

## TWO MODELS OF ZEN

—METAPHYSICAL AND EXISTENTIAL—

ESHIN NISHIMURA

### I

Zen is simply nothing else than the life-long way of self-inquiry (koji-kyuumei or 己事究明), therefore, the particularity of Zen will be best clarified by seeing what Zen calls ordinary self 己事 which means "matter" of the self. Zen understands self as 事 (ji or matter), like in the case of the Zen saying: "the matter of life and death is great, and yet time is instantly and quickly passes" (生死事大 無常迅速<sup>1)</sup>). In this way, the 事 of 己事 means the matter of the paradoxical and dialectical synthesis of life and death, and moreover when this matter (事) is specifically called "事大", "大" could also be interpreted as that of Buddhist understanding of all existing beings which consist of the four elements (四大) of earth, water, fire, wind (地水火風). The Zen understanding of the self is, in this way, the non-substantial and the impermanent, and that means the staring at the desperate condition of all existing beings themselves. Such Zen understanding of man's existence is neither mere speculation, nor contemplation upon the essence of the desperate condition of man's existence, but the sincere question of how one could cope with such an unavoidable condition of the self. This sincere question is specifically humane because of the secondary relation of man to himself which is already relation itself (contradictory relation between life and death). While man is unaware of this secondary relation (self awareness of his

own self), it is not yet the existential in terms of Kierkegaardian existentialism. "Self-inquiry" in Zen shall become authentic only when man restores such an original relationship to his own self. No matter how man talks about "self inquiry", it would not be authentic as long as he understands himself in a speculative way. 'Self inquiry' should not merely be the inquiry of what-ness of self, but how-ness of self.

"Self inquiry" in its strict sense of Zen, therefore, starts with the great doubt (大疑) about man's existential self. Since the content of the self is fundamentally paradoxical, therefore in the beginning, man wishes to be free from the bondage of despair of self, through the intellectual or speculative way of study on Buddhist texts such as tripitaka, or various sorts of patriarchal records of the Buddhist tradition. But in the course of text study, man becomes dissatisfied with book reading or the intellectual study under a master, since the existential self can never be objectively investigated from the outside; so, as a matter of course, he gives up to proceed that way and turns his direction inwardly to his existential self. Objective knowledge is nothing but a symbol of real fact, and it can not directly touch with the reality of the matter which the physical and temporal self is missing.

The same kind of frustration is seen even inside philosophy as the shift from the speculative philosophy of reason to the existential philosophy of experience. These two different kinds of philosophical attitude co-exist either among the different persons simultaneously under keen tension between each other, or come to existence in a particular individual person one after another. An example of the former will be seen in the co-existence of rational understanding of mythological gods and naive belief in gods of production in ancient Greece, or in the co-existence of two attitudes of religion such as attitude of faith and that of knowledge in the Middleval tradition, or the antagonistic attitude of Pascal against Descartes, of Schelling and Kierkegaard to Hegel in the Modern age.

Schelling's shift in his life course from negative philosophy concerned with essence of Reality (Was-heit) to the positive philosophy concerned with existence of Reality (Wie-heit) will be a typical example of the latter case.

These two dimensions existing in man are the attitude of the objective participation in Truth asking: "What is?" in one way, and that of the subjective participation in Truth asking: "How to?" in the other. And needless to say, both attitudes are based upon the fundamental human requirement.

Reflecting upon the attitude in self inquiry (己事究明), we may notice the fact that there are also two different models among the Zen Buddhist thought tradition. These two approaches to the reality of Zen teaching on self inquiry have been co-existing throughout history, and by the proper nature of self, the existential approach has always been superior over to the intellectual.

To begin with the Meditation of the Buddha, it had a revolutionary meaning to the traditional Indian way of meditation which had been practiced by the people of Brahmanism for the purpose of rebirth in Heaven after death. Though Buddha followed the outer form of traditional meditation practice (yoga), he was critical to the Brahmanic metaphysical philosophy which presupposes an ontological Substance beyond this world of phenomena. His purpose in practicing meditation was to transcend the suffering of all sentient beings amid this world of suffering. Hegel called this specific Indian way of self awareness ("Fürsichwerden der Seele auf die abstrakteste Weise") "Intellektuelle Substantialität<sup>2)</sup>". This kind of thought pattern takes in common the type of mysticism in thought and asceticism in practice, since speculation in general is fundamentally based upon dualism of body and soul.

Buddha's attitude toward such traditional Indian thought was critical as Buddha's Silence (Avyakṛta) to the non-Buddhist philosopher's metaphy-

sical questions shows. For the Buddha, any question of the metaphysical beings has no meaning to solve the existential of man. Karl Jaspers writes; "Buddha takes theoretical treatment of the metaphysical topics even to be injurious. Such a way of treatment produces another bondage. This is because the metaphysical thinking clings to the form of thinking, in spite of fact that the only way of salvation is to be emancipated from such a form of thinking."<sup>3)</sup> Japanese modern philosopher Watsuji Testuro 和辻哲郎, interprets the Buddhas' Silence in the opposite way by saying that silence does not mean the avoidance of metaphysical thinking but is a "definite turning point" that happened in primitive Buddhism: a turn from Ontology to Epistemology occurred in Buddha in the traditional Indian Metaphysical thinking.<sup>4)</sup> Watsuji asserts that the Buddha's silence is not merely the so-called non-Buddhist idea of epoche, but shows his deeper level of investigation about knowledge itself. Reexamination of the meaning of natural knowledge is the crucial point in the Buddha's epistemology, and here we may find the authentic meaning of Buddha. Watsuji's view of Buddha is really unique and precious when he interprets Buddha's silence not as a simple negation of metaphysics, but as the positive acceptance of Reality of all existing being which is fundamentally paradoxical in the way of keeping silence.

## II

When Chinese people accepted Indian Buddhism, they transformed it into their own way in their spirituality which is more down-to-earth and practical than Indian philosophical speculative mode. Zen Buddhism which started by the creative combination of Mahayanistic philosophy and Zazen meditation practice is a typical example of transformation of Indian Buddhism in the Chinese climate. "Daijyou-hekikan" 「大乘壁觀」 or Mahayana Meditation is already seen in Bodhidharma's "Erh-ju-szu-

hsing-lun" or Treatise of the Two Ways and four Practices (菩提達磨「二入四行論」). In this particular text, we may realize that Bodhidharma uses Zazen meditation not to transcend this world of suffering, but to stare at the origins of suffering so that man might accept in the still and hard state of mind of meditation. This text says the following:

The noumenon-entry is to understand the essence of Buddhism through teaching, to believe deeply that all sentient being are equally embodying the same true nature but because of covering of outcome dust, it cannot be manifested. Therefore, if man throws the untruth away and returns to the Truth and steadily stays in the state of wall-like mind, in the oneness of self and other, of the sentient and the holy, with steadiness and unmovedness, moreover, not to follow the letters or teachings, then he is identified with noumenon, so that there exists no dualistic understanding but quietness and spontaneity. This is called the noumenon-entry.

Practice-entry is so-called the four practices to which all other practices are included. What are the four? The first is the practice to return for one's evil deed. The second is the practice to follow the pratyaya (contributory cause). The third is the practice not to want to get anything. The fourth is the practice to be consistent with dharma. What is the practice to return for one's own evil deed? If Buddhist practitioner receives suffering, he should have thought in his mind that in the past lives he mistook the means for the end, therefore he repeated reincarnation with harboring grudge and harming others...accept any suffering with gentle mind with no grudge. Secondly, the practice to follow the pratyaya is to have thought that that all sentient being have no self but tentative combination of pratyaya, therefore they have to accept both suffering and happiness

equally, because everything is the result of pratyaya...Both gain and loss are all the result of pratyaya. There is no increase and decrease in mind. If man's mind is not moved with mere enjoyment, he would be identified with the Way...Thirdly, the practice not to want to get anything...An angel of guna (virtue) and her sister lady darkness are always go hand in hand. The three world of delusion are just like a burning house, and all of those who have a body are suffering. Who else could be peaceful?...Fourthly, the practice to be consistent with dharma is...to give oneself to the other with no grudge in his mind, since all beings have nothing to grudge originally.<sup>5)</sup>

As it is already clear from the above quotation, the four practices are all concerned with suffering of man and his acceptance of it in the non-attaching mind. This teaching tells us the fact that these practices are so Chinese that none of touches any word of Satori experience, while they simply teach us the way of inactivity and nature (無為自然) of Taoism (道教).<sup>6)</sup>

The well-known discussion of the Southern and Northern schools about Satori experience (南頓北漸) also has specific significance in this context.

A) Shen-hsiu's poem runs:

The body is the tree of perfect wisdom (bodhi).  
 The mind is the stand of a bright mirror.  
 At all times diligently wipe it.  
 Do not allow it to become dusty.

B) Hui-neng's poem runs:

Fundamentally perfect wisdom has no tree.  
 Nor has the bright mirror any stand.  
 There is originally nothing.  
 Where has it been defiled by any dust?.

- A) 神秀……身是菩提樹 心如明鏡台 時時勤拭 莫使染塵埃  
 B) 慧能……菩提本無樹 明鏡亦非台 本來無一物 何處有塵埃

In case A, Reality (Bodhi-tree or bright mirror) is objectively investigated, and a gradual approach to the Reality is suggested so as to shift from the unreality of ordinary life to the Reality. However, no matter how one tries to reach the Reality through such a way of approaching, What is realized toward the end of that gradual process would be no more than relative Reality (approximation of Reality) as Sören Kierkegaard always pointed out when he criticized Hegelian quantitative dialectics of "Both-and." For Kierkegaard, Truth should be instantaneously at hand only when man (Sinner=Untruth) chooses "Either-or" in front of God (Truth) existentially. The result expected through the gradual practice of meditation (漸修), therefore in the same way, would be no more than gradual awareness of the Truth (漸悟).

In case B, on the other hand, objective Truth (Bodhi tree, Bright mirror) is negated absolutely as well as objective untruth (dust), and "There is originally nothing" (本來無一物) (or "Buddha nature is always pure" 仏性常清淨 in Tun-huang text) is positively presented. For Hui-neng, man's original nature (absolute Truth) is beyond Truth and Untruth, or in other words, man's existence is the synthesis of Truth and Untruth (this is Reality), therefore if man distinguished these contradictory two elements, he would miss his own existence (this is Unreality). To be aware of existence as a whole instantaneously is Instant awareness [Sudden Enlightenment seems to me to be an inadequate translation] (頓悟) in which Zazen meditation and Satori wisdom is identified (定慧不二). The Platform Scripture (六祖壇經) writes as follows:

Calmness and wisdom are the foundations of my method. first of

all, do not be deceived into thinking that the two are different. They are one substance and not two. Calmness is the substance of wisdom and wisdom is the function of calmness. Whenever wisdom is at work, calmness is within it. Whenever calmness is at work, wisdom is in it. Good and learned friends, the meaning here is that [calmness and] wisdom are identified. Seekers of the Way, arouse your minds. Do not say that wisdom follows calmness or vice versa, or that the two are different.<sup>7)</sup>

If in this life we understand the doctrine of sudden enlightenment, we shall be enlightened and see the Buddha right in front of us.

If one wishes to follow certain practices in order to seek the Buddha [outside], I do not know where he can expect to find the real Buddha.

If one in his own mind sees the real Buddha, that will bring about his realization of Buddhahood.

He who does not seek the real Buddha in himself but seeks him outside, is surely a man of great delusion.<sup>8)</sup>

As we already know, instant Awareness (頓悟) means therefore not instantness of time, but logical Oneness of Zazen and Satori, in a Kierkegaardian sense of Instant which is "Fullness of Time".

Hu-shin (胡適) once writes; "The theory of Instant Awareness by Ho-tsu Shen-hui (荷沢神会) is based upon the teaching of Tao-sheng (道生) who lived in the fifth century and Tao-sheng's teaching was the first revolutionary canon of Chinese thought fired against Indian thought. Its revolutionary weapon was 'Instant awareness' and its target were troublesome 'gradual practices' such as utilitarian acts of benevolence, control of breath and so on so forth<sup>9)</sup>".



## III

In this way Instant Awareness of Southern school became to be a leading faction of Chinese Zen, and Northern school ceased to exist. However, here we see again an interesting opposition between Ho-tse (荷沺宗), and Hung-chou school (洪州宗) that happened to exist within southern school. Kuei-feng Tsung-mi (圭峰宗密) compares four schools of Zen in his days in his "Chung-hua-ch'uan-hsin-t'u-chan-men-shih-tzu-ch'eng-hsi-t'u" [中華伝心地禅門師資承襲図]. The four schools are Pei school (北宗), Hung-chou school (洪州宗), Niu-tou school (牛頭宗), and Ho-tse school (荷沺宗). Concerning the Hung-chou school and Ho-tse school, he writes;

- A) What the Hung-chou school (洪州宗) teaches is that to arouse the mind, to move thinking, to play fingers, to open eyes, and daily behaviours are all nothing but the functions of Buddha nature. Covetousness, anger and delusion; good deed and evil deed; pleasure and suffering. They are all Buddhanature.
- B) What the Ho-tse school (荷沺宗) teaches is that delusion is originally quiet, that the state of dust is originally empty. The heart of unconditioned quietness is spiritual perception (靈知), and therefore not unclear (不昧). This quiet perception of the unconditioned quietness (空寂之寂知) is quiet mind (空寂心) which Bodhidharma ever transmitted. Mind is the perception which is free from both delusion and Satori awareness... Perception is the root of all good (知之一字衆<sup>11)</sup>妙之源).

Even though Tsung-mi asserts that his standpoint (Ho-tse school) is surerior to the others, it takes too much importance upon perception

which uses only intellect, and moreover in this school, perception is given even substantial value, and in so doing, this school (model A) is apart from the mode of Zen which is total inquiry of the existential self.

Model B (Hung-chou school), on the other hand, has nothing to do with intelligence. What it is concerned with is only daily physical motion and behaviours. So-called dynamic daily Zen (平常禪) in the Tang dynasty was rooted in this Hung-chou school of Ma-tsu tao-i (馬祖道一). The essence of Ma-tsu Zen (馬祖禪) would be summarized in the word "action is nature" (作用即性) or "daily behaviours is Buddha behaviour" (日用即妙用), and in this way, Ma-tsu centered Zen among many other Buddhist school. "The Record of Ma-tsu" [江西馬祖道一禪師語錄] states:

Ma-tsu met Nan-yueh Huai-jang (南嶽懷讓) for the first time when he was meditating at Ch'uan-fa-yuan (伝法院)... Nan-yueh asked; "What are you intending by Zazen meditation? Ma-tsu replied; "I intend to become Buddha". Nan-yueh at once brought a piece of tile and polished it in front of the hermitage. Ma-tsu asked; "What are you intending by polishing the tile?" "I hope to make it a mirror" replied Nan-yueh. Ma-tsu said; "How is it possible to get a mirror by polishing a tile". "If so, how is it possible to become Buddha by Zazen meditation?" replied Nan-yue.<sup>12)</sup>

Monk asked Ma-tsu! "What is the authentic understanding to reach Tao?" Ma-tsu replied; "Man originally embodies self nature (自在). Unless he does not attach to the matter of good and evil, he could be called a practicer of Tao. To take good or to avoid evil, or to enter the Samadhi by speculation upon Sunyata are all belonging to delusion.<sup>13)</sup>

Needless to say, what Ma-tsu here calls "self nature" is not specialized

Self nature which is embodied by the specific training of Zen, but very spontaneous physical inborn actions and behaviours in daily life ; therefore, it is neither transcendental nor immanent nature which is idealised through the speculation in any sense of metaphysics. This fact is especially clear when we read the following sentences.

When Ma-tsu asked by Ta-mei fah' ang (大梅法常), "What is Buddha?", Ma-tsu replied, "Your very mind is it" (即汝心是). [In the case of Ching-te chuan-teng-lu (『景德伝灯録』), Ma-tsu's reply is "The very mind is Buddha" (即心是仏)]. Ta-mei asked, "How can I keep it?" Ma-tsu replied, "Take good care of it". Ta-mei asked, "What is Dharma?" Ma-tsu replied, "Your very mind is it". Ta-mei continued to ask, "What is the mind of Patriarch?" Ma-tsu replied, "Your mind is it." Ta-mei said, "The patriarch has no mind, has he?" Ma-tsu replied, "Be aware that your mind is already practicing Dharma". Ta-mei got Satori awareness at this reply.<sup>14)</sup>

Ma-tsu's saying: "Your very mind is it" (即汝心是) is pointing out the essence of his Zen which is most existential, while "The very mind is Buddha" (即心是仏) recorded in Ching-te chuan-teng-lu sounds something like an universal thesis transcending each individual. In fact, Ma-tsu himself says "Mind is not Buddha" (非心非仏) to deny the fixed idea of "Mind is Buddha". Ma-tsu's wellknown saying; "Each of you should reach his own mind rather than memorizing my words" (汝等諸人, 各達自心。莫記吾語) is also a symbolic teaching to push his disciples back to their own self in stead of keeping the master's words in their minds as a golden rule. Since then this saying: "Do not memorize my words" was repeated by the masters of Ma-tsu's lineage such as Pai-chang huai-hai (百丈懷海) and Lin-chi i-hsuan (臨濟義玄).

Let me quote some lines from the Lin-chi-lu (臨濟錄) which show the more practical teaching of his existentialism.

The Master took the high seat in the Hall. he said: "On your lump of red flesh is a true man without rank who is always going in and out of the face of every one of you. Those who have not yet proved him, look, look!"

Then a monk came forward and asked, "What about the true man without rank?"

The Master got down from his seat, seized the monk, and cried, "Speak, speak!"

The monk faltered.

Shoving him away, the Master said, "The true man without rank—what kind of shit-wiping stick is he!" Then he returned to his quarters.<sup>15)</sup>

Bring to rest the thoughts of the ceaselessly seeking mind, and you'll not differ from the Patriarch-Buddha. Do you want to know the Patriarch-Buddha? He is none other than you who stand before me listening to my discourse. Since you students lack faith in yourself, you run around seeking something outside.<sup>16)</sup>

There is only the man of the Way, listening to my discourse, dependent upon nothing—he it is who is the mother of all buddhas. Therefore buddhas are born from non-dependence. Awaken to non-dependence, and there is no buddha to be obtained, either.<sup>17)</sup>

The Master addressed the assembly, saying: "Men who today study the Way must have faith in themselves. Don't seek outside! But you just go on clambering after the realm of worthless dusts, never

distinguishing the false from the true.<sup>18)</sup>

As you might already realized, Lin-chi even uses the word "The true man" (真人) or "The man of the Way" (道人) or "The man listening to my discourse (即今目前聽法底) instead of "mind" (心) or "own mind" (自心) or "Buddha" (仏), and when Lin-chi finally preaches: "On meeting a buddha, slay the buddha; on meeting a patriarch slay the patriarch; on meeting an arhat slay the arhat; on meeting your parent slay the parent; on meeting your kinsman slay your kinsman; and you attain emancipation", Zen brought its existential characteristic into full play.

#### IV

Co-existence of K'an-hua-ch'an (看話禪) of Ta-hui tsung-kao (大慧宗杲) and mo-chao-ch'an (默照禪) of Hung-chih Cheng-chueh (宏智正覺) in the Sung dynasty seems to be a different type of transformation of Zen also caused by the duality of human spirituality that is the speculative and the existential.

Ta-hui's criticism upon Hung-chih was centered on Hung-chih's emphasis upon quiet Zazen meditation and lack of individual satori experience. The central teaching of Hung-chih is the complexity of "mo" (默) which means silence and 'chao" (照) which means illumination. Silence means here the state of mind in Zazen meditation, so it simply means Zazen itself and illumination means here the light naturally shining out of man's original spirituality, so it simply means satori enlightenment. According to Hung-chih, illumination of Spirituality is spontaneously displayed whenever man meditates in silence, so that man does not need to make any effort to get the light of Satori. "The Record of Hung-chih" (「宏智錄」) writes as follows;

It (Reality) belongs to neither practice nor to certification; it is

embodied originally. It is not what is stained what is thoroughly pure. If man illuminates thoroughly, breaks thoroughly, embodies brightly, practises gently, focusing his eyes upon that very purity, there would not be any life-death suffering; nor prints of appearance and disappearance; original light illuminates his crown with emptiness and spirit; original wisdom corresponds each object with quietness and shining<sup>19)</sup>...

From the above quotation, we may investigate that Hung-chih's teaching has enough mood of simple naturarism with which man does on have anything to do by his own effort, and this is the typical type of theory of "Original awareness" (本覺) which teaches "from effect to cause" (從果向因). "The Letters of Ta-hui" (「大慧書」) are criticizing Hung-chih from the standpoint of "First awareness" (始覺) which teaches "from cause to effect" (從因向果) as follows;

Today, there is a kind of heretic-like priest (一種剃頭外道) who leads people to dwell in peace (安住) only, in spite of fact that his mind-eye (心眼) has not yet opened. If man were satisfied with such a way of dwelling in peace, no matter that a thousand Buddhas appear in this world, he could never dwell in peace, but his mind only puzzled. This kind of priest also lets people sit in silence-illumination (默照) by forgetting all feelings in illumination and acception, and in this way, illusion increases more and more endlessly. By completely mistaking the Patriarch's way, and absurd guidance, such a kind of priest spoils people' life and let them be indifferent to this matter (是事)<sup>20)</sup>.

Ta-hui, on the other hand, positively asserts the importance of Satori experience which is realized by breaking the doubt about individual

existence. He writes;

Once one gets The Mind (此心), he has to take the Satori experience as the ultimate principle (当以悟為則)... As one is with Koan, who is he? As one knows that his spiritual ability is inferior, who is he? As one seeks for the clue to begin with, who is he? I (Ta-hui) do not hesitate to tell you (Wang-yen-chang, 汪彦章) that you are the only Wan-yen-chang and there is nobody else; There is only one Wan-yen-chan; where can you find any other than you who is with the Koan right now? You have to know that the man of inferior spiritual ability who is seeking for the clue to begin with is no other than Wan-yen-chan. There is no other Wan-yen-chang. If this were the true existential Wan-yen-chang, his spiritual ability would not be inferior and he would not seek for any clue to begin with, but have faith in the Master of his own home (自家主人公), therefore, there would not be any trouble at all.<sup>21)</sup>

As in case of Hung-chih, "Original awareness (本覺) a priori gives us a sense of metaphysical substance, so in the case of ta-hui, we can not help admitting a somehow metaphysical mood when he teaches Satori awareness as the Ultimate Principle (以悟為則). But at the same time, we see in Ta-hui the full sense of existentialism when he put emphasis upon the individual being saying "you are the only Wan-yen-chang and there is nobody else (只是箇汪彦章, 更無兩箇).

## V

Japanese Zen started in the Kamakura period as a copy of Sung Dynasty Zen on one hand a criticism of it on the other. Eihei-dogen (永平道元), for example, transmitted the Ts'ao-tung-ch'an (曹洞禪) of

Tien-tung ju-ching (只管打坐) which puts importance upon single-minded Zazen (天童如淨) with his authentic experience of "relaxation of body and mind" (身心脱落). Also he introduced daily rules of Zen monastery (叢林清規) which eliminated the secular part of Sung Zen monastic rules.

As it is well known, young Dogen faced fundamental question about Buddhist practice asking why all Buddhas ever wanted to achieve Satori, in spite of the fact that each of the Buddhist schools is talking about man's original Dharma nature and his inborn self-natured body. Dogen's question was really existential doubt about the meaning of Buddhism itself which is represented by the Hongaku doctrine (本覺法門) of the Tien-tai school. Dogen studied and doubted the Hongaku doctrine which belongs to the category of working from the result toward the cause (從果向因). He went over to China and studied Zen under Tien-tung ju-ching (天童如淨) who was respecting Hung-chih and yet critical about his Original awareness. Tien-tung ju-ching's Zen was tending to "First awareness" (始覺) which belongs to the category of working from cause toward result (從因向果). Zazen practice was important to get Satori awareness for Ju-ching. But his Zazen practice was not to wait for Satori (待悟): rather he regarded practice itself as no other than a manifestation of original awareness (本証妙修<sup>22</sup>).

Dogen's saying: "I realized that the eyes are horizontal and the nose is vertical" (眼橫鼻直) and "I return Home with empty hands" (空手還鄉) are the declaration of his independence from the traditional Zen sect (禪宗) by returning to his own existence.

Syuhou-myouchou (宗峰妙超) in the Rinzai background is another example of reducing Zen into Self inquiry only (己事究明專一) when he admonishes students in his will (「與禪大燈國師遺誡」) saying: "Unless devote yourself to the good Way which Buddhas or Patriarchs have not transmitted, true Buddhism ceases to exist because of the vanishing of the cause-effect chain... On the other hand, those who devote themselves only



to self-inquiry, will be meeting with me every day no matter how long after my death." Shuuhou-myouchou was critical against people of Five mountains (五山) who are just engaging in the cultural life of Zen temples while forgetting their self-inquiry.

Bankei-youtaku (盤珪永琢) was the most extreme in this sense. He preaches Zen to the lay people as well as his monks in just ordinary Japanese daily language (平話 or 国語) without using any technical terms of Zen tradition. His Zen teaching is specifically called "non-born Zen" (不生禪), since he only taught "The unborn Buddha-mind which parent have given birth to" (親の産み付けてたもった不生の仏心). He simply directs each student to his own self, saying:

I was still a young man when I came to discover the principle of the Unborn and its relation to thought. I began to tell others about it. What we call a "thought" is something that has already fallen one or more removes from the loving reality of the Unborn. If you priests would just live in Unborn, there wouldn't be anything for me to tell you about it, and you wouldn't be here listening to me. But because of the unbornness and marvelous illuminative power inherent in the Buddha-mind, it readily reflects all things that come along and transforms itself into them, thus turning the Buddha-mind into thought. I'm going to tell those in the lay audience all about this now. As I do, I want the priests to listen along too.

Not a single one of you people at this meeting is unenlightened. Right now, you're all sitting before me as Buddhas. Each of you received the Buddha-mind from your mothers when you born, and nothing else. This inherited Buddha-mind is beyond any doubt unborn, with a marvelously bright illuminative wisdom. In the Unborn, all things are perfectly resolved. I can give you proof that they are. While you're facing me listening to me speak like this, if

a crow cawed, or a sparrow chirped, or some other sound occurred somewhere behind you, you would have no difficulty knowing it was a crow or a sparrow, or whatever, even without giving a thought to listening to it, because you were listening by means of the Unborn.

If anyone confirms that this unborn, illuminative wisdom is in fact the Buddha-mind and straight lives, as he is, in the Buddha-mind, he becomes at that moment a living Tathagata, and he remains one for infinite kalpas in the future.<sup>23)</sup>

Bankei's "direct pointing Zen" (直示禪) is actually only one Zen teaching that is created in Japan independently from Chinese Zen, as D. T. Suzuki always pointed out.<sup>24)</sup> It may also be interpreted as the Japanese transformation of the Tang dynasty Zen of ma-tsu or Lin-chi. Paradoxically speaking, on the contrary, it seems to be similar to the naturalism of Sitting-awareness (修証一如) of Dogen, as is severely criticized by Hakuin (白隱慧鶴) later on. Bankei actually taught not to wait for Satori experience, while Hakuin put emphasis upon the "Seeing" of the self nature (見性).

Biographically speaking, while young Bankei entered the Zen school with his intellectual question about the meaning of "bright virtue" (明德) in the Ta-hsueh (or Great Learning, 「大学」), a Confucian classic text, young Hakuin entered for the purpose of escaping from his fear of Hell which he happened to know through a Buddhist preacher when he visited a Nichiren temple with his mother. Hakuin's life-long theme was how to be emancipated from fear of Hell and therefore the evident transcending experience once for all was crucial. In his old age, after he was eighty years old (he died at age eighty-four), he often made calligraphies saying "Adoration of the Great Hell Bodhisattva" (南無地獄大菩薩). From this fact, one may easily understand how Hakuin hated those who are satisfied with nothing to do but Zazen meditation only without defi-

nite experience of awareness of reality of man's existence. For Hakuin, Oneness of practice and awareness (修証一等) was nothing but the "illusional meditation in demon's cave" (鬼窟裡活計) or simply "A old great demon guarding dead body" (一箇老大の守屍鬼)<sup>25)</sup>

According to the traditional thought of Japanese Zen, Souto Zen has been interpreted as the school of "Original awareness" (本覚的禪風), while Rinzai Zen that of "First awareness" (始覚的禪風). it seems to be reasonable so far as we have above discussed. However, among contemporary Buddhist scholars today in Japan, Dogen is taken as the person who severely attacked Original-awareness and Rinzai Zen as more Original-awareness type of Zen, especially when Hakuin teaches in his poem of adoration of Zazen (「坐禪和讃」) writing: "Inborn Buddha-nature a priori existing in all sentient beings" (「衆生本来仏なり」). It would be correct in one way or the other, but what Hakuin pointed out is to realize the existence of Buddha-nature by one's own existential effort, therefore there would be nothing existing unless man makes sure of his own inborn self-nature. Hakuin teaches that Buddha-nature is self nature and the essence of self-nature is no-nature (「自性即ち無性にて、既に戲論を離れたり」). Hakuin does not have any idea of metaphysical substance like "Original awareness primary existing before man's self realization.

However, what is more serious is that Hakuin's creative Koan system to lead student to the essential core of Rinzai Zen is now mistaken by Rinzai student as a defined model of Zen study, so that Rinzai students today give all their effort only for finding an ideal answer to each Koan, and are satisfied with their master's agreement to his answer, forgetting the original function of the Koan to make one realize his existential self by way of breaking through his ordinary self-consciousness. The short coming of Japanese Rinzai Zen is in fact that self-inquiry is now replaced by Koan-inquiry, and in this way, Rinzai Zen seems to be tending toward

a kind of metaphysical Satori experience. As I discussed before in the beginning of this presentation, the transcendence of Zen has to mean the entire freedom from all kind of speculative tendency and the returning to the ordinary life with entirely and qualitatively different eyes to live this life in the most existential way.

### Notes

- 1) 『勅修百丈清規』下一「遊方參請」
- 2) Vorlesugen über die Geschichte der Philosophie, herausgegeben von Michelet, S. 162.
- 3) 『ヤスバース選集』V, p. 33.
- 4) 『原始仏教の實踐哲学』岩波書店, 1932, p. 160.
- 5) 理入者, 謂藉教悟宗, 深信含生凡聖同一真性, 但為客塵妄覆, 不能顯了。若也捨妄帰真, 凝住壁觀, 自他凡聖等一, 堅住不移, 更不隨於文教, 此即與理冥符, 無有分別, 寂然無為, 名之理入。  
行入者, 所謂四行, 其餘諸行, 悉入此行中。何等為四, 一者報怨行, 二者隨緣行, 三者無所求行, 四者稱法行。云何報怨行。修道人, 若受苦時, 當自念言, 我從往昔, 無數劫中, 棄本從末, 流浪諸有, 多起怨憎, 違害無限。……甘心忍受, 都無怨訴。第二隨緣行者, 衆生無我, 並緣業所轉, 苦樂齊受, 皆從緣生。……得失從緣, 心無增減, 喜風不動, 冥順於道。……。第三無所求行者, ……功德黑闇, 常相隨逐, 三界久居, 猶如火宅。有身皆苦, 誰得而安, ……。第四稱法行者, ……法體無慳, 於身命財, 行檀棄施, 心無惜惜。……。
- 6) cf. 禪の語録1 『達磨の語録』p. 38, 柳田聖山注。
- 7) “The Platform Scripture” trans. by Wing-tsit Chan, St. John Univ. 1963, p. 45「我此法門以定慧為本。第一勿迷信定慧別。定慧體不二。即定是慧體, 即慧是定用。即慧之時定在慧, 即定之時慧在定。善知識, 此義即是定慧等。學道之人作意。莫言先定後慧, 先慧後定, 定慧各別。」
- 8) *ibid.* pp. 145-147「今生若悟頓教門, 悟即眼前見世尊。若欲修行去覓仏, 不知何處求真。若能心中自見真, 見真即是成仏因果。自不求真外覓仏, 去覓總是大癡人。」
- 9) 『神和尚遺集』, p. 39;「這是中國思想對於印度思想的革命的第一大炮。革命的武器是『頓悟』。革命的对象是積功積, 調息安心等等煩瑣的『漸修』工夫。」
- 10) 『禪の語録』9, p. 307.
- 11) *ibid.* p. 317.
- 12) 入矢義高編『馬祖の語録』p. 3.
- 13) *ibid.* p. 24.
- 14) 『祖堂集』卷十五, 大梅章。
- 15) “The Record of Lin-chi” trans. by R. F. Sasaki, The Institute for Zen Studies, 1975, p. 3.

- 16) *ibid.* p. 7.
- 17) *ibid.* p. 14.
- 18) *ibid.* p. 16.
- 19) text publ. by 名著普及会, p. 298 「渠非修証, 本來具足。他不污染, 徹底清淨。正当具足清淨處, 著得箇眼, 照得徹, 脫得盡, 体得明, 踐得穩, 生死元無根帶, 出沒元無朕迹, 本光照頂, 其虛而靈, 本智応縁, 雖寂而耀。」
- 20) 『禪の語録』17「大慧書」p. 19「今時有一種剃頭外道, 自眼不明, 只管教人死獗狙地, 休去歇去。若如此休歇, 到千仏出世, 也休歇不得, 轉使心頭迷悶耳。又教人隨縁管, 忘情默照, 照來照去, 帶來帶去, 轉加迷悶, 無有了期。殊失祖師方便, 錯指示人, 教人一向虛生浪死, 更教人是事莫管。」
- 21) 『禪の語録』17「大慧書」p. 118「既辨此心, 當以悟為則。……正提撕時, 是阿誰。能知根性陋劣底, 又是阿誰。求入頭處底, 又是阿誰。妙喜不避口業, 分明為居士說破。只是箇汪彦章, 更無兩箇。只有一箇汪彦章, 更那裏得箇提撕底, 知根性陋劣底, 求入頭處底來。當知皆是汪彦章影子, 並不干他汪彦章事。若是真箇汪彦章, 根性必不陋劣, 必不求入頭處。但只信得自家主人公及, 並不消得許多勞攘。」
- 22) cf. 石井修道『宋代禪宗史の研究』p. 355.
- 23) “The Unborn” tr. by Norman Waddell. North Point Press, 1984, pp. 34-35.
- 24) 『鈴木大拙全集』第一卷 p. 7.
- 25) cf. 『遠羅天釜』卷之上, 「答鍋島摂州殿下近侍書」(『白隠和尚全集』第五卷, p. 128)

\* This article was presented at The Conference on Medieval Zen in Cross Cultural Perspective, sponsored by Hsi-Lai University, Los Angeles May 13-16, 1992.