, of one whole world, and that it is only by not realising this fact that we wrongly

believe in two independent worlds negating each other. We can go a step further and state that this relative world in which we know we live is no other than the spirit-world itself. There is, indeed, one complete undivided whole world and nothing else. It is the result of intellection that we have to speak of the spirit-world as if it were a more real world than the world of sense, or, conversely, to speak of the sense-world as being actual than the spirit-world. But the separation is a fiction, because what is not to be divided is divided as if divisible, and when divided the one is believed to be as real as the other.

In the one complete world, strictly speaking, no reference is possible even to the spirit or to the sense-intellect. Being absolutely one, there is here no room for terms of distinction or discrimination; indeed, no speaking, no thinking is possible here; an absolute silence is probably the only way to describe the somewhat of it. Even silence, if it is understood in contrast to sound or speech, will certainly miss the point. But as long as we are all humanly and socially constituted, we cannot remain eternally dumb, we necessarily break out into speech, and utter, "Let there be light". Light comes forth, and lo! there is also the forthcoming of darkness, and they, light and darkness, set up a world of dichotomies, and we take this world for reality. But it is an illusion created by the intellect, however inevitable the process may have been, for there is no way for us to escape this intellectualisation. Nevertheless, as I say, it is an illusion because it does not truthfully represent the One as it is in itself.

The idea may be expressed in the following way too. What we truly and really have is the one spiritual world, that is,

the One, undiscriminated, indeterminate, undistinguished, undifferentiated. But our human consciousness is so destined that it cannot remain in this state of oneness, of sameness; and we somehow begin to reflect upon it in order to become conscious of it, to give it a clear definition, to make it the subject of contemplation, and also to break it up into pieces so that the energy eternally sealed up in silence and inactivity will become vociferous and manifest itself in the dynamics of human activities. The One, as far as we can comprehend it, has now ceased to be indeterminate, undistinguished, undifferentiated. As a result, we have now a world of infinite varieties and complexities. But we must not imagine that the breaking up of the One into the Many is a development in time-process. If we do, we inevitably come to the conclusion that there was once a time when nothing but the one complete world existed by itself, and unconscious of itself, and that this went in time through the process of unfolding itself into the many-ness of things, and so on. When this way of thinking is cherished, the world of spirit is left behind in the maelstrom of phenomenal forces, and we are given up to the interplay of opposite ideas, of opposite values, of opposite traditions. We then lose our spiritual equilibrium for ever, we are hopelessly and inextricably mixed up in a world of contrarieties.

To counteract this tragedy, we have to remember that the world of spirit is right here, we are right in it, we have never departed from it. Even when we seem to be the abject slaves of the Many and the playthings of dualistic ratiocination, the world of spirit is encircling us, is circulating through us, has its axis of movement in our workaday life. The spirit left behind countless ages ago is no spirit and we

shall have nothing to do with it, for it cannot possibly be of any use to us now. The intellectual illusion may lead us away from the one complete world of spirit by conceiving it as beside this world of particulars, but we cannot be too careful about the polarisation, lest the intellectual illusion forever veil us from having a glimpse of the spiritual landscape.

When we think about it, the human power of thinking is the queerest thing ever devised by nobody knows whom — perhaps by a most evil-intentioned and at the same time most lovingly-disposed mind. It works in two opposite directions, sometimes beneficially, but more frequently disastrously. The intellectual illusion has started up this world of dualities, and because of it we are made cognisant of the final abode where we come and where we return, but also because of it we go astray in the meantime, wandering from one post to another. Reason is used to refute itself, to destroy the prison erected by itself. A wedge is needed to split a solid block of wood, and to get the first one another wedge is applied, and the process will have to be infinitely repeated.

Human life is simply a bundle of paradoxes and contradictions; intellection as such cannot get anything out of it; all it does is to become despairingly muddled up with self-proposed problems. Buddhist scholars, therefore, take up paradoxes as paradoxes and describe or explain life as the distinction of non-distinction or as the discrimination of non-discrimination. According to the intellectual scheme, the spirit-world will correspond to a world of non-distinction and non-discrimination, and the sense-world to a world of distinction and discrimination. But, strictly logically speaking, non-distinction or non-discrimination, when taken by itself, makes no sense, because things are what they are by being distinguished and

discriminated : non-distinction or non-discrimination must mean non-existence. The spirit-world is then non-existent when it is made to stand by itself ; it can exist only when it is considered in relation to a world of distinction. But the Buddhist conception of a world of non-distinction is not a relative one but an absolute one ; it is the one absolute world which exists by itself and does require anything relative for its support. But, we may ask, is such an existence at all conceivable by the human mind ? No, not intellectually. Hence the paradoxical expression : the distinction of non-distinction and the discrimination of non-discrimination, or, reversing it, the non-distinction of distinction and the non-discrimination of discrimination.

Expressing it in another way, we can state that life as we live it is the self-identification of contradictions and not the unification or synthesising of opposites. Red is red and not-red, hand is hand and not-hand. When we say a thing is, it is an affirmation ; when we say it is not, it is a negation. This is true in the world of distinction, it is in the very nature of distinction that it is so ; negation and affirmation cannot go together all at once. But it is not so in the Buddhist logic of self-identity ; for here negation is not necessarily a negation, nor is affirmation an affirmation ; on the contrary, affirmation is a negation and negation is an affirmation. This does not mean that negation implies an affirmation which the logician may develop later. With the Buddhists, there is no such implication, nor is there any equivocation either. This statement is a most straightforward one. We may call it a logic of self-identity which is neither unification nor synthesising. To demonstrate the truth of this logic, if a man is a Zen master, he will hold out his hand and ask, " Why is this called a hand ? " When there is no answer speedily coming,

he may probably pick up one of the sweets before him and say, "Try this, my friend, it is delicious." Here is a distinction of non-distinction.

At the outset of this lecture, an allusion was made to ordinary people's assumption of a spiritual world as existing along with the world of sense. We now know that this assumption is at once wrong and not wrong. Intellectually, the separation of the two worlds is quite tenable; but when the two are kept separated and there is no interpenetration or interfusion between them, the dualism proves fatal because it contradicts life as it is actually lived by us. Our experience is contrary to this dualistic interpretation. For the spiritual world is no other than the sense-world and the sense-world is no other than the spirit-world. There is one completely whole world. Therefore, when I say that the spirit belongs to the world of non-distinction and sense to that of distinction, we have to be reminded of the logic of self-identity, in which the two worlds are at once one and not-one. This is a hard statement and most difficult to understand.

The Buddhist idea of non-distinction distinguished or non-discrimination discriminated no doubt transcends our intellectual comprehension, and thereby we realise that the religious life is not to be apprehended by reasoning. But this does not mean that religion is to be altogether put aside as not falling within the ken of ratiocination, for all the talk so far carried on is based on reasoning whereby man attempts to give a consistent explanation of his experience. Irrationality is also a form of reasoning. We cannot escape it. The danger arises when experience is denied in order to put reason foremost, while the fact of life tells us that the latter grows from the former and not *vice versa*. Reasoning must conform to life,

and when there is something in life which refuses to be dealt with by reason, it is the latter and not the former that is to make a new start. Faith lives and the intellect kills. It is for this reason that religion generally assumes an antagonistic attitude towards reasoning and sometimes goes even so far as to demand a summary disposal of it, as if it were an arch-enemy of religion. This attitude, however, on the part of religion is not judicious, for it really means religion's surrender to its "enemy". If one truly understood what is meant by non-discrimination discriminated, one would not think of going against intellection *per se*, for intellection is after all the handmaid of religion, whereby we can say the intellect is orientated towards its own original home.

What is wrong with intellection or reasoning is that by its dualism it sets up the idea of "self" as it were a reality to which is to be given a specially honoured niche in the hall of human experience. As long as intellection is confined to its proper sphere of work, all is well, but the moment it steps out and invades a field which does not belong to it, the outcome is disastrous. For this stepping out means the setting up of the self as a reality, and this is sure to collide with our ethical and religious valuation of human life; it also runs contrary to our spiritual insight into the nature of things. The self as we all know is the root of all evils. Every religious leader teaches to get rid of this notion, as it erects an insurmountable barrier between God and man if he is a Christian; or it leads him, if he is a Buddhist, towards laying up the stock of demerit and strengthening all the time the hindrance of Karma. Intellection for this reason is never welcomed in the realm of religious experience. Indeed, we are often told to be transformed into a simple-hearted ignoramus, be-

cause the truth of religion, that is, the spiritual truth is revealed only to such souls. Buddhists often speak of the "Great Death", which means dying to the ordinary life, putting an end to the analysing intellect, or laying aside the idea of the self. Slay, they would say, with one stroke, this meddling intellect, and throw it to the dogs. This is a strong statement, but the idea is plain; it is to transcend the intellect, to go beyond the world of distinctions. For the spiritual world of non-discrimination[1] will never open its door until the discriminating mind is destroyed to its foundations. Then only takes place the birth of Prajñā, the illumination, all-

---

[1] It may not be amiss to note here again that the spiritual world of non-distinction and non-discrimination has no separate existence of its own. It is right here with and in this world of infinite distinctions; indeed, it is no other than this world itself. It is spoken of as if it were an independent world transcending the latter; this is because of our bifurcating intellect. If it were not for it, there would be neither distinction nor non-distinction; it is due to the intellect that we divide into two the One in which we live, and move, and have our being.

The world of non-distinction may be considered as having two senses: the one is relative as distinguished from the world of distinction, and the other is absolute, where distinctions of all kinds are excluded, and in this sense it is the One, the Absolute. To silence our ever-annoying and logic-loving intellect, Buddhists have such expressions as distinction of non-distinction, or non-distinction of distinction, where distinction may be replaced if desired by discrimination.

Buddhists have *shabetsu* for distinction and *funbetsu* for discrimination. *Sha* or *sa* means "difference", while *fun* or *bun* is to "divide", "to cut into two". *Betsu* is "separation". *Shabetsu* has a statical, spatial, objective, physical application, whereas *funbetsu* is more intellectual, logical, subjective. Practically, the two terms mean the same thing, and here they are used indifferently and interchangeably.

transcending wisdom. Vijñāna, that is, the discriminating, self-centered mind is now enlightened and becomes Prajñā which will move in its own straight path of non-distinction and non-discrimination. Vijñāna which can be identified with our normal consciousness will lose its way if not guided by the light of Prajñā in the labyrinth of interminable complexities. Prajñā's all-illuminating light, however, does not obliterate distinctions but will make them stand out more boldly and clearly in their spiritual significance, for the self is now dead and sees itself reflected in the mirror of non-distinction. We must not think that Prajñā exists in separation from Vijñāna, or *vice versa*. Separation means distinction, and where there is distinction only, there is no Prajñā, and without Prajñā Vijñāna becomes muddled and goes astray. Prajñā is the principle of non-discrimination lying underneath every form of distinction and discrimination. To understand this, that is, to get out of the *cul-de-sac* of intellection, the "Great Death" must once be experienced, Buddhists say.

Prajñā is, therefore, a knowledge that knows and yet knows not, an understanding that does not understand, a thought that is not thought. It is thoughtlessness full of thoughts. It is no-mind-ness, not in the sense of unconsciousness, but in the sense that

"The cherry trees bloom each year in the Yoshino
mountains,
But split the tree and tell me where the flowers are!"

Or

"Expecting to see her come,
How often have I wandered on the beach,
Where I hear no sound
But the breeze passing through the pine needles."

No-mind-ness, or mindlessness, or thoughtlessness — these are uncouth terms, but there are no adequate English words to express the Buddhist notion of *mushin* (無心, literally, "no-mind") or *munen* (無念, literally, "no-thought"). The idea is to express the unconscious working of the mind, but this unconsciousness is not to be interpreted psychologically, but on the spiritual plane where all "traces" of discursive or analytical understanding vanish. It is where our power of ratiocination reaches its limits; it is on the other side of consciousness in its broadest possible sense, including both the conscious and the unconscious. When no-mind-ness is thus defined, we see that real Buddhists are not treading the same path on which we dualistically-minded people usually walk.

Prajñā is thus *acintya*, "beyond thinking", or "no-thinking". All thinking involves the distinction of this and that, for to think means to divide, to analyse. *Acintya*, non-thinking, means not to divide, that is, to pass beyond all intellection, and the whole of the Buddhist teaching revolves about this central idea of no-thought, or no-thinking-ness, or no-mind-ness, or *acintya-prajñā*, showing that no spiritual truth could be grasped by ratiocination.

To repeat, the spiritual world of non-distinction and non-discrimination is not a separate existence of its own apart from the world of intellection, for if it were separate it would not be a world of non-distinction, and have no vital connections with our daily life. What Buddhists strongly insist upon in their philosophy is the merging of the two contradictory terms: distinction and non-distinction, thinking and not-thinking, rationality and irrationality, etc. They then tell us not to make any logical thinking about merging of opposites, for as far as formal logic goes, such merging is the height of ab-

surdity. Instead, they tell us to experience the merging itself where no-thought is actually found infused with all forms of thought, that is, actually to perceive the impossibility of consciousness itself when severed from its background of absolute unconsciousness—and this not psychologically but spiritually.

To experience this truth of merging spiritually, means to realise the irrational rationality of non-discrimination, to perceive that two contradictory terms are self-identical, that is, A is Not-A and Not-A is A. It is to become Prajñā itself where there is no distinction between the subject and the object of intuition, and yet there is a clear perception of the distinction—that is the distinction of non-distinction and the discrimination of non-discrimination. It goes without saying that this makes no sense on the rational plane; yet it is imperative to have a penetrating insight into this fundamental truth of absolute self-identity of opposites. This insight, or realisation, or perception, or intuition, whatever term we may use, means the awakening of Prajñā, the attaining of Bodhi or enlightenment, becoming the Buddha, entering into Nirvana, being born in the Pure Land, the Western Paradise; in the Hindu philosophy it is being born for a second time; in the New Testament it is the giving up of life in order to gain it.

To state the matter in a practical manner, religion requires us all to put everything away that we have for some reason or other put upon ourselves and does not really belong to us. For one thing, we put on so many clothes ostensibly to keep ourselves warm but mostly to make us look more than we really are. We build houses on a far greater scale than we actually require, just because we desire to display our wealth or social position or political power. But these things are

appendices that do not make our real stature even one tenth of an inch higher. When we examine deeply our own being, we realise that these appendages have after all nothing to do with it. When we face death, we have no time to think about them, even what we consider to be our own body we feel like casting aside as not belonging to us.

The spiritual "man" is not dependent upon any form of externality. When taking a bath, one recognises the true man as was once remarked by the Empress Wu of the T'ang dynasty when she treated the Buddhist monks to a bath. When there is nothing to screen oneself from outside views, one comes to oneself. This is where we stand altogether free from distinction and discriminations. While the latter are not to be despised or ignored or negated, we have once to see ourselves absolutely stripped before the spiritual mirror, if we aspire for perfect enlightenment. To stand thoroughly naked with no worldly titles, with no special rank, with no material accretions, to be all by oneself, to be absolutely alone—this is where Buddha speaks to Buddha, this is where one can say, "Tat tvam asi" (Thou art it).[1]

---

[1] It is interesting to note that Pascal in his *Pensées* makes a distinction between the heart and the reason (269 *et seq.*), and he says that what experiences God is not the reason but the heart, that God is felt by the heart—which is faith—and not by the reason. What the reason can achieve as the last thing is "to recognise that there is an infinity of things which are beyond it". The reason's office consists in disavowing itself and submitting to feeling, that is, to the heart, "which has its reasons which reason does not know". According to Buddhist phraseology, Prajñā, "the heart", has its own way of reasoning which is altogether beyond the demonstration or discrimination of the Vijñāna, "the reason". The reason is always discriminative, and this prevents it from directly taking hold of reality

The Emperor Hanazono (reigned 1308–1317), a most devout Buddhist, once invited Daitō, the National Teacher (大燈国師, 1282–1337), who founded the Daitokuji monastery in Kyoto in 1324, to a talk on Buddhism. When Daitō, properly attired in the Buddhist robe, appeared before the Emperor and had seated himself, the Emperor remarked,

"Is it not a matter of unthinkability that the Buddha-dharma (仏法 *buppō*) should face the Royal Dharma (王法 *ōbō*) on the same level?"

Daitō replied, "Is it not a matter of unthinkability that the Royal Dharma should face the Buddha-dharma on the same level?"

The Emperor was pleased with the reply.

This famous *mondō*[1] is most suggestive. The Buddhist which has its abode in the world of non-discrimination and non-distinction. Pascal says, "Faith is a gift of God; do not believe that we said it was a gift of reasoning". Faith is the taking hold of reality by non-discrimination. Buddhists would say, Pascal's "faith" or "spiritual insight" corresponds to their perfect enlightenment. What, however, most decidedly distinguishes the Buddhist way of thinking from the Christian is that Buddhists regard "the reason" as not different from "the heart", but as growing from the heart and identical with the heart, and further that this self-identity of reason and heart does not prevent each from functioning in its own way —the reason as the instrument of demonstration and discrimination and the heart as the organ of intuition. The Christians would say that "God made Himself to man". This being so, God is now in man and man is in God, God is man and man is God, yet God is God and man is man—this is the greatest religious mystery, the profoundest philosophical paradox, the discrimination of non-discrimination and the non-discrimination of discrimination, which constitutes the Buddhist logic of self-identity.

[1] 問答. *Mon* means "questioning" and *dō* or *tō* "answering". Any Zen dialogue is known as a *mondō*.

authority (Buddha-dharma) here represented by Daitō is the world of spirit or non-distinction in its absolute sense, and the royal or civil authority (Royal Dharma) is the world of distinction. So long as we live in the dual world of distinction, we must obey its laws. A tree is not a bamboo and a bamboo is not a tree; the mountain is high and rivers flow; the willow is green and the flower is red. In the same way, where social order obtains, the master is master and the subject is subject. Daitō was a subject and had therefore to sit below the Emperor, and the Emperor's remark was made with this in mind. Inasmuch as we stay in the world of the intellect we cannot allow the intrusion of the non-thinking irrational spirit. And as the Emperor was living in a world of distinction, he could naturally not recognise the existence of a world above his own, and Daitō must stand below the Emperor. But Daitō's mission here was to make the Emperor have an insight into the spirit-world, and as long as the Emperor stayed with his own point of view, he would never be able to see how the world of non-distinction could break through into the world of distinction and there claim its place. As Zen students would say, Daitō took the Emperor's weapon away from him and used it against him. The Emperor was awakened. He realised that the Royal Dharma belonged only to the world of distinction and that it owed its authority to the all-pervading and at the same time all-annihilating presence of the Absolute Dharma.

This most thoroughgoing interfusion, as it were, of distinction and non-distinction is impossible to understand if one stays on the plane of reason and rationality. It is a world of the

unthinkable, *acintya*, only revealed to the spirit. The Emperor's remark came out of a world of distinction and his unthinkability did not go beyond it; whereas Daitō took his position in the world of absolute non-distinction and, therefore, his unthinkability was not in the same category as the Emperor's. Both used the same term, but in meaning they were poles apart. So we can see that every word has a double meaning, rational and irrational, intellectual and spiritual, differential and non-differential, relative and absolute; and it is for this reason that Buddhism is said to be very difficult to understand; but once awakened to the spiritual truth of distinction not distinguished, one will find one's sailing quite easy even over the turbulent waters of thought. Daitō's retort must have to a certain extent enlightened the Emperor, for he continued to allow Daitō's sitting on the same level with him.

On another occasion, when the Emperor had an interview with Daitō the Master, he asked,

"Who is he who remains companionless within the ten thousand things?"

This is a reference to the Absolute which defies analysis and has none facing it. If the Emperor had really understood the last *mondō* he had with the Master, he would not have asked this. Evidently he still had something in his mind which did not give him a complete satisfaction, he needed further enlightenment. The Master, however, did not give him a direct answer so to speak, but standing on the same level with his august questioner, that is, still in the world of distinction, he just moved a fan in his hand and said,

"I long enjoy being bathed in the Imperial breeze."

Here is a poetical allusion to the soft relaxing spring breeze

which we all enjoy in the same way as peace-loving people do the wise government of a spiritually-minded ruler. By the use of his fan, Daitō symbolised the spring breeze of the Absolute and a state of spiritual tranquillity and relaxation issuing therefrom, and ascribed it to the Imperial grace. But where is the Absolute which stands without companion? The Emperor is an absolute, Daitō is another, and the present lecturer even a third; so many absolutes and yet all in one in the Absolute. Distinction is non-distinction and non-distinction is distinction.

The fundamental idea of Buddhism is to pass beyond the world of opposites, a world built up by intellectual distinctions and emotional defilements, and to realise a spiritual world of non-distinction, which involves achieving an absolute point of view. Yet the Absolute is in no way distinct from the world of discrimination, for to think so would be to place it opposite the discriminating mind and so create a new duality. When we speak of an absolute, we are apt to think that, being the denial of opposites, it must be placed in opposition to the discriminating mind. But to think so is in fact to lower the absolute into the world of opposites, necessitating the conception of a greater or higher absolute which will contain both. The Absolute in brief is in the world of opposites and not apart from it. This is apparently a contradiction, and can never be understood so long as we stay in a world of distinction. To go beyond this world will not help, nor to stay in it either. Hence the intellectual dilemma from which we all struggle in vain to escape.

This fruitlessness was pointed out by Daitō the Master, who, remaining silent on the main issue, simply moved his fan and poetically referred to the Imperial virtue. Daitō

wasted no time in attempting to convince the Emperor by argumentation, for he knew that whatever understanding one could have of the truth must come from life itself as we all live it, including even the august personage himself, and not from merely discoursing upon the Absolute. Daitō purposely evaded touching upon the subject of the companionless one whom the Emperor wished personally to interview. He had no desire to lead the Emperor along the ordinary route of reasoning; the companionless one must remain companionless, that is, beyond distinctions and discriminations, and yet persistently with them and in them. To demonstrate this Daitō resorted to a most effectively eloquent one: the Absolute, the companionless one, not only moved with the Master's fan, but is the Master and the Emperor and everything else.

From this it is evident that to understand Buddhism, in fact, all religion, we must go beyond the domain of the intellect. The intellect's function is to discriminate this and that, to divide the one into two; therefore, when the one is demanded and not the two, something else must operate to take hold of it; yet this one is conceivable only when it is associated with the two, while this association does not mean that the one stands against or is conditioned by the two, in which case the one will no more be an absolute one but one of two. The one must be found in the two, with the two, and yet beyond the two, that is to say, non-distinction is in distinction and distinction in non-distinction. To state the point more directly and precisely, distinction is non-distinction and non-distinction is distinction. This is not the denial of the intellect or the stoppage of reasoning, but it attempts to reach the foundation of it by means of negation-affirmation. It is by this double process only that the intellect can transcend itself, for without

this transcendence the intellect can never liberate itself from the contradictions it weaves out of its own body. In terms of Christian experience, we can say that this is living in Christ by dying to Adam, or it is Christ's rising from the dead. Paul says: "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain." (1 Cor. 15:14.) One must die before one can rise—and this rising is acceptable by faith and not by reasoning. The merging of contradictions, the self-identity of distinction and non-distinction, is achieved by faith, which is personal experience, the opening of the Prajñā-chakshu,[1] ("the eye of transcendental wisdom"), the think-

---

[1] According to Eckhart, on "True Hearing", "The eye with which I see God is the same with which God sees me". The Prajñā-chakshu is this kind of eye. The Chakshu has no particular reality as its object of sight; when it is said to see something, this something is no other than itself; the Chakshu sees itself as if not at all seeing; for its seeing is no-seeing and its no-seeing is seeing. Says Eckhart, "My eye and God's eye is one eye, and one sight, and one knowledge, and one love". When we speak of seeing in a world of discrimination, the act sets up the dualism of the seer and the object seen, the one is distinctly separated from the other. If not for this dualism, no seeing can take place in this world of opposites, of sense and intellect. But this is not the way to perfect enlightenment which belongs to the world of non-discrimination where abides the Absolute One all by itself. The opening of the Prajñā-chakshu means one's coming into the presence of this Absolute, that is to say, it is where "my eye and God's eye is one eye". Here seeing is no-seeing; a distinction there is between "my eye" and "God's eye"; nonetheless there is no distinction because they are "one eye". This absolute "one eye" is a colourless one, and for this reason it discerns colour. "If my eye is to discern colour, it must itself be free from all colour". The Prajñā-chakshu is of non-discrimination, hence its discrimination of all particular entities. When discrimination is not discriminating

ing of the unthinkable.

Prince Shōtoku (Prince Regent, 593–621), the founder of Hōryūji Temple at Nara, wrote commentaries on three Mahayana Sutras: the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*, the *Vimalakīrti*, and the *Śrīmālā*. It is noteworthy that in all of them the unthinkability of Buddhist experience is significantly insisted upon. In the *Śrīmālā*, the Tathāgata-Garbha ("Matrix of Tathagatahood") is described as being buried in innumerable defilements, yet as remaining beyond their control. The Tathāgata-Garbha is the pure undefiled spiritual world of non-discrimination, while the defiling world is that of thought and differentiation. That these two are in their nature separate and cannot be merged is self-evident as far as the human way of thinking is concerned; yet the Sutras declare the defiled are found dissolved in the Garbha, while the Garbha itself remains uncontaminated. This is really beyond the bounds of thinkability. But when the self-identity of distinction and non-distinction is understood, the Garbha as the field where purity and defilement display themselves each in its own form of existence will be understood. This understanding, let it be remembered, is not on the plane of intellection, but on the spiritual plane and it is generally known as faith. The question of faith and knowledge is sometimes quite a puzzling one because most of us fail to sound the depths of our spiritual life, which belongs to the realm of Acintya, the unthinkable. It is a Buddha who recognises another Buddha. Unless our insight reaches the same level as that of the Buddha, the teaching of the *Śrīmālā* remains forever a sealed book.

---

and yet discriminating, we have perfect enlightenment. This is what may be called "coincidencia oppositorum".

Christian experience, as far as I can see, teaches the same thing: the Buddhist unthinkable corresponds to divine revelation which is something supernatural and superrational and altogether beyond the human power of thinkability. This revelation will never come to us as long as we are bound up by the chain of logical reasonableness. God will never reveal himself in minds stuffed with rationalistic ideas; it is not that he dislikes them, but that he is simply beyond them. He is ever disposed to appear before us, but it is we ourselves who shun him. In truth, divine revelation is not to be sought after by our own efforts; it comes upon us by itself, of its own accord. God is always in us and with us, but we by means of our human understanding posit him outside us, against us, as opposing us, and exercise our intellectual power to the utmost to take hold of it. The revelation, however, would take place only when this human power is really exhausted, has given up all its selfishness and ideas of distinction.

Strangely, but in one sense most naturally, we all, Buddhists as well as Christians, living as we do on the plane of the intellect, submit everything to intellectual test and domination, and reject as unworthy of consideration all that the intellect fails to understand. In our folly we treat Buddhism in the same way as Christians do their religion, but sooner or later we are all bound to pick up what we cast away and place it on the spiritual altar of our being. For whether we realise it or not, it was there all the time, that is, in the undiscriminating matrix of Tathagatahood. When it comes to itself, the entire world with all its ugliness, and defilement and undesirableness will be seen as revealing the glory of God. When the bird sings, it transmits God's voice. When the Buddha held out a golden flower, Mahākāśyapa smiled. Why? Because both were in God's

Pure Land, which is ours as well as Amida's. In this Land no words are needed, all conceptualisation vanishes, for who knows, knows.

The Emperor Goyōzei (reigned 1586–1616) wrote a poem on the subject:

"Smiling eyebrows are opened:
Is it cherry or peach blossom?
Who does not know?
Yet nobody knows."

From the viewpoint of non-distinction nobody knows, yet everybody knows. The flower is offered and somebody smiles. Apparently no communication has passed, but something must have passed between the two minds—something lying beyond the borderland of ratiocination. For Mahākāśyapa's smile was not an ordinary one such as we on the plane of distinction often exchange; it came out of the deepest recesses of his nature, where he and Buddha and all the rest of the audience move and have their being. No words are needed when this is reached. A direct insight across the abyss of human understanding is indicated. Our smiles are sense-bound and on the surface of our consciousness, they are like bubbles, they come and go, but Kāśyapa's smile is the singing of the bird, the blossoming of the cherry, the rustling of a breeze through the autumn-leaves, the murmuring of the waters along the winding mountain stream. "Do you wish to know the way to enlightenment?" A Zen master kicked the dog and it yelped. Where there is understanding no comment is needed, but where is no understanding no amount of argument is convincing. Heaven speaketh not, nor doth the earth, and the four seasons prevail.

To think this Unthinkable, to open the secret of existence,

to escape from the prison of rationality, to pass beyond the field of opposites, and to rise to the higher point of view, it is imperative to have an insight into timelessness of time which also involves spacelessness of space. After repeatedly teaching that "however much we try to measure Buddha-knowledge by means of thought we can never succeed", the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* goes on to state in the "Chapter on Eternal Life": "In the immeasurably long past I obtained my Buddhahood, and I have been living here for an incalculably long period of time. I am immortal". According to history, however, Śākyamuni attained enlightenment at Buddhagaya an the Nairañjana River more than twenty-five centuries ago, when he was twenty-nine. Ignoring this fact, he declares in the Sutra that his enlightenment took place hundreds of thousands of kalpas ago, and that he had been ever since preaching on the Mount Vulture as he was then. Indeed he is still found there preaching in the same old way surrounded by hundreds of thousands of his disciples, and we can hear him even in these faraway islands of Japan.

The two statements are obviously contradictory as any of us can see: That Śākyamuni after his enlightenment preached on the Mount Vulture some twenty-five centuries ago; and that his enlightenment took place even before he appeared among us and he is still preaching on the Mount so vigorously that we can all hear it even now. Contradictions of this sort abound through every phase of our life, not only intellectual but emotional as well. In the latter case contradictions appear as fears, worries, vexations, and so on. Our emotional life is so mixed up with the intellectual that we cannot separate the one from the other, for life is one through and through. The intellect lies dormant without the instigation

of the emotions and the latter becomes altogether muddled when not backed by the former. An intellectual clarification purged of all its dilemmas helps the mind to become calm and content, being in harmonious relation with its environment. When the clarification attains this stage, it is known as enlightenment, which is thinking the Unthinkable, discriminating the Undiscriminated, and the upheaving of the Absolute into consciousness. This is also known as a state of fearlessness (S. *abhaya*) which issues from the Great Compassionate Heart of Kwannon, Avalokiteśvara.

The problem of the self-identity of contraries has ever been the great problem for all thinking minds, for all philosophers and religious people. Buddhists have also valiantly and in a most characteristic manner grappled with it and have come to a definite solution of it in their doctrine of Acintya, of no-thought, or mindlessness, which, positively stated, is the opening of the Prajñā-chakshu, or plunging into the bottomless abyss itself, as Zen Buddhists would say. The solution, however, is in one sense no solution at all, for the Unthinkable (*acintya*) remains forever unthinkable, lying beyond the ken of logic and intellection. Especially with Zen Buddhists, they do not go any further than merely stating the contradiction as it stands. They call a spade a not-spade, heaven not-heaven, God not-God. When asked why, they would say: God is God, a spade is a spade, heaven is heaven; and they would make no attempt to explain these contradictory statements. The Buddhist teaching as expounded in the *Vimalakīrti*, one of the Mahayana Sutras commented by Prince Shōtoku, is full of such contradictions. In truth, the Buddhist solution of the great problem of life consists in not solving it at all, and they contend that not-solving is really the solving.

When the Master Daitō saw the Emperor Godaigo (reigned 1318–1338) who was another student of Zen, the Master said,

"We were parted many thousands of kalpas ago, yet we have not been separated even for a moment. We are facing each other all day long, yet we have never met."

Here we have the same idea as expressed by Śākyamuni in the *Saddharma-puṇḍarīka* mentioned before. In spite of the historical fact that he attained enlightenment near Buddhagaya at a definite moment of time, he says that he was fully enlightened even before the world was created. The historical fact of his enlightenment is a record which we time-minded make with the intellect, because the intellect likes to divide, and cuts time into years and days and hours, and constructs history, whereas time itself underlying history knows no such human artificial cuttings. We are living partly in this time-space-conscious history but essentially in history-transcending time-space. Most of us would recognise the first, but not the second phase of their life. Daitō the Master here wishes to remind the Emperor of this most fundamental experience we are all going through. Hence his paradoxical proposition. (As with Buddhists "Here" is "Now" and "Now" is "Here", the idea developed here in regard to time also applies to space.)

The fact that the Master and the Emperor were facing each other is a fact based upon the concept of time as infinitely divisible. But from the point of view which is only possible in the realm of non-discrimination where no dividing of time takes place and no rational calculation is possible, historical facts have no significance. In other words, "You and I have never been in each other's presence even for a moment through all eternity," and yet "we have never been separated". Or, expressed conversely, "I have been with you all day long, but

have never entered your presence!" The Master is viewing things from his non-discriminative point of view, which the Emperor was at first unable to understand. None of these things are understandable when given to the judgment of our everyday experience as dominated by rationalisation. Buddhists must learn to disregard those "facts" so called as happening in time-history, if they desire to attain enlightenment and to be with Śākyamuni on the Mount Vulture.

The reason we are annoyed in our daily life and unable to escape from its annoyances, is due to our intellectual inability to go beyond itself. Here then is a need for a major operation to sever the knots of the intellect. A mountain is not a mountain and a river is not a river, yet a mountain is a mountain and a river is a river. Negation is affirmation and affirmation is negation. Nor is this a mere play on words. When it is so understood, it is still on the plane of intellection, and we shall never be able to get away from the vicious circle. And as long as we are in it we shall never be out of the cycle of transmigration. Therefore, we must admit that all the fears and vexations and anxieties of life are due to our failure to dive boldly and straightforwardly into the centre of our being, and then to rise out of it on the plane of distinction where no more exist now the problems that have harassed us so agonisingly. The diving and the rising, however, we must remember, are not two separate acts; they are one, the diving is rising and the rising is diving. Buddhists are thus always exhorted to strive not to be tied by words and other products of intellection, but to view all problems from the higher plane where no words are ever spoken, where there is only the showing of the flowers and the smiling of Kāśyapa. Yet words are needed to transcend words, and intellection is needed to rise above the

intellect, except that this rising be made not in a dualistic or "escapist" sense, for no such escape is here possible.

We are now in a position to say something about Karma. Human suffering is due to our being bound in Karma, for all of us, as soon as we are born, carry a heavy burden of past Karma, which is, therefore, part of our very existence. In Japan the term is connected with bad deeds, and evil people are spoken of as bearing the Karma of the past. But the original meaning of the term is "action" (*kṛ*) and human acts are valued as good, bad, or indifferent. In this sense, human beings are the only beings which have their Karma. All others move in accordance with the laws of their being, but it is human beings alone that can design and calculate and are conscious of themselves and of their doings. We humans are the sole self-conscious animals, or, as Pascal says, "thinking reeds". From thinking, from thinking consciously, we develop the faculty of seeing and planning beforehand, which demonstrates that we are free, and not always bound by the "inevitable laws" of Nature. Karma, therefore, which is the ethical valuation of our acts is only found in human beings, and, in fact, as soon as we enter the world our Karma is attached to us.

Not only are we wrapped up in our Karma but we know the fact that we are so wrapped up. It may be better to say that we are Karma, Karma is our self, and, more than that, we are all conscious of this, and yet this very fact of our being aware of the Karma-bondage is the spiritual privilege of humanity. For this privilege, implying freedom, means our being able to transcend Karma. But we must remember that with freedom and transcendence there comes along respon-

sibility as well as struggle; the struggle as an outcome of freedom means suffering. The value of human life indeed lies in this our capability for suffering; where there is no suffering resulting from our consciousness of Karmic bondage, there will be no power in us of attaining spiritual experience and thereby reaching the field of non-distinction. Unless we definitely make up our minds to suffer we cannot enjoy the special spiritual privilege granted to us human beings. We must make full use of it, and, accepting the Karma-bondage as far as it extends, resolutely face all forms of suffering and thereby qualify ourselves for transcending them.

With the problem of Karma we again encounter a case of contradiction, this time in a far more serious way, because it involves life itself; it is the case of life and death. As long as we remain in the domain of intellection we may put it aside for a while as not concerning us very vitally where a philosophical urge is not necessarily so impelling as that with the professional people. But when the question concerns life in its most fundamental sense, we cannot dispose of it lightly. If Karma is human life itself and there is no way to be free from it except by being deprived of life, which means self-destruction, how can there be any kind of emancipation? And without emancipation there is no spiritual life. We cannot be eternally suffering, however this be the fate of humanity. Just to be conscious of Karma means no more than throwing ourselves into hellfire. God could not visit upon us this form of punishment however bad we may be. Is there not after all something in our recognition of Karma which will lift us from it? But this is obviously a case of self-contradiction. We find ourselves plunged headlong into an ever-rotating whirlpool of human destiny.

The Karma-contradiction, as long as it is a contradiction, must be solved in the same way as its intellectual counterpart. The intellectual contradiction was solved when we entered the realm of non-distinction; so the Karma-contradiction is to be solved by entering the realm of no-Karma. Where is this? It is where we became conscious of Karma as underlying all human activities. This consciousness points to the way of liberation. The human privilege of self-judgment or self-appraisement is also the key to self-deliverance. Just because we are conscious of ourselves and know to evaluate our deeds, we are permitted to have a glimpse into a realm where no such human judgment or evaluation avails, that is, where Karma is merged into no-Karma and no-Karma into Karma.

To put the matter in another form, we can say this: as long as we are human, we cannot escape from Karma, for we are Karma and the latter will follow us wherever we go, like our own shadow; but because of this we are able to escape from it, that is, to transcend it. Ordinarily, we are constantly under the oppressive consciousness of Karma-bondage, and this fact we express in the form of the spiritual urge to rise above ourselves or to approach God by perfecting or purifying ourselves, if that is possible. Rationally speaking, being merely conscious of Karma-bondage may not be more than a state of contemplation; but in our heart we feel that the consciousness is far more deeply seated and rises out of our inmost self which is somehow related to something beyond itself. Our struggle with Karma we feel is dictated by this Unthinkable, for the contemplation itself is no more than the reflection of it. If it were not for this fact, we should have no urge, no struggle, no suffering, no affliction of any kind. The consciousness of Karma is thus always found linked with this

urge; without this urge in the human heart there would be no Karma-consciousness in our minds, and therefore we know that Karma is connected with no-Karma. It is in fact no-Karma that so persistently presses itself into the domain of Karma, making the latter feel, as it were, uneasy and annoyed. This is the reason why I say that the being conscious of Karma-bondage most assuredly paves the way to transcending it; the very fact of our intense spiritual suffering is the promise that we can eventually rise above it. From the viewpoint of Buddhist experience, the suffering is the transcending; Karma is no-Karma.

The consciousness of Karma-bondage and the effort to shake it off manifest themselves as prayer. Prayer, logically speaking, is another form of contradiction, for it refuses to follow obediently the course of nature; in this it is altogether human. Animals have no prayer; angels and gods have no prayer either. Man alone prays because he is conscious of his impotence to rise above himself, and yet he urgently desires it. As far as Nature is concerned she pursues her own way, regardless of human desires, aspirations, or ambitions. She kills us when the body has run its course of continuance, she punishes us with all kinds of illness when we go out of the path prescribed by her. In this respect she is relentless. But from the human point of view we fervently pray for the recovery of the diseased even when our medical or scientific knowledge would tell us that it is absolutely impossible. It may be a human weakness, even human folly; most certainly it is; but it is human nature to feel sad, frequently terribly distressed and agonised, at the sight of our fellow-beings going through tortures and other forms of pain, for the relief of which we are utterly helpless. The only thing we can do in these circum-

stances is to pray. To pray to what? or to whom? We do not know, yet we pray, that is to say, we simply desire to see the course of nature reversed—and this is not necessarily based on egoistic impulses. This is decidedly irrational, and it is for this very reason that I say that prayer opens the way to the spiritual life and finally places us in the domain where Karma is no-Karma and no-Karma is Karma.

To repeat: Karma oppresses us all the time, yet all the time we strive to rise above it. This striving, this impulse to transcend Karma, issues directly from our spiritual nature. Prayer, therefore, which is another name for the urge, constitutes the essence of the religious life. Prayer apparently does not add much to humanity, but whatever little it does, brings out the most vital factor in the structure of human nature. For it is after all prayer that will shake off every possible piece of dirt and contamination attached to the human heart and make it thoroughly pure, thoroughly free from Karma-consciousness. The heart thus emerging out of Karma is no-Karma itself. But here is the one thing we must not forget—which is that the heart identifying itself with no-Karma never remains in that state; for the heart that is no-Karma is not the human heart. The heart, as soon as it attains the state of no-Karma, comes back to itself and begins to feel every suffering characteristically belonging to human nature. This heart is at once Karma and no-Karma in a perfect state of self-identity.

The noted Buddhist declaration that life is pain or suffering (*duḥkha*), let me remark, must not be understood as a message of pessimism, though it is usually so regarded. That life is pain is a plain statement of fact beyond a shadow of doubt, and all our spiritual experience of whatever sort, Bud-

dhist or Christian, starts from this. In fact, the so-called spiritual experience is no more than the experience of pain raised above mere sensationalism. Those who cannot feel pain can never go beyond themselves. All religious-minded people are sufferers of life-pain. The Buddha, says Vimalakīrti, is sick because all sentient beings are sick. When we are surrounded by sickness on all sides, how can one, if at all spiritually disposed, be free from being sick? The heart of the Compassionate One always beats with those of his fellow-beings, sentient and non-sentient.

The dissolution of Karma-bondage, we can see now, consist in accepting it as a fact of life-experience, but with the knowledge that the bondage really does not touch our inmost being, which is above all forms of dualism. This is expressed in the Buddhist logic of self-identity by saying that Karma is no-Karma and no-Karma is Karma. Where dualism holds good, this logic does not apply, though in truth dualism is only possible on the assumption of the truth of the logic of self-identity. Buddhism, therefore, always upholds above all things the logic of self-identity as absolutely necessary for the understanding of its teaching, which is the attainment of Buddhahood.

To divide is the work of the intellect, and where intellection prevails there is always a dualism. But as it is this dualism that weaves the net of Karma and catches us unawares, Buddhism is insistent on doing away with intellection; but what is most important here, as I have repeatedly said, is to remember that Buddhism rejects intellection and all its complications, not unconditionally, but with this reservation that it gains its proper functioning only after it is thoroughly purged of illusions and presumptions, that is, after it dies to itself.

One of the illusions the intellect sets before it is that it is free, that it can choose. By cutting up a seamless piece of cloth called life into several parts, the intellect tries to examine them, thinking that they can be pieced together and then the original reproduced. This dividing and piecing together, it claims to be its privilege, its enjoyment of freedom. But nothing is more ruinous than this to the proper status of intellection in the scheme of human life. For the intellect is not free by nature; its power to divide is really the power to kill itself. The intellect gains its freedom only when this killing of itself is accomplished. The choice of alternatives is not freedom in its real sense; to be free one must not be hampered in any possible way and in any possible sense; freedom means absolute independence. Now for the intellect, analysis, with its counterpart synthesis, is its life; but this analysing and synthesising means self-limitation, because the work requires something to work upon as well as some one who works. Intellection is putting one thing against another, which is opposition, and opposition is self-restriction, giving up independence and freedom. Whatever freedom the intellect may enjoy in choosing one thing out of many, it is a limited freedom and not an absolute one. And if it is not an absolute one, the spirit can never feel rested and happy with itself. It is the Buddhist logic of self-identity that can give to the spirit what it desires by transcending dualism and all its consequent issues.

It is thus most decidedly not the intellect or reason that makes us free from the bondage of Karma-consciousness. All that the intellect does towards spiritual liberation is that it foreshadows however faintly the image of freedom, whereby the heart is somehow encouraged, though it cannot yet clearly see the way to its own liberation. I have said here

"encouraged", but it may be better to say that the heart is all the more depressed: it sees something ahead and is yet utterly unable to locate it exactly. This feeling on the part of the Unconscious is reflected on the intellect, which will now exert all its powers in solving the problem of "thinking the Unthinkable".

A serious question presents itself now: When Karma is identified with no-Karma and the distinction between good and bad is annihilated, does this not mean moral anarchy and the disorganisation of human society? Buddhism itself will no more be, along with its logic of self-identity. When there is no Karma, good, bad or indifferent, there will be no moral agent who is to be held responsible for his deeds. The doctrine of Karma is, according to Buddhism, the doctrine of the moral law of causation, meaning a moral order in human society. The physical world collapses when causation is taken away. So with the moral world, it requires that good deeds add to the happiness of the whole community, including the individual agent himself, whereas bad deeds detract so much from it, and hurt the other people in every possible way. Buddhists naturally regard this teaching of "moral causation" [1] as the most essential for their daily guidance, spiritual as well

---

[1] By "moral causation" Buddhists mean that a deed, good, bad, or indifferent, brings its own result on the doer. Good people are happy and bad ones unhappy. But in most cases "happiness" is understood not in its moral or spiritual sense but in the sense of material prosperity, social position, or political influence. For instance, kingship is considered the reward of one's having faithfully practised the ten deeds of goodness. If one meets a tragic death, he is thought to have committed something bad in his past lives even when he might have spent a blameless life in the present one.

as moral, and when this is denied there will be no Buddhism left in spite of its logic of self-identity. Is it possible to say this in our practical life, that where there is no Buddhism we really have Buddhism? This amounts to saying that life denied is life asserted, or that committing suicide is living a full life. According to the logic of self-identity, the contradiction may really be no-contradiction; but how can we apply this statement to our everyday life and be happy in the best sense of the term? We may glibly talk about no-Karma, no-causation, no-life, to our heart's content, but should we make any pragmatic sense out of this evidently nonsensical diction? This will be the point now occupying our attention.

When Hyakujō Ekai (百丈懷海 Pai-chang Huai-hai, 720–814), one of the most noted Zen masters of the T'ang dynasty, had one day finished his preaching, an old man who used to attend his sermons regularly came to him and said, "In the days of Kāśyapa-Buddha innumerable kalpas ago, I lived here on this mountain, and one day a student asked me, 'Does an enlightened man fall into cause-effect (i.e., moral causation) or not?' I answered, 'No', and for this answer I have lived in the form of a wild fox ever since. Will you give the proper answer that I may be freed from this fox-form?" Thereupon the old man proposed the question himself,

"Does an enlightened man fall into cause-effect or not?"

The Master answered, "He does not obscure[1] cause-effect". The fox-man was enlightened and liberated. Next day the

---

[1] 不昧因果 I am not quite satisfied with "to obscure" though it is the literal meaning of the original *mai*. Here the sense is rather "to negate", "to ignore", or "to obliterate".

Master performed a funeral service for the fox-form left behind by the old man.

The meaning of the story is this: The enlightened man allows the law of causation, moral or physical, to take its course, that is, he submits himself to it, he does not sever himself from it, he does not make any distinction between it and himself, he becomes it, he is it. When Hyakujō says that the enlightened man does not obscure cause-effect, he means what I have stated here. The old man, on the contrary, had the law separated from him, he thought there was an external agent known as cause-effect or causation, and this visited him accordingly as he was good or bad. He did not realise that he himself was the moral agent as well as the law, that the law was inherent in the deed, that he was the law-maker himself. So, he thought that being enlightened meant severing himself from the law, putting it away from him, so that it will no more touch him. This was "not falling into cause-effect", he reasoned. But Hyakujō was the upholder of self-identity while the old man was a dualist.

Briefly stated, man may be compared to a geometrical point where three lines converge or intersect: physical-natural, intellectual-moral, and spiritual. The point, man, may be conscious of all these three, but not to the same degree of intensity and coordination. Dualists, including all the people in our common life, strongly and almost one-sidedly emphasise the intellectual-moral life at the expense of the spiritual. The result is that they cannot entirely give themselves up to their physical-natural life, nor can they completely ignore the claims the spiritual makes on them. They stand midway, turning sometimes this way and sometimes the other way. This wavering is a source of constant vexation and uneasiness. Yet

they cannot go over to the spiritual line because it is the dualist's destiny to stay on the line they have first chosen. In spite of this fact, however, there is a persistent urge impelling the intellect to transcend itself. The urge means the intellect's leaving its own line and going over to the spiritual. This is committing suicide on the part of the intellect, but it is required of it. The transference is to be executed in the most resolute manner, as is quite evident from the nature of the case. But this process of transference, properly speaking, is not at all a process from one stage to another, that is, the one that can be traced step after step spatially and temporally. For the very moment the intellectual-moral line is abandoned, one finds oneself on the spiritual, there is no gradation, no scaled progression, but a leap, an abrupt transference, a discrete continuity.

The intellectual-moral line cannot fall back on the physical-moral because it has diverted itself from it, and this diversion is its characteristic mark. It is the spiritual line that can revert to the physical-natural, making the latter acquire a new significance in human life. The spiritual may appear to some people to be going even so far as to identify itself with the physical-natural. What distinguishes the latter most conspicuously is its passivity, its absolute submission to the law of cause-effect. When a terrific storm sways over the woods, the trees break down, and havoc is left behind. The broken ones do not complain, nor do the destructive forces feel elated. Both are simply following supreme commands of Nature. There is something akin to it in our spiritual life. The divine will so called is accepted and obeyed without uttering words of dissatisfaction on the part of the spiritual man. "May thy will be done!" expresses the whole business—a state of

absolute dependence or of absolute passivity, in which we see both the physical-natural and the spiritual coincide. With all this, however, there is one thing which categorically divides the spiritual from the natural, that is, man from all the rest of creation, and we must take hold of this one thing if we wish to be truly worthy of the name, Man. This means that we must live actively, vitally, livingly the Buddhist logic of self-identity.

The spiritually-enlightened man is therefore passive to the will of God, which is, Buddhistically stated, the law of cause-effect. With him there is really no darkening or ignoring it, no falling into it, though not in the sense upheld by the aforementioned old fox-man. He simply goes along his way nonchalantly, so to speak, and fearlessly convinced of the truth which he has found in himself, though not of his own making. He is thus in one way quite passive, but in another way altogether active because he is master of himself. While this mastership is derived from a source beyond himself, he is given full authority to use it as he wills, that is, he uses it as if not using it; here is his active passivity. The two opposite contradicting terms are here found unified and identified in his life of self-identity.

To put the question of "not to fall or not to obscure" in a more or less familiar form, the following line of argument may be found helpful in the understanding of the Buddhist view of cause-effect.

When the appropriate conditions are matured, an event takes place, regardless of personality. The sun shines on all, good and bad. The law uniformly operates for all, enlightened and unenlightened; for it is the nature of the law that it should govern alike the moral and the physical worlds. The intellect

that formulates the law requires ratiocination and cannot admit irrationality. However good a man may be, his moral (or spiritual) qualification can never save him from the law. When it rains he must get wet like everybody else. The law of cause-effect is rationally formulated in accordance with rules of intellection, even the wise come under these rules, because they hold true on the spiritual plane as well as on the physical. The spirit cannot negate the intellect; what it can do is to transcend it, in the sense that it has its own government within the intellectual boundaries; and as long as it keeps this in good order it knows of no outside boundaries imposed upon it. Being its own master, the spirit makes use of the intellectual limitations and expresses itself through them while reserving its right interpretation. No doubt it belongs to a world of distinctions but at the same time is above it.

The spiritual world is at once of distinction and of non-distinction, and for this reason Karma is no-Karma as well as Karma itself. Karma retains its usual signification as cause-effect, but when seen in the light of non-distinction it is no-Karma. With the enlightened man, therefore, Karma does not work in the same way as with the unenlightened. The latter are not yet of the spiritual world and cannot help groaning under the heavy weight of Karma-hindrance. The enlightened one also has his Karma, but he carries it as if not at all feeling its weight, he is quite unconscious of it. It is not that enlightenment does away with Karma but that enlightenment goes its free independent way, Karma or no-Karma. In truth, there are no two worlds, the one of Karma and the other of enlightenment. There is just one world containing, as it were, Karma and enlightenment, physical-natural and spiritual-supernatural. Therefore, when a bell is struck, it rings, and we all

hear it, enlightened and unenlightened, and know that it is a bell.

The only difference, and a most essential one, between the enlightened and the unenlightened, is that the enlightened man has what I might call a spiritual consciousness along with the psychological and intellectual consciousness. People of the physical world have not yet been awakened to this spiritual consciousness. They just hear the bell and recognise the sound, they stop there, their insight does not go into the spiritual, they have therefore no enlightenment. It is different with the spiritually-awakened one. But we must not imagine that he is all the time conscious of his spirituality or that his "spiritual consciousness" so called is always claiming its right to be heard on the superficial plane of consciousness. It can never be focussed to a point as if it were a psychological image and distinguished from the rest of things moving there in our ordinary relative consciousness. Spiritual self-consciousness is *sui generis* kind of consciousness. It is a form of intuition unanalysable into subject and object, into one who intuits and that which is intuited. It is an intuition in which there is no opposition of the seer and the seen, it is a case of absolute self-identification. It is an intuition which is not intuition, for it is an intuition of non-distinction distinguished and of non-discrimination discriminated.

We can see now where the old man was wrong who had to assume the fox-form for five hundred lives. He committed the grave mistake of making the spiritual world stand away from the moral-intellectual world of distinction. Hyakujō (Pai-chang), knowing where the old man's fault lay, made it clear that there is no obscuring of Karma for the unenlightened as well as the enlightened. The enlightened man "falls" into cause-effect just as much as the unenlightened, but his

falling is merely the paying of an old debt.

This not obscuring of cause-effect is another illustration of the logic of Prajñā as is reiterated in the Prajñā class literature of the Mahayana Buddhist Sutras.[1] The Prajñā logic is the logic of self-identity; Prajñā is Prajñā because Prajñā is no-Prajñā. Extending this further we can say: White is black because white is white; or white is not white because white is white; or to be myself is not to be myself, whereby I am myself. The Buddhists claim this logic to be lying at the basis of all human experience and by thus illogically or irrationally constructing it we come to spiritual self-consciousness. The law of cause-effect is binding for all of us, we can never evade, obscure, or ignore it. We all fall into it, and it is only by virtue of spiritual self-consciousness that we become no more troubled with Karma, good or bad, letting cause-effect follow its own course. The Prajñā philosopher will declare that the being immersed in cause-effect is transcending it, that the falling into it is the not-obscuring of it.

I am, for example, born; I may become ill; I shall grow old and die. I cannot ignore the wheel of cause-effect, but the fact that I am conscious of its revolution and yet at the same time conscious that there is something that is never touched by the law of cause-effect, enables me to "escape from it". Thus we never fall into causality, because we are already it. To fall into it, or to be delivered from it, presupposes that there has been a state where there was no falling and no deliverance. When we are the wheel itself and

---

[1]The Mahayana teaching, indeed, of whatever class, is all based on the Prajñā logic of self-identity, where contradictions have no place as they are all absorbed in oneness of self-identity.

move along with it, there is neither falling, nor being delivered, for the wheel and we are one. Let us, however, not forget in this connection as before, that here must be a spiritual intuition or apperception as to the identity of the wheel and one who keeps it going all the time. With this intuition one gains immortality as Christians would say. Those who dance around on the moral-intellectual plane and can never identify themselves with it, will never find the way to an everlasting life.

There is another Zen story illustrative of the logic of self-identity. Some one asked a Zen master, "Summer comes, winter comes. How shall we escape from it?"

"Why not go to the place where there is neither winter nor summer?" answered the master.

"Where can such a place be found?" asked the enquirer.

"When winter comes you shiver; when summer comes you perspire." This was the master's solution.

As Pascal says, man is a frail thing, the universe need not arm itself to destroy him. One drop of poison will kill the most virtuous man as well as the wickedest one, but neither the universe nor the poison is conscious of its destructive power. Man alone is aware of the distinction between consciousness and unconsciousness, and he alone is self-conscious. "All our dignity consists in thought", that is, in consciousness. Our consciousness has then a great significance, and enlightenment is no more than a recognition of this fact, which constitutes our spiritual self-consciousness. Enlightenment is spiritual and not intellectual, it is not of thought, but of spirit. Becoming spiritually conscious of the facts of our everyday experience is not the same as psychologically or intellectually becoming conscious of them. The difference between this

spiritual form of consciousness and our ordinary consciousness in the world of sense is not on the same plane of experience; there is something categorically differentiating the one from the other. Cold is felt by the enlightened as well as the ignorant. When a bird sings all hear it, unless one is physically deficient. But the consciousness experienced by the ignorant does not rise above the sensuous plane. To the spiritually-experienced the hearing of the bird and the feeling of the cold is on the spiritual plane, which is interfused with the world of senses, and yet which must be distinguished from it when we wish to be precise about it; and the enlightened man interprets his daily experience from the spiritual point of view.

When the world is thus interpreted spiritually, or when it thus reflects itself in the mirror of spiritual consciousness, it is no more an object of the sense-intellect. The world with all its sufferings, shortcomings, and dualities, becomes one with the spiritual world, and for those who are enlightened, suffering is no doubt suffering, but they have absorbed it as it were in their spiritual consciousness where all such things as taking place on the psychological-natural plane find their proper meaning in harmony with the "unthinkable" scheme of the universe. Cause-effect in this sense no longer affects them, in other words, it is never obscured.

Pascal speaks of the thinking reed, but this thinking must not be regarded as mere cognition or contemplation, it must mean a process of becoming spiritually self-conscious. The importance of contemplation was highly stressed by the early Buddhists, but the Mahayana insists on something more. All contemplation suggests a form of dualism, for where there is an object of contemplation there must be a mind which con-

templates. Being spiritually conscious is more than contemplation, though self-consciousness also suggests a form of dualism. But spiritual self-consciousness implies there is neither the one who is conscious nor that of which the spirit is conscious. To be conscious and yet not to be conscious of any particular object is true spiritual self-consciousness. Here is the identity of object and subject, and it is from this absolute oneness that a world of multiplicity is set up. As long as we are bound with these multiplicities, we cannot escape their domination, but as soon as we rise in our spiritual consciousness above them, where there is yet no separation, no distinction, no opposition between this and that, we are free, and all the multiplicities hurt us no more. But as I have repeatedly explained, this does not mean the denial of the sense-world, but when it is made to stand by itself ungoverned by the spiritual one, Buddhists reject it.

It is for this reason that we are far greater than the universe in which we live, for our greatness is not of space but of the spirit. And there is nothing spiritual in the universe apart from human spirituality. The greatness of the world comes from our own greatness, and all about us acquires its greatness only from us humans. And our greatness is realised only when we become spiritually conscious of ourselves and all that goes about us, and by this kind of self-consciousness we achieve emancipation. According to legend, when the Buddha was born he exclaimed, "Above heaven and below heaven I alone am the Honoured (Fully-Enlightened) One". This shows that he had realised in himself the greatness which each one of us has within him, and this supreme affirmation is reached by going through with all kinds of human suffering, including intellectual and moral contradictions. The su-

preme affirmation is: When hot we perspire, when cold we shiver.

LECTURE TWO

There are two pillars supporting the great edifice of Buddhism: the Daichi (大智, *tai-chi*), Mahāprajñā, the Great Wisdom, and the Daihi (大悲, *tai-pei*), Mahākaruṇā, the Great Compassion. The Wisdom flows from the Compassion and the Compassion from the Wisdom, for the two are in fact one though from the human point of view we have to speak of it as two. As the two are thus one, not mathematically united, but spiritually coalesced, the One is to be represented as a person, as Dharmakāya.[1] The Dharmakāya is not the owner of wisdom and compassion, he is the Wisdom or the Compassion, as either phase of his being is emphasised for some special reason. We shall miss the point entirely if we take him as somewhat resembling or reflecting the human conception of man. He has no body in the sense we have a human body. He is Spirit, he is the field of action, if we can use this form of expression, where Wisdom and Compassion are fused together, are transformed into each other, and become the principle of vitality in the world of sense-intellect.

---

[1] Kāya meaning "the body" is an important conception in the Buddhist doctrine of reality. Dharmakāya is usually rendered "Law-body" where Dharma is understood in the sense of "law", "organisation", "systematisation", or "regulative principle". But really in Buddhism, Dharma has a very much more comprehensive meaning. Especially when Dharma is coupled with Kāya—Dharmakāya—it implies the notion of personality. The highest reality is not a mere abstraction, it is very much alive with sense and intelligence, and, above all, with love purged of human infirmities and defilements.

To grasp the meaning of this teaching fully, we must go to Kegon philosophy as expounded in the Kegon Sutras. In fact, this philosophy is the climax of Buddhist thought which has developed in India, China, and Japan. And as it is most desirable for all Buddhist students to be acquainted more or less with it, I will present it here in a summary way. Japan may not have much in the way of spiritual culture to contribute to the world-treasure of thought, but in Kegon philosophy we can say we have something worthy of the world's attention.

To understand Kegon (*Avataṁsaka* or *Gaṇḍavyūha*)[1] we must get well acquainted with the two key terms *ji* and *ri*. *Ji* (事, *shih* Ch.) means ordinarily "an event", "a happening", but in Buddhist philosophy, "the individual", "the particular", "the concrete", "the monad", while *ri* (理, *li*,), means "a principle", "reason", "the whole", "the all", "totality", "the universal", "the absolute", etc. *Ji* always stands contrasted to *ri*, and *ri* to *ji*. *Ji* is distinction and discrimination, and *ri* is non-distinction and non-discrimi-

[1] Kegon (*hua-yen* Ch.) means "flower-decoration". There are two Sanskrit terms for it: the one is *avataṁsaka* meaning "garland" and the other is *gaṇḍavyūha*, "blossoms-decoration". The *Gaṇḍavyūha* is the Sanskrit title for a text containing the account of Sudhana the young man, who, wishing to find how to realise the ideal life of Bodhisattvahood, is directed by Mañjuśrī the Bodhisattva to visit spiritual leaders one after another in various departments of life and in various forms of existence, altogether numbering fifty-three. The text is known in the Chinese translations (there are three) as the "Chapter on Entering the Dharmadhātu", which is the world of truth, the realm of the spirit. The *Avataṁsaka* in the Chinese Tripitaka is a general title given to the whole class of Kegon literature, which contains a number of the sutras all expounding the principles of Kegon philosophy.

nation. In regular Buddhist terminology, *ri* corresponds to *śūnyatā*, void or emptiness (空, *kung* Ch., *kū* J.), while *ji* is *rūpam*, form (色, *se* Ch., *shiki* J.). The distinction made in Greek philosophy between matter and form may also be applied to that between *śūnyatā* and *rūpam*, between *ri* and *ji*. Christians may designate *ri*, with certain reservations, as God or the absolute divinity, and *ji* as each individual human personality. German thinkers may equate *ri* with the universal and *ji* with the particular.

According to Buddhist philosophy, *ri* or *kū* (*śūnyatā*) is characterised first as emptiness or void. Emptiness does not mean absence in the sense that something was before and nothing is now. Emptiness is not a somewhat existing beside something, it is not a separate independent existence, nor does it mean extinction. It is always with individual object (*ji*); it co-exists with form (*rūpam*); where there is no form there is no emptiness (*śūnyatā*). For emptiness is formlessness and has no self-hood, no individuality, and therefore it is always with form. Form is emptiness and emptiness is form. If emptiness were something limited, something resisting, something impure in the sense of allowing something else to get mixed with it, it would never be with form, in form, and form itself. It is like a mirror: as it is empty and has nothing holding up as its own, it reflects anything in it that appears before it. Emptiness is again like a crystal thoroughly pure and transparent: it has no colour particularly belonging to it, therefore it takes any colour that comes before it.

Emptiness is not quite the proper term for *śūnyatā*, nor is void, though *śūnyatā* is originally spatial, indicating "absence of things", "unoccupied space", and the Chinese equivalent *kung* (*kū* J.) exactly corresponds to it. But as it is used

in Buddhist philosophy it has a metaphysical connotation, and it is likely that the Chinese Buddhist philosophers thought *ri* was very much better than *kū*, for *ri* is used in China in the sense of "reason", "principle", or "nature". In the sutras of various schools of Buddhism, *śūnyatā* (that is, *kū*, *kung*) is almost exclusively used. It is needless to remark here that *kū* has nothing to do with the modern concept of space.

Ji (*rūpam*, *shiki*) is form, but is used more in the sense of "substance", or "something occupying space which will resist replacement by another form". So it has extension, it is limited and conditioned. It comes into existence when conditions are matured, as Buddhists would say, and, staying as long as they continue, passes away. Form is impermanent, dependent, illusory, relative, antithetical, and distinctive.

Conceptually, *ri* and *ji*, *kū* and *shiki*, *śūnyatā* and *rūpam*, emptiness and form, appear to be antagonistic to and exclusive of each other, for where the one is, the other cannot be. But, according to Kegon philosophy, their relation is one of "perfect mutual unimpeded solution" (*en-yū mu-ge*). In other words, *ri* is *ji*, *ji* is *ri*, *ri* and *ji* are identical (即, *soku*); *ri* and *ji* are mutually merged, immersed in each other. *Ji* has its existence by virtue of *ri*, *ji* is unable to subsist by itself, *ji* is subject to a constant change. *Ri* on the other hand has no separate existence; if it has, it will be another *ji* and no more *ri*; *ri* supplies to *ji* a field of operation, as it were, whereby the latter may extend in space and function in time; *ri* is a kind of supporter for *ji* but there is no real supporter for *ji* as such on the plane of distinction. Identity does not exactly express the idea of *soku*, for identity suggests a dualism, whereas in *soku* the emphasis is placed on the state of self-identity as it is, and not on the two objects that are iden-

in itself. And this functioning may be reversed. When the one pervades all the rest, the latter in turn diffuse themselves in it; the pervading is the diffusing and the diffusing the pervading, they function mutually and simultaneously. The same may be stated in the case of the taking-in and entering-into. When the whole set is the latter and at the same time the latter is seen as being-taken-in by the former; for the entering-into is the being-taken-in and the being-taken-in is the entering-into.

To illustrate this thought, the Kegon has a parable of mirrors. Let them be set up at the eight points of the compass and at the zenith and the nadir. When you place a lamp at the centre, you observe that each one of the ten mirrors reflects the light; now you pick up one of the ten and you see that it also reflects all the rest of the ten containing the light, together with the particular one you picked up. Each one of the nine is in the one and the one is in each one of the nine, and this not only individually but totalistically. This parable illustrates the way Kegon philosophy conceives the world of *ji*, but as it is a parable it gives only a static, spatial view of it in the fourfold manner:

1. One in one;
2. One in all;
3. All in one;
4. All in all.

But the central idea of Kegon is to grasp the universe dynamically whose characteristic is always to move onward, to be forever in the mood of moving, which is life. The use of such terms as "entering-into" and "being-taken-in" (or "taking-in"), "embracing and pervading", and "simultaneous unimpeded diffusion", shows that Kegon is time-minded. The

the experience. But the account so far given is concerned with its statical or spatial aspect, and nothing of the movement aspect is brought out that goes on in the world of *ji* as seen in the light of *ri*. Though the phrase "Perfect unimpeded mutual solution" suggests somewhat of movement, the chief emphasis is placed on the state of solution and not necessarily on the functioning itself. The solution tells us more about the relation between *ji* and *ri* than about infinite forms of relationship taking place among individual things in the world of *ji* itself. Some of the most significant phrases belonging here are:

1. Simultaneous mutual self-identification (同時互即),
2. Simultaneous mutual turning-into (同時回互),
3. Self-identity of the acting and the being acted upon (即能即所),
4. Self-identity of the One and the Many (即一即多),
5. Simultaneous abrupt rising (同時頓起).

All these phrases purport to describe the various modes of *ri*'s functioning which is known as *jiji muge* in the world of *ji*. *Ji-ji* means each individual item in the world of *ji* and *muge* is "unimpededness". Each individual *ji* is not only dissolved unimpededly in *ri* but also each in the other, individually, mutually, and totalistically. So, when I lift a finger, the whole world of *ji* is found dissolved in it, and not only the world as such, but each individual reality separately.

Another set of Kegon terms that we may introduce here in order to make the Kegon way of thinking more understandable is: 1. "pervading" (徧 *pien*) and "embracing" (容 *yang*), 2. "taking-in" (摂 *shê*) and "entering-into" (入 *ju*). When the one is set against all the others, the one is seen as pervading them all and at the same time embracing them all

in itself. And this functioning may be reversed. When the one pervades all the rest, the latter in turn diffuse themselves in it; the pervading is the diffusing and the diffusing the pervading, they function mutually and simultaneously. The same may be stated in the case of the taking-in and entering-into. When the whole set is the latter and at the same time the latter is seen as being-taken-in by the former; for the entering-into is the being-taken-in and the being-taken-in is the entering-into.

To illustrate this thought, the Kegon has a parable of mirrors. Let them be set up at the eight points of the compass and at the zenith and the nadir. When you place a lamp at the centre, you observe that each one of the ten mirrors reflects the light; now you pick up one of the ten and you see that it also reflects all the rest of the ten containing the light, together with the particular one you picked up. Each one of the nine is in the one and the one is in each one of the nine, and this not only individually but totalistically. This parable illustrates the way Kegon philosophy conceives the world of *ji*, but as it is a parable it gives only a static, spatial view of it in the fourfold manner:

1. One in one;
2. One in all;
3. All in one;
4. All in all.

But the central idea of Kegon is to grasp the universe dynamically whose characteristic is always to move onward, to be forever in the mood of moving, which is life. The use of such terms as "entering-into" and "being-taken-in" (or "taking-in"), "embracing and pervading", and "simultaneous unimpeded diffusion", shows that Kegon is time-minded. The

formula expressive of this is:

1. When one is taken-in by all, one enters into all;
2. When all is taken-in by one, all enters into one;
3. When one is taken-in by one, one enters into one;
4. When all is taken-in by all, all enters into all.

There is another fourfold formula expressing the same idea in its working modes:

1. One enters into one by taking-in one;
2. One enters into one by taking-in all;
3. All enters into one by taking-in all;
4. All enters into all by taking-in all.

Practically speaking, both formulas describe the same event taking place in the world of *ji*.

The philosophy of *jiji muge*, or the idea of interpreting the universe as a great dramatic stage where takes place an infinitely complicated interplay of all forces and all units as explained above in a most summary fashion, is the climax of Buddhist thought which has been developing in the Far East for the last two thousand years.[1]

---

[1] There is one significant fact I wish to note in connection with Kegon terminology, which is that its Chinese exponents have chosen the character *ji* to denote an individual thing or substance so called. *Ji* (*vastu* in Sanskrit), as I mentioned before, first means "a matter", "an event", or "a happening", and secondarily "an existing thing" in contradistinction to a general idea. In view of Kegon's dynamic and temporal interpretation of the Dharmadhatu or universe, it seems to be better now to retain the original meaning of *ji* as an event. The Kegon philosophers, like all other Buddhists, do not believe in the reality of an individual existence, for there is nothing in our world of experience that keeps its identity even for a moment, it is subject to constant changes. The changes are, however, imperceptively gradual as far as our human senses are concerned, and are not noticed until they pass through certain stages of modification. Human sensibility is bound up with the notion of time-divisions, it translates

There is a short treatise by Hōzō (法蔵 Fa-tsang, 643–721) on Kegon philosophy, a lecture given to the Empress Sokuten Bukō (Tsê-tien Wu-hou) of the T'ang Dynasty. He here explains

---

time into space, a succession of events is converted into a spatial system of individual realities, and the latter are regarded as monads remaining in being all the time, and independent, though not absolutely, of other monadic existences. Properly speaking, the Kegon idea of *enyū muge*, "perfectly unimpeded interpenetration", is attained only when our consciousness is thoroughly pervasive with a feeling for a never-ending process of occurrences.

The reference is to this never-ending process when Buddhists declare "*Anicca vata sankhāra*", that is, "all component things or objects of experience are transient". *Sankhāra* (*saṁskāra* S.) as a technical Buddhist term is a very difficult one to render into English. (See Stede's *Pali Dictionary*, *s. v.*) The Chinese translators generally have 行 (*gyō* J., *hsing* Ch.) for it and occasionally 事 (*ji* J., *shih* Ch.). *Ji* is thus used for both *saṁskāra* and *vastu*, whereas the translators have sometimes 法 and 行 for *vastu*, showing that in their minds *ji*, *hō*, and *gyō* were to a certain extent interchangeable terms.

In Buddhism 法 (*dharma* S., *hō* J., *fa* Ch.) means "an object", "a being", "a reality"; 行 (*gyō* J., *hsing* Ch.) is literally "going", hence "a movement", "an act", "a deed", and used almost synonymously with 法 (*hō*, *fa*) "an object"; and 事 (*ji*, *shih*) denotes "an event", "a happening". When we gather up what commonly lies underneath these ideas, we can see that Buddhists have conceived an object as an event and not as a thing or substance. And it is for this reason that Buddhists pronounce this world of our sense-experience to be transient, impermanent (*anitya*), egoless (*nairātmya*), and therefore pain and suffering (*duḥkha*).

The Buddhist conception of "things" as *saṁskāra* (or *sankhāra*), that is, as "deeds", or "events", makes it clear that Buddhists understand our experience in terms of time and movement, and therewith the Kegon conception of *jiji muge* become intelligible. The Great Compassionate Heart is not a solid body from which love emanates or issues towards objects, but is the mode of consciousness or the feeling of self-identity flowing through an eternal process of becoming.

the teaching by means of the golden lion which is said to have been a part of the court decorations. The book is divided into ten short sections as is the usage with the Kegon writers, who consider the number ten the most perfectly rational number, and I think it best to follow his arguments in the exposition of Kegon thought here.

ON THE GOLDEN LION

I

Gold has no self-nature (*svabhava* S.) and, now modelled by the artist, assumes the form of a lion. Likewise, *ri* has no form of its own, taking any form the conditions may ascribe to it.

II

The lion as such has no reality, it is all of gold. The lion is unreal, but gold is not without reality. *Kū* (emptiness or *ri*) is not a definite object of discrimination but manifests itself in all forms which are nominal and apparitional.

III

〔In conformity with the traditional Buddhist theory of cognition, Hōzō remarks:〕 To permit an illusory existence of the lion is *parikalpita*[1]; that the lion appears to be real is *paratantra*,[1] and that the gold remains unchanged is *pariniṣpanna*.[1]

---

[1] *Parikalpita* means that to think that an object one sees before one is a reality and has an independent existence by itself is "an outcome of the imagination". *Paratantra* means "depending upon another". According to this view, all things are related to and dependent upon one another. It is a kind of Buddhist relativity theory, one might say. *Pariniṣpanna* is "a perfected view" whereby one is able to see the world as it really and truly is.

IV

When the gold takes-in the lion in its totality, there will be no lion left to be a separate entity. For this reason we say that the lion has no form of its own.

V

That the lion has at all come to exist is due entirely to the existence of the gold; without the gold there will be nothing whatever. The lion is subject to birth and death, but the gold itself suffers no change. Hence we speak of no-birth.

VI

1. To think that the lion, depending for its existence on the maturing of various conditions, and subject to constant changes as to its form, has really no substance of its own—this is the view held by the ordinary Hearers.

2. To think that all things have their existence only conditionally and have no self-nature, so called, and therefore, are thoroughly empty (*śūnya*)—this is the view held by the Mahayanists of the first stage.

3. To think that while things are thoroughly empty, this emptiness does not prevent their existing as if they were real, which permits both the lion's conditional existence and the gold's assuming a temporary form—this is the view held by Mahayanists of the last stage.

4. When the mutual conditioning of gold and lion is transcended, no room is left for the imagination [that is, intellection] to assert itself, it lies altogether helpless; when the dualism of being and non-being [i.e. emptiness] is done away with, words become useless and the mind is absolutely at rest.

This is the view held by the Abrupt School of Mahayana Buddhism.

5. When the imagination [i.e. intellection] no more asserts itself, the whole body of reality is bared and a world of multitudes is manifested with all its complexities and in apparent disorderliness. However confusingly masses and forces may act and react, they are all of pure solid gold. In the midst of the ten thousand things most inextricably interplaying among themselves, there is a system prevailing here; they are merged with one another, and yet each retains its own individuality. As all is one, they are all of formlessness; as one is all, the principle of cause-effect prevails unmistakably. Forces and functions, interacting and interfusing, are sometimes rolled up and sometimes spread out, in the freest possible way. Those who hold this view belong to the Perfect School of Ekayana [" one vehicle "].[1]

---

[1]These five systems of teaching as here characterised are differentiated by the Kegon scholars in the body of Buddhism. The Chinese Buddhists were quite at a loss to find out what was the genuine teaching of the Buddha when they were confronted with the apparently conflicting and mutually excluding doctrines as enunciated in more than five thousand volumes of the Buddhist sutras which were translated into Chinese one after another by the Sanskrit scholars from India and central Asiatic kingdoms. It was naturally one of the most important and difficult tasks imposed upon the Chinese Buddhist scholars to establish a plausible system of thought among those enormous masses of literature. They classified them according to their understanding, which led to the founding of several schools of Chinese Buddhism. Each school took up certain sutras as most essential and fundamental in the understanding of the Buddhist truth and arranged the rest as leading up by degrees to the doctrine specially cherished by its followers. The Kegon school belongs to the last of the five classes of Buddhists here enumerated.

VII

The ten mysteries may be recounted here:

1. Gold and lion simultaneously persist and each is perfect and sufficient with itself and in itself.

2. Gold and lion, each distinct in itself, are merged in each other, for one is many and many is one. But remember that this intermerging by no means hinders gold and lion from being themselves, each holding to its office as lion or gold.

3. When you see the lion, you see it as a lion, and no gold is there. The lion is evident, and the gold vanishes out of sight. But when you see the gold, you see it only and there is no lion; now the gold is evident whereas the lion vanishes out of sight. When you observe them from still another angle, sometimes they both are evident, sometimes neither of them is visible.

4. 〔The relation of the one to the many is comparable to Indra's net of pearls.〕 A golden lion is visible in every one of the pores on the lion's whole body including his sense-organs, limbs, etc. Every one of the golden lions visible at every one of the pores is now seen entering all simultaneously and abruptly into the shaft of one hair, each retaining its distinctive individuality; an infinity of lions are thus manifest on every one of the hairs covering the lion-body; further, every one of these infinite numbers of lions visible on every single hair, carrying all the rest along with itself, is now entering into every other hair, thus covering the lion's body with infinitely complicated systems of its own likenesses. This is Indra's net of pearls.

5. When the eye takes-in the lion in the most thorough-going way, the eye itself is the whole lion and there is nothing

else left. When the ear takes-in the lion in the most thorough-going way, the ear itself is the whole lion and there is nothing else left. When all the senses simultaneously take-in the lion, each of them possesses the whole lion exclusively, and yet this does not hinder their possessing it conjointly.

6. When every one of the pores in every one of the sense-organs of the lion takes-in the whole lion in the complete manner, any one of the organs is thoroughly identified with any other, and the eye becomes the ear, the ear becomes the nose, and so on, and there is no impediment, no obstruction between them.

7. When gold and lion are set against each other, there arise various systems of relationship: the manifest and the hidden, the one and the many, lord and subject, *ri* and *ji*. All these relationships taking place in their utmost complexities do not clash with one another, but in perfect harmony work each in its specific way; distinctly and pre-eminently holding its place each is merged in others.

8. The lion is an object that goes through transformation, changing its form every moment of time. The moment is divisible into three periods, past, present, and future, and every one of these three periods is again divisible into three, and this process is repeatable *ad infinitum*. All these periods are included in the notion of time and each one is convertible to others. Time is not something infinitely extending between past and future; it is no more or less than this very moment.

9. Set gold and lion in opposition and the one will be manifest while the other is hidden; the many will come forward while the one stands back; for both lion and gold have no self-nature rigidly determined as theirs, they revolve around the mind as centre. It is because of this mind that we can

speak of *ri* and *ji*, that things come to exist and subsist.

10. The lion acts, whereby the working of Ignorance is indicated; the gold holds on whereby the notion of substance is made plain. As to the interplaying and intermerging of *ri* and *ji*, reference may be made to the notion of the *ālaya-vijñāna*.[1]

VIII

The three sets of opposites characterise the lion: To say it is a lion describes it generally; when its five senses are referred to, it is a specification. When the lion together with its details is seen mutually dependent for their existence, there is a unity of purpose; when each of the lion's component parts acts independently as if not knowing of one another,

---

[1] To explain what this *vijñāna* is requires a lengthy treatment and I wish here just to state that it is a kind of absolute spirit from which all things rise and into which all things return, itself remaining the same all the time. The *ālaya*, meaning "storage" or "treasure-house" is the last of the eight *vijñāna* ("consciousness"). The first five correspond to the five senses, the sixth is the *manovijñāna* whose function is to distinguish, to generalise, to form abstract ideas, corresponding to the intellect, or to the reasoning faculty. The *manas* is the seventh, the function of which is somewhat difficult to define; for one thing it performs the office of bridging the *ālayavijñāna* with the *manovijñāna*. The *ālaya* is devoid of self-consciousness and indiscriminately hoards up all things good and bad, and subsists. The *manas* functions unintermittently holding fast to the *ālaya* and discriminates it as the Ego. This ego-discriminating function is reflected by the *manovijñāna* which imagines thereby, "Here is my Self", and starts up all forms of evil originating from this individualising self-consciousness. The *manas's* ego-consciousness is constant and knows no intermission while that of the *manovijñāna* is intermittent and distinctive. In short, the *ālaya* is a world of non-distinction and non-discrimination.

there is a diversity of purpose. When all the component parts join together to make up the lion, there is an integration; when each returns to its own office and status, there is a disintegration.

IX

The argument set forth so far are meant to clear up the way to Enlightenment (*bodhi*). It is attained when, seeing the lion before you, you realise that all things are by nature quiescent, i.e., in the state of Suchness (*tathatā*), they are such as they are, that the way to Enlightenment opens when you perceive that since the beginningless past, things have been free from all kinds of errors, controversies, and contradictions.

X

By entering into Nirvana is meant: that when both gold and lion are transcended all the causes of spiritual vexations are cleared away, and the mind is at peace like the great ocean; that when all the harassing passions subside, and all the intellectual errors are accounted for, there is no more the sense of being threatened by an unknown enemy, all the entanglements are wiped out, all the impediments are put aside, and the source of suffering is exhausted. When one attains to this state of spiritual enlightenment and contentment, one is said to have entered into Nirvana.[1]

---

[1] Here ends the "Chapter on the Golden Lion". The text is altogether too summary and comprehensive for most readers to be fully grasped. My intention is to write a special book devoted to a fuller exposition of Kegon Philosophy.

Broadly stated, the gist of Kegon philosophy consists in viewing the world in a fourfold way:

1. A world of *ji*,
2. A world of *ri*,
3. A world of *ri* and *ji* perfectly interfused,
4. A world of *ji* where each individual *ji* is seen as interfused with every other individual *ji*.

The Kegon term for the world *hokkai*, 法界, is *dharmadhātu* in Sanskrit. *Hō*, *dharma*, is a very comprehensive term, and it means many things. It means "reality as object of sense", "an idea", "principle governing human experience", and some other things, whereas *kai*, *dhātu*, corresponds to our common notion of the "world" or "universe". The *hokkai* in Kegon, therefore, may be defined as a world revealing itself to the enlightened mind, and its real significance will not be understood by us until we have entered into the *jiji muge hokkai*, that is, the last of the four world-conceptions above mentioned. Most philosophers and religious thinkers may reach the stage of the *riji muge*, but not that of the *jiji muge*. They may teach pantheism — or "panentheism", a term used by some German philosophers; they may follow the mystic way, but they have not yet attaind the Kegon interpretation of the world.

To envisage the Kegon world, it is best to distinguish two forms of intuition: sensual-intellectual and spiritual; and it is the spiritual that opens up the new world-vista for us. Its characteristic may be said to consist in synthesising spatial and temporal intuitions. Sensual-intellectual intuitions are conceptual, static, and spatial, and not qualified for grasping life as it moves on. The spiritual intuitions, on the contrary, dive straightforwardly into life itself; they are at once temporal

and spatial; they move with time and abide with space; they are forever fleeing or flowing, yet they never depart from the spot where they are; they start from "here-now" and return to "here-now"; they seem to be always at the same place and eternally abiding with "now", and yet they are moving every minute of the hour, every second of the minute; "I am interviewing you this very moment and I have never seen you since time immemorial"; "I am here absorbed in meditation and coming out of it one thousand miles away". These are not logical conclusions derived from certain definable premises but direct statement of the intuitions of a highly trained mind. They transmit the state of affairs taking place in the *jiji muge* world of Kegon.

The following Zen story will illustrate in a way the point here specified. The Zen master Bokujū (睦州 Mu-chou), of the ninth century, in the late T'ang dynasty, had a disciple called Ō (王 Wang), who was a high government officer. One day the disciple was late in arriving, and the master asked him why. He replied, "I have been watching a polo game".

The master asked, "Were the men tired?"

"Yes, master".

The master asked again, "Were the horses tired?"

"Yes, master".

"Is the wooden post here tired too?"

The officer naturally failed to answer this most unexpected question.

That night he could not sleep, yet towards the morning the answer dawned on him. He hurried back to the master and said that he understood it. The master at once repeated the question, "Is the post tired too?"

"Yes, master", was the officer's decided answer. Bokujū

nodded and smiled. Later, a master of the Sung dynasty, commenting on this story, pointed out that unless the post was tired too there could be no real tiredness anywhere.

The moving power in the Kegon world of *jiji muge* is the Great Compassionate Heart by which our self breaks down its limits, expands beyond itself, and becomes other selves. The heart is like a heavenly body of light; an all-expanding energy emanates from it, and by entering into all other bodies identifies itself with them; they are it and it is they; what affects them affects it and what affects it affects them. It is for this reason that Bokujū wanted to have his disciple see into the secret of the polo-playing of the world.

It is by the Great Compassionate Heart that the Kegon of *jiji muge* moves. If it were just to reflect one individual *ji* after another in the mirror of *ri*, the world would cease to be a living one, becoming simply an object of contemplation for the hermit or Arhat. It is the Heart indeed that tells us that our own self is a self only to the extent that it disappears into all other selves, non-sentient as well as sentient. The interfusion or interpenetration as the most eminent characteristic of the Dharmadhātu, that is, of the Kegon world, is not to be turned over to the intellect for analysis, but it must return to the source where it was first generated, that is, to the Great Compassionate Heart.

The Great Compassion is creator while the Great Wisdom contemplates. As they are not two but one, contemplation is creation and creation is contemplation. Space is time and time is space, and they merge at one absolute point, "here-now", and all things rise from this absolute point, revealing the Kegon world of *jiji muge*. This is the object of spiritual

intuition, where there is neither one who intuits nor that which is intuited. The Kegon world is a world of Suchness. All things are reflected in the mirror of God's thought and thought is creative; therefore reflection means creation. A new universe is constantly created, showing that God is in deep contemplation. This is what is meant by the "ocean-stamp meditation" (*sāgaramudrā-samādhi*), and it is from this Meditation that the Kegon world of *jiji muge* has its start. From this we can realise that our individual self rising from the absolute point of "here-now" gains its significance only when it is merged in all other selves; in fact, there is no individual self as such, and it is an illusion to hold to it as if it were the last reality in the world—which most of us are constantly doing. But this ought not to be considered denying a world of particular *jiji*.

In this light the following statement often made by Zen students is to be understood, where the spiritual life is described as quite different from the ethical. According to them, "In the sense-world there is a need for regulation, and each has to fulfil his duty or office at his own place, but in the spiritual world no such sense of obligation obtains. There is no self-sacrifice here, no giving up of oneself for others; for what appears such would be, so far as the agent himself is concerned, like cutting the spring breeze in two in the shadow of lightning. In such a state no 'trace' is left, no distinctions remain, and one moves from one part of the whole to another without hindrance. As the Buddhist would say, 'When I am hungry I eat, and if I don't want to eat I refrain from doing so'. There is no artificial effort here, no moral restraint or striving; for the spirit is perfectly free when working on the plane of no moral choice, of no intellectual distinctions".

To come back to the subject of Great Compassion, which is the moving force of the universe, Buddhists personify it in various ways. Amida (*Amitābha* S., "infinite light") is one of such personifications, the most popular one in Japan. His followers belong to the Jōdo (the Pure Land) school of Buddhism. Before I proceed, however, just a word is needed as to what is meant by personification. When we speak of personifying something, we think of two things: the one is something which is not animated, and the other is something animate. The inanimate thing is now endowed with sentiment and transformed into an animate being so that it will be of the same order with us humans who are sentient beings. But in fact there are no inanimate objects in the world, they are all living and animated, even so-called concepts are alive and are able to act upon us in a most vital sense. Of course, there are many concepts already dead and altogether obsolete, which when treated as still living will surely bring untold calamities. The reason why they cease to work is because they are merely intellectual creations and not sustained by spiritual intuitions. Wherever the spirit moves there is life, there is a person. Not only objects of nature but what are known to be human constructions such as tables, ships, houses, etc., are also endowed with life and affect us individually and collectively when they are touched by the spirit. But they die as soon as this relationship is suspended. So with concepts. As long as they are sustained by the spirit, that is, as long as they are spiritual revelations, they survive, have eternal life, and are personalities. This is exactly the case with Amida. Amida is not a concept personified as is usually understood. He is the ground from which all spiritual revelations grow and to which all personalities are related.

There are some scholars who think of Amida in connection with history, and on this ground they regard Amida legend as mere fiction not worthy of serious consideration, much less of truly religious concern. But Buddhists would ask: What is history? What is a historical personage? Shall we regard this sense-world, time-divided, as more real, dependable, and trustworthy than the spiritual one which transcends limitations of time and space? Is the spiritual world just a fabrication of a visionary, that is, untrustworthy mind? Is the year 1946 really more real than the year zero, or time beyond measurement, for instance, "infinite kalpas ago"? However this may be, the Pure Land Buddhists regard Amida just as real and lively and historical as they are themselves; no, from the point of reality, they regard Amida as more animating and inspiring, and accept his Vow as being of supremely vital significance.

One of Amida's principal vows is that he will not attain enlightenment until by his enlightenment all sentient beings are also enlightened, and as he had attained it in the infinite past it follows that we are enlightened already. When this is interpreted intellectually it is absurd; for Amida here is not conceived as an individual reality in time and space, and as such he stands in a very much closer relationship to me than a book before me, in fact even closer, I can say, than my own parents, hence his enlightenment could not but affect me. When Amida attained his enlightenment he entered the spiritual world where he and we and all the rest of beings are one and not distinguished one from another, and therefore his enlightenment meant our enlightenment and ours his. This is the mystery of enlightenment and also of the spiritual world. When this is realised either by Amida or by ourselves, we know that his Vow has already been brought to fruition in

us and with us, and we are no more unenlightened ones. My attainment assumes the enlightenment attained by others, and this is the meaning of the following statement: "When a person attains enlightenment on earth a lotus flower unfolds in the Pure Land to provide a seat for him". The Pure Land is a spiritual world, and this is a physical world, but the two are interfused, and what takes place in the one is reflected in the other. The spiritual world of non-distinction and the sense-world of distinction are thus to be one. When people are in the spiritual world which is the Kegon world of *jiji muge*, the pure water of enlightenment will wash them clean of all their Karma-defilements accumulated ever since they were born—indeed even prior to their birth.

As long as we remain in a world of dualistic logic, this world of *jiji muge*, controlled by the Great Compassion, will be unintelligible, and as a result we shall encounter all manner of suffering in our daily life. We Japanese have for the last ten years been groaning under the misguided policies of totalitarianism or of individualism, both of which are equally inimical to *jiji muge*, for both lack a true understanding of Compassion. Even the much-vaunted development of science and technique may prove the source of misery to mankind unless the principle of Great Compassion is well understood. Much of the friction existing between nations comes from a lack of mutual understanding, the root of which lies assuredly in not recognising the importance of the Great Compassion in international affairs. Even democracy of which we in Japan hear lately so much, must, if it is to succeed, be firmly founded upon the idea of brotherhood. However much of legalism and the technical arrangements of economy and industry are planned out to make it work as smoothly as

possible, so long as the Great Heart of Compassion is missing there will always be some measure of uneasiness, a lack of spiritual lubrication, as it were, among the people.

Amida is famed for his forty-eight vows called "Original Vow" (*pūrvapraṇidhāna*). Some of these vows may be said to be out of relation with modern life, but the common theme running through them all, is the saving of all sentient beings from the sufferings which ensue from intellectual discriminations, various forms of passion, selfish desires, and Karma-hindrances. When the self is asserted and that which is above self is lost sight of, i.e., when the world of individualism is emphasised at the cost of the higher self, the whole world becomes hopelessly involved in misery, and it is this world from which Amida wishes to save us by leading us to a realisation of the spiritual life. But we must remember that leading a spiritual life does not mean abandoning the so-called worldly life. To do this is simply to follow a dualistic interpretation of life, i.e., fleeing from the Kegon world of *jiji muge*. Enlightenment is found in Amida, with Amida, and through Amida, but Amida is no other person than our own self in this world, which has now been transformed with all its multiplicity and Karma-complications into a spiritual Dharmadhātu as described in Kegon teaching. To be in the world as if not in the world will give a clue to the Kegon life.

Some may say: Is it not enough then to stay in this world of individuation? Where is the need to move into a realm of non-distinction? The moral world is quite sufficient, and there is no necessity to go out of it in order to embrace a religion or to look for a spiritual life. What do we really gain by negating this practical and dualistic world, if the spiritual life is no more than accepting this world of distinctions

as it is? But those who talk in this way fail to realise that ethics alone can never give full inner satisfaction. Most of us are not quite conscious of all our spiritual aspirations and yearnings, for they are hidden under so many layers of pride and self-deception and crude intellectualities that it is extremely difficult to appreciate the spirit at its full value. But in fact, it is working all the time underneath the heavy coverings of self-conceit and intellection; and just as we are not ordinarily conscious of the air, so we are apt to overlook the claims of the spirit demanding our foremost attention. But when we meet happenings incompatible with our selfish desires and baffling human calculations, we are made to pause and reflect on the feebleness of our earthly aspirations. This is the time when the spirit asserts itself and forces us to look beyond mere intellection. Even when suffering is not so keenly experienced, we often come across something in our heart which whispers to be heard. Some are sensitive enough to listen, but others are deaf, due to their heavy Karma-hindrance. Even when we listen to this still small voice, we may not at once realise what it really means; however, once we learn to listen, the time will sooner or later come when we have to find out its full signification. This is in one way an allurement, yet in another way it is a threat, for we recognise here a power stronger than ourselves compelling us to choose between the self and the not-self, between intellection and spiritual intuition.

Those who live on the plane of discrimination and ethics may remain indifferent; those who have never experienced a spiritual awakening will always be difficult to get interested in a higher plane. For religion never grows from ethics and logic; it is the latter which emerge from religion. Even

when religion and ethics seem to be talking of the same thing, they are moving in a different world, the one is in the Kegon world and the other is in the world of senses only. Both may refrain from evil, but in the moral man there is a certain feeling of constraint, of giving things up which he may think properly belong to him, whereas the spiritual man moves naturally, spontaneously as flowers bloom in spring; his mind is free from "traces" of conflict or the need of choice. For it is Amida Buddha and not my narrow self that is operative here, Amida has awakened me from this conflicting life of dualities and distinctions, of struggles and decisions. This my awakening to the presence of Amida is spiritual intuition, the spirit's self-awakening, and the seeing into the world of *jiji muge*. The Buddhist life begins here as distinguished from the moral life of self-righteousness.

There is an old Chinese song which runs like this:

"When the sun rises I work in the field;
When the sun sets I rest.
I dig a well and I drink;
I till the soil and I eat—
What has the Imperial power to do with me?"

According to Chinese history, the reign of Yao was an ideal age, the people were not made conscious of political tyranny, were free from social restraints, they were as the sun was to the growth of a plant. In the primitive life of man and also in the animal life, there is something reminding one of man's spiritual life, because they are all living dictated by God, they just follow God's will, and putting aside all that savours of human conceit and selfishness. A life of innocence is one of the marks of spirituality.

This spiritual life in accordance with the way of Nature—

Nature conceived in its divine aspect—is all very well as far as the individual *ji* is concerned; but he cannot be all the time staying at home and quietly contemplating the Karma-hindrances under which all his fellow-beings are pitifully groaning in the world of distinction; his compassionate heart cannot feel rested until he does something for them. He is a Bodhisattva and not an Arhat. His Bodhisattvaship, i.e., Amida enshrined in his heart, will never let him remain complacent and self-absorbed in meditation but cause him to establish in others something of what he is enjoying himself. Man is a social being, he comes from the Kegon world. We all aspire for a Utopia, though it is in the nature of a Utopia that it can never be achieved on this earth. But just the same we aspire to it and exhaust all our energies for its perfection. Amida's Vow is eternal; he knows that there will be always some beings whose enlightenment is not yet quite fully matured, and therefore he will never rest until the last one is brought to enlightenment and salvation. In the ethical world of distinction and discrimination, Amida's efforts are utterly inane, they are much ado about nothing; he is like an old man trying to fill the well with snow, he will never come to an end of his work. And the strangest thing is that he knows that fully well. But he will never quit his work, he goes on eternally with his work, for he is the work.

The question is: Why this useless work on the part of Amida or the Bodhisattva? This question will never be settled as long as we are on the plane of distinction and discrimination, of logic and ethics, of utility and purposefulness, of give and take. Philosophers and theologians have wrestled with it ever since the dawn of human consciousness, and they have not yet come to any definite solution, for they have never once en-

tered into the Kegon realm of *jiji muge*, they have never once gained the absolute point of "here-now"; where distinction is no-distinction and discrimination is no-discrimination, where the cherry-blossoms are not pink and the waves never swell on the Pacific. These mysteries, Christians would say, are forever concealed in the bosom of God. It is not permitted for the human understanding to fathom them. It is only when he lays it aside and throws himself into God's arms that God reveals these secrets to man.

All the Bodhisattva's vows are, therefore, purposeless, and so is the Buddhist life at its highest stage of development. Some may call this kind of life that of the animal or plant, and there is some truth in the statement, because the birds fly in the air and the flowers bloom in the field. The birds are probably looking for something to eat, the flowers are surely going to invite the butterflies and smooth the way to bearing seeds. This is, however, from the human point of view, for in spite of all this purposefulness on the part of Nature, we can detect here something, transcending all that—what Christians call the glory of God. The glory of God shines through all these biological data and is not at all distracted by them. Nature is not altogether natural, it reflects something supernatural. It is indeed where Christians as well as Buddhists praise God. His glory is his purposeless achievement, his pure act.

On the other hand, we can state that God too has something of Nature in him, yet this naturalism does not hinder his being supernatural, that is, God. When Voltaire says that we do not have to trouble ourselves much about our salvation, it is God's business to save us, Christians may regard it as blasphemy, but the Kegon philosophers may not

take it so; God's necessity is not necessarily human necessity. In God necessity is thoroughly interfused with freedom; with him necessity is freedom and freedom is necessity. Voltaire failed to see this interfusion, this self-identity of contraries, for he judged God from his own human point of view and was unable to transcend himself. His "blasphemy" consists in his own desecration, is directed towards himself. God is not at all hurt, God goes on with his "business" and man never ceases asking for his salvation through the grace of God.

Something similar to this we have in Buddhism too. Some ask: If we attained enlightenment, as Amida tells, when he attained his, innumerable kalpas ago, what use of our so fervently running towards Amida now? In answer we will say this: If they are so convinced, that is, if they are so fully conscious of the fact of their attainment at the time of Amida, we can say that they are most assuredly already enlightened. In other words, their attainment and Amida's are synchronous. When they have it he has it, and when he has it they have it. Therefore, to be sure of their enlightenment immeasurable kalpas ago with Amida, means that they have it right at this moment and right in this place. There is no need for them to run after Amida, or to run towards him, they already have what they seek; only let them be positively convinced of this fact. If even a shadow of doubt should cross their heart, they are doomed. Voltaire must have had divine help when he was so sure about God's own business.

However this be, the forty-eight vows on the part of Amida, and constant prayer-offering and repentance on the part of all sentient beings—this is the gist of the spiritual life, the working of the Great Compassionate Heart. As far as we, sen-

tient beings are concerned, we feel deep in the innermost part of our being certain disquieting yearnings somewhat beyond ourselves. We are not so much concerned with Amida's business or Amida's promise, as with ourselves. This apparently selfish concern ceases only when Amida actually enters into our being. It is then all Amida and no self. Kegon would say, now Amida is fully manifested, has gained full potency, has interfused himself into the manyness of things, has transformed the static spatial conception of the *jiji muge* into a most lively temporal functioning, technically known as the "simultaneous awakening of multitudes (*jiji*)".

Herein one can see where lies one of the essential differences between Christianity and Buddhism. Christianity always turns towards some form of dualism; even when God and man are united in a mystical way, the union does not obliterate all traces of dualism; it is not like the one we have already noticed in the Kegon conception of *jiji muge*. Some may say that Kegon is pantheistic, but pantheism is evidently a Christian notion, as it still holds a residue of dualism in it; for God to all intents and purposes stands outside things in which he is seen manifesting himself. In Buddhism, even God leaves no traces anywhere outside or inside the Dharmadhātu of *jiji muge*.

Besides Amida, Far Eastern Buddhists have Kwannon Bosatsu (Avalokiteśvara, though not in his original form)[1] "personifying" the Great Compassionate Heart. He has no

---

[1] Kwannon was no doubt originally represented as "he", but as his function is to exercise the Great Compassionate Heart to its fullest capacity, he is most intimately associated with the "eternally feminine", and has come to assume "she" characteristics. Almost all the paintings of Kwannon in Japan and China are feminine.

vows like Amida's forty-eight vows, but he is said to manifest himself in thirty-three different forms in response to his devotees' aspirations. But as such aspirations cannot be limited to any definite calculable number, he will have an infinite number of ways whereby he can come into touch with them. The main point is that he is always ready to respond whenever and wherever conditions are matured; that is, when his devotees are in real earnest in invoking his help, they see him face to face. "Seek and there will be a response", is said of Kwannon, reminding one of Christ's saying, "Knock and it shall be opened unto you".

In the ordinary Buddhist mind, Amida is associated with our after-death life in the Pure Land, whereas Kwannon is the rescuer from our worldly evils and calamities. But what distinguishes Kwannon from the rest of the Bodhisattvas is that he is the giver of fearlessness (*abhayadana*) when one is in the midst of worldly troubles such as war, earthquake, flood, fire, deaths of friends and relatives, and so on. On such occasions let one think of Kwannon and invoke his aid, and one's heart will be filled with a feeling of fearlessness and be able to cope with whatever evils are threatening one. This is what the Sutra means when it states that by reciting Kwannon's name, if a man is under the executioner's sword, the sword will be broken to pieces. The miracle is not on the physical plane, but it takes place in his own spirit filled with fearlessness. It goes without saying that fearlessness is spiritual, not merely moral. It does not mean recklessness, desperateness. It is a calm acceptance of the inevitable, or rather, being in a contemplative mood over the vicissitudes of life, on a higher plane of thought. Fearlessness is the Buddhist expression of "Let thy will be done!"

"To think of Kwannon's power", which means his compassionate heart, is not just to call it up from memory. It is seeking him in one's own being, it is looking up to the beyond, it is coming to one's existential limits and jumping over the precipice which opens up before one. Fearlessness rises from this. The door which was thought impossible to pass through now yields to a knock, one's limitations are transcended finding oneself king of the vast unknown. All the little things of life which hedged us in on all sides fall away.

The love of Kwannon or Amida for all sentient and insentient beings consists in imparting to them this spirit of fearlessness. What hinders compassion to pass from one body to another is fear. Fear erects all forms of obstruction between two souls and prevents them from interfusing, to build up the Kegon world of *jiji muge*. The self is afraid of going out to the not-self. Fear, breeder of doubts, suspicions, and jealousy, makes the self fortify against everything that surrounds it. This spirit of self-fortification destroys the functioning of the Great Compassionate Heart which is the moving force of the Kegon world of *jiji muge*. Fearlessness breaks down all possible barriers between self and not-self, or rather this taking down of the barriers is fearlessness.

Fearlessness is purposeless. When it has a certain purpose to attain, it restricts itself by that, and for this reason it begins to be timid and calculating. The Great Compassion ceases to be "great", becoming merely human and self-limiting; for in this case "great" means infinite, boundless, immeasurable; and anything that goes beyond all sorts of measurableness must also be purposeless, not in the sense of licentiousness or of mechanical necessity, but in the sense of

self-identity of purposefulness and purposelessness, of distinction and non-distinction.

There is another Chinese poet who sings of his nap on a summer day;

"My nap was so deep,
I never heard the shower passing;
When I awoke,
How cool I felt the air in my room!"

This together with the one by the farmer of the Yao days illustrates fearlessness and purposelessness of the Buddhist life as inspired by the boundlessness of the Great Compassionate Heart.

From this way of looking at the universe can we then say that the making of vows, the offering of prayers, and the working for salvation are all to no purpose? The answer is: "No", and "Yes". For such a question can never be decided on the intellectual plane where dualism rules in one form or another. Where a dualistic logic prevails there is always something to decide by "Yes" or "No". The decision cannot be both "Yes" and "No", because this is the field of "either-or" and not of "both-and". If we say all is purposeless, then we ask, what is the use of living at all? Is it not better to commit suicide and put an end to this useless and purposeless life? The trouble is that human life is so dominated by the intellect and practical considerations. We apparently cannot just live without asking questions. We apparently cannot even leave the sparrow of the air and the lilies of the field alone but have to inquire whether they are increasing or decreasing the glory of God. We somehow hesitate to enter into the Kegon world of *jiji muge*. All these practical "human" considerations together with intellectual

arguments prevent our truly appreciating God's way with us. God's way is "both-and", and not "either-or". At the absolute point of "here-now" no choice is possible, there is no "either-or". But as soon as we stop and want to see if we are really at "here-now", the "both-and" vanishes and the intellect at once wields its full power. We tremble, hesitate, and ask questions and forever part with fearlessness and purposelessness.

We must remember, however, as we have repeatedly stated, that doing away with "either-or" and taking up "both-and" by no means clashes with the reality of human miseries, sufferings, and tribulations that surround us everywhere; that is to say, the latter remain actualities, and as long as they are actualities, prayers will be offered and Amida's and Kwannon's Great Compassionate Heart will be widely opened to them. This is the grand mystery of life and the intellect must accept it as such and humbly wait for the spirit to reveal itself. Here is a field closed to science, naturalism, and rationalism. "Supernaturalism" is to be upheld though not in the sense of denying the claims of the intellect.

In the *Lotus Sutra* (*Saddharma-puṇḍarīka*), Śākyamuni tells that he attained enlightenment in the infinite past, that this triple world is his home and all sentient and non-sentient beings are his children. In the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*, we read that Prajñā, the Great Wisdom, goes hand in hand with Karuṇā, the Great Compassion, and this in spite of Prajñā transcending the dualism of being and non-being. Prajñā is never separated from Karuṇā, the Great Heart of Compassion for all human ills. Vimalakīrti declares, "I am sick because my fellow-beings are sick". Prajñā and Karuṇā are conflicting concepts; that is, Prajñā is the world of non-discrimination

while Karuṇā is that of discrimination. From the fusion of the two, however, comes Upāya with all its multitudinous devices of salvation. Upāya means "device", "means", "measure", "planning", "calculation", etc. In short, Upāya is this world of particulars seen from the point of human achievements and disappointments.

In Japanese Buddhism, Zen represents the Prajñā phase of the Mahayana, and the Pure Land school claims the Karuṇā. Zen is apt to incline towards the Arhat ideal, and the Pure Land towards the Bodhisattva ideal. Zen is sometimes mistaken for a form of nature mysticism, "the intellectual love of God", or "an aesthetic contemplation of Nature", but that it is not so has been amply demonstrated in the foregoing paragraphs. The Pure Land (Jōdo) is meant for the masses, some would say, for, as it is at present in Japan, it emphasises the significance of illiterateness and unsophisticatedness. In truth, religion is generally set against learning; too much learning is calculated to prevent the growth of the spiritual life, and it is quite natural for the Jōdo to uphold illiterateness and if possible set aside scholarship and pedantry. Zen, on the other hand, does not necessarily despise learnedness; as we all know, Zen developed in China and embodies in it a great deal of Chinese thought and culture; and to understand Zen literature, it is important to have some knowledge of Chinese literature. As facts stand, Zen in Japan is studied very much by the intelligentsia and not so much by the masses. The Pure Land developed in Japan under the leadership of Hōnen (1133-1212) and Shinran (1173-1262). While it is not meant in any emphatic way for the unlearned, the latter generally find themselves under the heavy yoke of political tyranny and naturally seek shelter in the Great Compassion-

ate Heart of Amida. The Pure Land as a system of religious faith has nothing to do with politics and there is something in it truly and powerfully appealing to human hearts. In this respect, the Pure Land is social and humanistic; in Zen there is a certain amount of aloofness.

To give an example of the Jōdo type of Buddhists in contrast to Zen as already cited, let me quote one or two incidents in the life of Shōmatsu, popularly known as Shōma, 1799–1871. He was one of the great Shin devotees of the modern age, even within our memory. He was resident in Sanuki, poor labourer working for others. His anecdotes are recorded in a little book, *Shōma as He Was*[1] and the following are taken from it.

He once visited a Buddhist temple in the countryside, and, as soon as he entered the main hall where Amida was enshrined, proceeded to stretch himself out before the shrine and make himself comfortable. Asked by an astonished friend why he was so lacking in respect for Amida, he said, "I am back in my parent's home, and you who make this kind of remark must be only a step-child". This is an attitude of mind which reminds me of a child asleep in its mother's breast. He seemed so happy in the embrace of the Great Compassionate One that a world of physical and social formalities vanished altogether out of his mind.

Again, when the same Shin devotee was returning home to Shikoku from Kyoto, he had to cross an arm of the sea. While in the sailing boat with his companions a storm arose, and so fierce was the sea that it seemed the boat would sink. The others lost their all-important faith in the Nembutsu and

---

[1] 庄松ありのままの記. First published in 1889.

invoked the aid of Kompira, the god of the sea. But Shōmatsu slept on until his friends waked him and asked how he could sleep so soundly in the face of such calamity. "Are we still in the *shaba* world[1]?" Shōma queried back rubbing his eyes.

On another occasion, when he had been working in the rice field and was tired, he came home to rest. When he felt a cool refreshing breeze he thought of his Amida-san in the shrine. Thereupon, he took it out and set it beside him, saying "You too will enjoy the breeze". This may seem an extraordinary act, but in terms of pure feeling everything that needs one's care has life, just as a child makes a living being out of a doll. In the same way, we read in a Chinese story of a son who on a stormy night lay on his father's tomb covering it from the rain with his own body. In this world of pure feeling there is no consciousness of a process of personification. It is only the intellect which makes the distinction between animate and inanimate, sentient and non-sentient. From the spiritual point of view, all is alive and the object of affectionate regard. Nor is this a case of symbolism, but a taking of actualities as actualities—this is the life of *jiji muge* and Buddhist experience.

Incidents like this—Shōma's sound sleeping in a boat about to be capsized—are often recorded of deeply religious-minded people such as Madame Guyon, or Hakuin, a great Japanese Zen master, 1685–1768. What impresses us most in Shōma's case is his remark, "Are we still on earth?" We can say that he was not aware of his being in which world, this world

---

[1] *Shaba* (*sahaloka* in Sanskrit), means "patience" and is another name for this world of suffering.

of suffering, or that world of perfect bliss—the Pure Land. He was in all probability living in his own world of ideas, not intellectual but spiritual. Life and death were like floating clouds in the sky, they were not at all a matter of much concern for him.

When Shōma was ill while travelling, his friends carried him home in a palanquin and told him, "Now that you are back in your own home, be at ease and grateful for Amida's mercy". Shōma said, "Thank you, but where I may be lying sick, the Pure Land is always just next to my room".

A visitor called and seeing him very ill, the caller said, "If you die, we will see to it that you have a fine tombstone over your grave". Shōma promptly retorted, "I shall never be under the stone".

From these we can say that Shōma's world did not necessarily coincide with ours, he did not see things around him in the same light as we did, his eyes were fixed on a world beyond ours, though not in the sense of a separate world.

This attitude on the part of Shōma may be explained in terms of Zen, which declares Tao, the Way, to be our everyday thought. "Everyday thought" here means to be on the plane of spirit, not isolated from the physical-intellectual one. To the mind of Shōma, the Pure Land was not somewhere beyond this world, but here. His life in this world was life in the Pure Land, where the sea is always calm and boats are steady. In the midst of turmoil, therefore, he had no cause to be afraid of anything. When he was sleepy he slept; when he wanted to sit up, he sat up, when the boat was tossed up and down, he too was tossed up and down; for he identified himself with the turmoil, and accepted whatever came as though unconcerned with consequences.

Even in the rising waves he felt the loving arms of the Great Compassionate One, and he slept in the boat even as he laid himself down before the image of Amida in the country temple. This consciousness of the loving arms of Amida meant that his "everyday thought" in the Kegon world of perfect interfusion was never disturbed by outward circumstances.

The following two more sayings of Shōma's will illustrate where his world was. When Shōma heard somebody complaining about Christian missionaries' activities, he said, "Nothing could be better than a common man becoming a Buddha". When asked as to how one could be assured of one's life after death, he said, "Leave that to Amida, it is no business of ours".

In concluding this lecture may I be allowed to say a few words about the practical applications of the Kegon thought of *jiji muge* to our social construction. Society is a sort of organism whose component parts or units (*jiji*) are most intimately related to one another in every conceivable way. If any one part of it suffers damage in some form, the other parts are sure to share it sooner or later and in one way or another. It is like our own body, even a little scratch on the skin may cause immediate death due to a poisonous infection. Every unit, therefore, is to be carefully guarded against possible injuries, and at the same time its healthy growth is to be promoted by all means. The health and development of the entire body depend upon these individual units; the latter are of as much importance as the former. Capital and labour are equally needed for industry, and the proletariat is not to be set against the bourgeoisie, nor the latter against the former. Mutuality is of utmost necessity for the welfare of the whole

community, and this mutuality works to the best advantage when it is based on equality and freedom of the will. And all these, we must remember, are available only when they are rooted in the fertile soil of the Great Compassionate Heart.

The ideal of world-peace will become realisable when the idea of tolerance and mutual understanding is fully appreciated. As long as international politics is based on power, there will always be fear, suspicion, and secret designing between nations, which will most assuredly call forth warlike engagements again over the whole surface of the earth.

In religion too, the spirit of tolerance must prevail. Christianity and Buddhism are two great world religions. They differ in many ways. To give a few of them: The one has a transcendental God and the other has the Kegon world of *jiji muge* where the doctrine of interfusion and interpenetration is expounded; the one is apt to stress the dualistic aspect of existence while the other teaches the logic of self-identity; the one is more for social justice, individual liberty, communal welfare, moral responsibility, etc., but the other, historically conditioned, shows an inclination towards solitariness, aloofness, a contemplative life, political indifference, etc. Generally speaking, the Christian God, if not wholly transcendental as is held by some, is transcendentally immanent, whereas the Buddhist God is immanently transcendental. To work together for the spiritual welfare, Buddhists and Christians must learn to be full of the spirit of tolerance and mutual understanding.

Jōshū Jūshin (趙州従諗 728–897), one of the great Zen masters of the T'ang dynasty, was once asked by one of his disciples Sai, who was a high court official, "Is it possible that a spiritual master like yourself goes to hell?"

The master said, "I am one of the first who go".

"How could such a holy one ever go to hell?"

"If I did not, it would have been impossible to interview you here". This was the master's answer.

The same master was another time approached by an old lady who said, "Women are considered to be heavily laden with the five obstructions. How can I be freed from them?"

The master said, "Let all the other people be born in Heaven, but may I, this old woman, be forever drowned in the ocean of suffering".

When every one of the units composing this universe is suffused with this Great Heart of Compassion and self-sacrifice, the realisation will in no time take place—"Peace on earth and glory in Heaven", which is no other than the embellishing (*vyūha*) of the Pure Land.

〈検印省略〉

1948, 8, 5. 第1刷　1968, 4, 10. 第2刷
松ヶ岡文庫　　印刷所 内外印刷株式会社　　発行者 西村七兵衛
発行所　京都市下京区正面烏丸東　法蔵館