

Chapter One

Introduction

Harada Sekkei Roshi: There is something mysterious, but it's important, there is something and it's mysterious.

Reggie: I see.

Harada Sekkei Roshi: But nevertheless the attitude of science is that they can't leave it just being mysterious. They've got to try and understand it.

Reggie: I know, I know. This is the challenge. Yes.

Harada Sekkei Roshi: You do it that way, leaving it mysterious.
(Interview, November 14, 2000, p. 18)

A major focus of psychology has been to try to understand the human mind. Many different theories, beginning with Freudian psychology, about how mind works have been advocated over the last century and more. All have been an attempt to explain, to understand, to know. They have been attempts to address the fundamental concerns of how a human can be happy and at peace – what is a person, what is mental pathology, and how does healing occur.

These theories that have been promulgated have been used as guides, as templates, in how to help people alleviate their suffering. How a clinician actually responds to their client is in part based on their theory of how the human mind works. For instance, if a client walks into a psychotherapist's office and says, "I feel terrible," the psychotherapist has many theoretical options from which to choose in deciding how to intervene. A Freudian may guide a person to examine their childhood. A Jungian may want to investigate their dreams. A Brief Therapy model-based therapist may want to look for a person's exceptions to this behavior.

This *can't* know, this mystery, I believe is the foundation of the practice and philosophy of Zen Buddhism. About this mystery many, many sutras and Buddhist texts have been written over the centuries and certain specific practices have been developed, the aim of which is to train people to realize in their own experience what can't be known.

Hopefully this mystery will be the guide and foundation of this study. It is the heart of what a person is from a Zen perspective. And it is based on this that pathology and healing are understood.

The aspects of the human mind that Zen addresses are vast. How mind functions is viewed in many different ways. Investigating these ways fully would be a lifetime of work. Thus, I initially chose in this study to focus on two ideas that are fundamental to the Zen understanding of mind. These were *pratya* (Skt., Jap. *en* 縁) and *pratitya-samutpada* (Skt., Jap. *engi* 縁起), which are the Buddhist idea of causality, and attachment (Jap. 執着 = *shu-chaku* in Japanese, *shu-jaku* in Japanese Buddhist terminology), which is one way to translate the word used for the Second Noble Truth, the cause of suffering.

As this study progressed, I realized that I couldn't focus on these two ideas without also focusing on the idea that is fundamental to the functioning of mind from the Zen perspective. Without doing this, my study would be missing the element that ties the Zen understanding together. Thus, the mystery also had to be included. It is what Zen considers to be the fundamental nature of a person. It is commonly spoken of in Zen as no-self or no ego (Jap. 無我 = *muga*), or emptiness (Jap. 空 = *ku*, or 空っぽ = *kara-po* colloquially in Japanese). Thus

there are three ideas that are focused on in this study--causality, attachment, and no-self.

Much has been written about the psychology of Buddhism in general and Zen in particular. As Buddhism and Zen grow in popularity in the West, the volumes increase. I am part of this interest in the West. As a practicing psychotherapist, I am interested in how the implicit psychology of Zen can be applied to clinical work. This is the motivation for this study. The approach of this study to understand the Zen answers to the fundamental questions of psychology is to find out how people are living this psychology. This study has been done in the spirit of Husserl, whose watchword was "to the things themselves" (Spiegelberg, 1982, p. 680). The guiding question has been what is the mind of a Zen master in a traditional Japanese context? This study seeks to understand psychologically the three selected ideas through the reports of those who are living the practice of their sect of Zen and are acknowledged by others as having realized the truth of the teachings of Zen. What is the lived experience of the teaching of Zen will be the lens through which the Zen answers to the fundamental questions of psychology are understood.

The Relevance of Zen to Psychology--A Personal View

This is a subject that I approach with passion. I am not a neutral observer in this work. In fact I feel that my life is at stake in this enterprise. By life what I mean is not the externals in life, like career or relationships with others or such.

Life here has more to do with what might be called my essence or my soul in Christian terms, or my original nature or my face before my parents were born in Zen terms. Life here is about who or what am I and how am I a part of this great universe in which I find myself.

Questions about the fundamental nature of life have been nagging me for as long as I can remember. They seemed to have originated in this unsettled sense I've always had that something wasn't quite right, something wasn't satisfied, that the usuals in life, such as a family and career and leisure pursuits, weren't enough. I have enjoyed the usuals, I have wanted them in my life, but I couldn't settle just for the usuals. I felt impelled to address something more fundamental, more basic, to life.

My first experience of finding some kind of answer to this nagging sense I had came while listening to a tape of a lecture by Ram Dass (formerly Richard Alpert, an American who had gone to India to study with a guru, Neem Karoli Baba, and after returning to the United States in 1969 gave many lectures on yoga) when I was twenty years old. I had an experience that I felt answered all my questions and afterwards I thought that my search was finished. However, over the next few months my sense of dissatisfaction with life gradually returned. I slowly and reluctantly came to admit that during my experience my ego had seemed to have had disappeared, but after the experience faded away, my ego was still firmly functioning. I came to believe that my ego was the source of my dissatisfaction with life. The value of the experience then became that I had received a glimpse, an intuition, a possibility for realizing the truth of my

fundamental nature. Ever since then I have been on a journey to actualize in life what I then intuited.

This intuition has been my guide since then. Initially I practiced various Indian disciplines. Then Ram Dass told me one day to study with a Japanese Zen master, saying that, “Your heart is okay, but your mind is a mess. Maybe some mental discipline will do you some good.” When I met this Zen master, I immediately intuited that this was a person who had actually realized in life what I had only intuited so far. The journey eventually led me to Japan, where in 1990 I met my present Zen teacher.

Since my first encounter with Zen in 1974, I have received through my Zen practice many experiences of my fundamental nature. A good example is the following: I had been at the monastery in Japan where I practice Zen with my teacher, Harada Sekkei Roshi, for about six weeks during the fall of 1993. Just before the end of this stay during a personal interview regarding my Zen practice Harada Roshi asked me, “When you return to America and someone asks you what is Zen, how will you answer?” Upon hearing this my mind immediately flashed through many of the experiences I had had during my years of Zen practice and then flashed upon what seemed to be an infinite variety of possible experiences that I had not yet had. I was so overwhelmed by the breadth and depth of all of this that to try to put this into words seemed crazily impossible. At that moment I burst into very loud laughter. I then stopped laughing and was quiet while I searched for words to describe this. As I started to speak, fumbling for words, Roshi interrupted me. He smiled, leaned towards me, and said, “Your

ha ha ha--that is a very good answer!” In that moment of spontaneous, wild laughter there was a mutual recognition of an aliveness of being that I intuit as my fundamental nature.

As wonderful as these kinds of moments have been, I am not a monk. I am a person of the world, having relationships and wanting to do many things. My passion for life is not only for the true nature of life, but also for the more tangible aspects of life. And as I experienced various aspects life, such as relationships, work situations, and bodily health concerns, I sought for a way to express my intuition in the midst of these various activities. This led me to psychology.

Psychology was attractive to me because it worked with the personal issues of everyday life. It is very directly dealing with my moment-to-moment life experience. As I focused on my personal experience, aspects of myself came alive that previously had been dormant. I learned about communication. I learned about staying with my feelings even when they are unpleasant. I learned about thoughts and feelings that I always had had, but of which I was not aware. I learned the connection between my thoughts, my emotions, my body, and my behavior. I learned about my unconscious and the influence of my family history.

As I engaged psychology, initially as a client and later as a psychotherapist for others, my original intuition and my experiences in my Zen practice were my guides. My whole purpose in engaging psychology was to find a way to live what I had previously intuited and then experienced in moments in

my Zen practice. To integrate Zen and psychology was not a question for me of if it was possible. It had to be possible. For me both were dealing with the same fundamental matter. Thus I began to search for ways to integrate the two.

This integration has been an experience with mixed results. In various ways I have heard that it can't be done. One of my professors in graduate school told me the two forms had such different purposes and ways of doing things that it wasn't possible to combine them. I read about how Jung strongly believed that Westerners should not do psychology based on Eastern practices and understandings (Clarke, 1994, pp. 61-64; Coward, 1985, pp. 61-75). I would commonly hear at American Zen centers that Zen in Japan was dead, just empty ceremonies without any living sitting practice, and that Zen in America was evolving in new ways that are culturally congruent with Americans.

After I came to Japan I heard in different ways about the difficulties of my endeavor. Psychology is not nearly as popular in Japan as it is in America. In particular there is not the understanding that psychotherapy is a valid way of dealing with the difficulties of everyday people in everyday life. Psychology is more reserved for more severe psychopathology. So commonly among Japanese people there is not an understanding of psychotherapy as I am trying to practice it. Also, the basis of the practice of Zen is expressed differently among Japanese people. I am convinced that the fundamental matter is the same with both Easterners and Westerners, but how to communicate this and talk about it is a major challenge. The result has been that it has been very difficult to understand the psychology of Zen, as my understanding of psychology is quite different than

the Japanese *roshis* (Jap. 老師 = Zen master) that I have interviewed for this study.

Despite these difficulties the intuition of the fundamental aliveness of being persists, as it always has. The difficulties are recognized, but I believe all of the *roshis* who have participated in this study share with me a belief that a psychology for everyday people based on Zen is not only possible, but also needed in the contemporary world. Realizing and living the mystery of life is the natural state of all human beings. How mind works in this natural state is the psychology of Zen. Investigating this psychology is the focus of this study.

Zen Buddhism and this Study

Zen Buddhism is a religion that has a long history of development and changing forms. When viewed from a historical perspective, it is difficult to say exactly what Zen is. Even today, there are many different forms of Zen being practiced throughout the world. Within Japan itself the two main contemporary schools of Zen Buddhism, the Rinzai sect (臨濟宗) and the Soto sect (曹洞宗), have many differences as well as many aspects in common.

Zen is a Japanese word that refers to the school of Buddhism that developed in Japan that had its historical roots in the Chan sect of Buddhism in China. Bernard Faure (1993) writes at the beginning of his book about the relationship between Chan and Zen:

There is undeniably a continuity between Chan and Zen, and most scholars consider the two terms interchangeable. However, there are many historical, cultural, and doctrinal differences as well, and these differences are not merely superficial: they would surely

affect the ‘essence’ of Zen, if this term had any referent. Two basic assumptions of this book are that there is no such ‘essence’ and that discontinuities are, when one focuses on them, at least as obvious as continuity. (p. 3)

Of the several schools of Chan Buddhism in China there were two that reached Japan. These two developed into the contemporary Rinzai and Soto schools (Fischer-Schreiber, Ehrhard, & Diener, 1991, p. 262). In the true spirit of the Western synchronistic approach to Buddhism, I have had personal experience practicing Zen under Japanese teachers from both of these schools. I use the term “synchronistic” because Japanese people do not usually practice this way. They may change teachers, but only within the lineage and sect of which they are a part. This point is commonly misunderstood by Western practitioners.

I have thus had the opportunity to experience as well as study academically both contemporary Japanese schools of Zen. I have found in these two schools differences in ways to practice Zen. With my Rinzai teacher I did, or at least tried to do, *koan* (Jap. 公案) practice. A *koan* is a question asked by a Zen master to their student that is used as a focal point in Zen meditation. *Koan* study as it is practiced today in the Rinzai sect is based on the formulation of Hakuin Zenji (1689-1769) in Japan in the eighteenth century (Fischer-Schreiber et al., 1991, pp. 80-81). There are many different versions varying from lineage to lineage, but all have a series of *koans* that a person must pass through. With my Soto teacher I did *shikantaza* (Jap. 只管打座), which is just sitting without a meditation object. Together with *shikantaza koan* practice also is engaged, but not as a series of *koans*. In Soto practice a student often has only one *koan* for their whole length of practice.

Although I found this difference of use in *koans* and other differences as well, I also experienced many similarities between Rinzai and Soto. Despite what Faure asserts in the previous quote, which others also have asserted, my experience has been that the “essence” of what my two teachers were talking about was the same. The forms have been very different, but the sense of enlightenment and freedom that I felt in the company of each Zen master was the same. The way of speaking, the metaphors used, the explanations of the Chinese Zen texts, the forms of practice, were all different. Yet, my intuition was always that they were talking about the same thing. My reason for changing from a Rinzai teacher after sixteen years to a Soto teacher was not that I believed my Soto teacher to be superior or different, but rather because I believed that I could understand him better – and because, in all honesty, I was a *koan* student failure. I needed a different form of practice. Still, I felt I was fundamentally still doing the same thing.

I do not believe that the essence of Zen is the same as all other religions. I think that the differences are too significant to be able to assert this. I have never thought that the realization of a Zen master and a great Christian saint are the same. Many people assert that Buddhism is a kind of *philosophia perennis*, an expression of the fundamental universal religious nature of mankind. Aldous Huxley (1945) wrote about this philosophy in *The Perennial Philosophy*. About *philosophia perennis*, Huxley wrote, “Rudiments of the Perennial Philosophy may be found among the traditionary lore of primitive peoples in every region of

the world, and in its fully developed forms it has a place in every one of the higher religions” (1945, p. vii).

The Zen Buddhism that I want to research is very informed by my personal experience. It is contemporary Japanese Zen that I am interested in. This is distinct from Zen outside of Japan. This Zen is a part of the Buddhist tradition. Zen Buddhism is Buddhism, so it does have aspects in common with other schools of Buddhism going back to the Buddha himself. Thus, on occasions it is appropriate to refer to Buddhist ideas. However, there is much about Zen that is distinctly Japanese, particularly in the ways of doing and explaining the practice.

Even within Zen as it is practiced today in Japan there is a great disparity of forms within the Soto and Rinzai schools. For example, many Zen priests never do Zen meditation while others do. When I stayed at Rinso-in Temple in Yaizu-shi, Shizuoka prefecture, in 1989 with a group from America, the meditation hall had been refurbished specifically for our use. According to the resident priest it had not been used in about one hundred years. This is not uncommon in contemporary Japan. The primary occupation of many, if not most, Japanese Zen priests is various ceremonies for the dead, something I have very little interest in.

My interest in this study are those parts of Japanese Zen Buddhism that are actively involved in the personal practice of the realization of enlightenment, *satori* (Jap. 悟) in Zen language. This practice is based on the intuition that one has a true self that is not fully realized in one’s life and experience. The drive

for *satori* is the drive to realize fully and completely this true self. This type of practice is done in both the Soto and Rinzai schools, as my own experience attests.

I personally believe this is the important question for Zen and Buddhism in general in the West. As Buddhism becomes established in a new land, a new kind of people must understand in their own way what is the truth of the Buddhist teaching. The nature of enlightenment is crucial to this endeavor.

Therefore, the Zen Buddhism that I will refer to in this report and have studied is the Zen that is actively involved in the practice of enlightenment. This is a kind of cross-Zen practice, if you will, but not all of Zen. It is specific to Japan and is not generalizable to Chan in China or Zen in the West.

Zen Buddhism and Psychology

Buddhist psychology has been developed in great detail in some Buddhist schools, notably the Abhidhamma from Theravada Buddhism and the Yogacara school of Mahayana Buddhism. Some schools of East Asian Buddhism have a developed psychology. The Hosso (Jap. 法相宗) sect¹ of Japanese Buddhism is an example of this. Within Zen Buddhism itself, however, in general not much attention is given to the specific functioning of mind. More commonly it is mentioned in passing, as Sekkei Harada Roshi (1998) does on page 188 of *The Essence of Zen*. Here Harada writes, “The source of the consciousness of the ego-self is called the “store consciousness” (Jap. 阿頼耶識 *arayashiki*, Skt. *alaya-vijnana*). This consciousness is *said* (italics added) to be the origin of

delusion.” The specific functions of mind are thus generally thought of in Zen as working according to what is described in old Buddhist texts, such as the Lankavatara Sutra, but are not given much attention in daily practice.

There are many reasons for this. One of these is the tradition of a “transmission from mind to mind,” *ishin denshin* (以心傳心) in Japanese.² This is the belief that the understanding of the truth of reality cannot be transferred from master to disciple through intellectual means. It can only be transferred directly mind to mind, without words. One of the earliest examples of this in Buddhism came during Buddha’s lecture at Vulture Peak when he held up a flower. No one understood except Mahakashyapa, who smiled. The Buddha recognized thereby that Mahakashyapa understood and afterwards appointed him as his dharma successor (Huikai, 1228/1977, case #6).

There is a deep distrust of language and intellectual understanding in Zen. Zen masters have often said over the centuries that the sutras cannot be understood in truth intellectually. An example of this is the story of Te-shan Hsuan-chien (Chinese, Jap. Tokusan), who was a very learned scholar of the sutras in China. One day at a teashop the old lady proprietor asked Te-shan Hsuan-chien by what mind did he understand the sutras. He could not answer, decided to become a monk, and burned all of his writings (Huikai, 1228/1977, case #28).

The rational mind, with its use of discrimination, logic, and language, is understood to have a great capacity for delusion. People misunderstand these

functions of mind and believe that there is real significance to the perceptions that they have through these functions.

What is trusted in Zen is the non-rational, which has the potential for a person to understand what is outside the limitations of the rational mind.

Bodhidharma (Skt., Jap. 菩提達摩 *Bodai Daruma*--d. 520), who according to the myth of the tradition brought the practice of Zen from India to China,³ perhaps set the tone for this in his meeting with the Chinese Emperor Wu. When asked by Emperor Wu who he was, Bodhidharma responded by saying, “I don’t know”, or more literally translated, “don’t know” (Yuanwu, 1125/1977, case #1). The latter translation is attractive to me because it leaves out the “I.”

An excellent example of this “don’t know” in practice is can be found in the *Mumonkan*, case #19 (Huikai, 1228/1977) in the dialogue between Zen master Nansen and his student Joshu.⁴ Joshu asked Nansen what was the Way of Buddha and Nansen replied that it was “everyday mind.” Joshu was confused, so he asked what kind of practice would be good to do. Nansen replied, “If you seek for it, you’ll only go in the wrong direction.” Joshu was further confused, so he asked how he could ever understand the Way without practice. Nansen’s answer was, “The Way is neither knowing nor not knowing. Knowing is illusion, not knowing is indifference.⁵”

The “don’t know” of Bodhidharma is not nihilism nor apathy, but something which is neither knowing nor not knowing. It is not something that can be solely understood through the means of the intellect. It is something that

is an expression of a person's fundamental nature, or, in Zen language, a person's Buddha nature.

The focus in Zen has been on this "don't know", on Buddha nature, or leaving it mysterious, as Harada Roshi was quoted at the beginning of this paper. Detailing a psychology has great potential for delusion from this perspective. Doing so can give the impression that mind is some kind of fixed entity, that it only works in specific ways, and thereby lose its fundamental nature, its mysterious nature. Psychology can thus easily become an expression of the discriminative mind and miss other functions of mind. Using a common Buddhist metaphor (Sheng-yen, 1997, p. 39), psychology is intended to be the finger pointing at the moon, that is, a description of mind; but often gets mistaken for the moon itself, that is, the means of the description are equated with mind, thereby missing other functions of mind.

Indeed there is an understanding of mind that serves as a basis for the Zen way to realize one's true self. It is founded on this not knowing, this mystery. It is imperative that this mysterious nature of mind be expressed through all of the articulating the functions of mind as understood in Zen practice. Each function of mind is empty, *ku* (空) in Japanese, non-substantial, transient, and not fixed absolutely as it is described. Mind is free, wild and untamed, as surely as it is rooted in the moment, in the body-mind of each sentient being.

Definition and Discussion of Terms

The law of cause and effect.

From the Buddhist viewpoint all phenomena are the result of various causes, in Japanese *en* (縁) or *innen* (因縁). Nothing can exist independently of causal factors. This is the Buddhist law of cause and effect, *inga* 因果 in Japanese. This law states that every cause *in* 因 will have an effect *ka* 果 and every result has its cause.

The definition of the law of cause and effect that is found in two Pali Canon texts (*Majjhima Nikaya III, Samyutta Nikaya II*) is:

When this is, that is
 This arising, that arises
 When this is not, that is not
 This ceasing, that ceases. (Rahula, 1974, p. 53)

The law of cause and effect is asserted by many to be the first or basic doctrine of Buddhism (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 61; Kalansuriya, 1987, p. 126; Masutani, 1996, pp. 109-110; Mizuno, 1987, p. 41; Rahula, 1974, p. 53). It is the fundamental way in which Buddhism understands how the world appears. Kalansuriya (1987) writes, “In the *Majjhima Nikaya*, the Buddha contends: ‘He who sees causality sees the *Dhamma – Yo paticcasamuppadam passati so dhammam passati*’”(p. 126). According to Buddhism causality is how life arises, exists and continues, and passes away.

The law of cause and effect was the Buddha’s answer to understanding death. To solve the problem of death was perhaps the Buddha’s greatest desire. This problem has been always been the focus of Zen Buddhist practice. Dogen (Jap. 道元), the founder of the Soto Zen Buddhist sect in Japan, wrote in the *Hokke-ten-hokke* chapter of the *Shobogenzo*, “The clarification of life, and the

clarification of death, are the one great purpose of Buddhists” (1233-1253/1994, p. 108). Almost every meditation hall at Zen monasteries in Japan has a sign on which is written, usually in old Chinese script, “謹白大衆 生死事大 無常迅速 各宜醒覺 慎勿放免.” In the entrance hall to the meditation hall at Harada Roshi’s monastery in Obama-shi, Japan, there is an accompanying sign in English that translates this as: “Respectfully I appeal to you: Each of us must clarify the great matter of life and death. Time passes swiftly. Do not be negligent.”

The relationship between cause and effect in the Buddhist sense has certain specific characteristics according to which it always operates. Kalansuriya (1987, p. 129) identifies these as being objectivity, necessity, invariability, and conditionality. Objectivity means that specific conditions, neither more nor less, bring about specific effects. Necessity means that when certain conditions come together they necessarily produce a certain effect. Invariability means that effect produced is always the same from certain specific conditions. Conditionality means that certain conditions or group of conditions give rise to death and decay.

The context in which this law has its applicability is a matter of debate among different Buddhist scholars. Some, like Kalupahana (1975, p. 107), assert that this law is an empirical law, as in a Western science principle, has universal validity, and operates in and governs all situations. Others, like Kalansuriya (1987, pp. 147-148), claim that this law is only applicable within the Buddhist view of the human person. Kalansuriya argues that there are significant

differences between the Western scientific view of causation and the Buddhist view.

The purpose of this study is not to enter into this debate. This study is not an analysis of various Buddhist texts. However, it is significant to note based on this debate that the applicability of causality is not something that can be assumed to be the empirical world. The terms being defined may be applicable only within the Buddhist understanding of the human person. They may only be functions of Mind in the Buddhist sense.

This Mind, as D.T. Suzuki (1930, p.171) carefully points out, is not the psychological mind. Mind is the Absolute Mind, that which transcends all duality, that which is Absolute Emptiness, the mystery. However, the psychological mind functions within Mind. Actually, it might be more correct to say that each individual mind is Mind. The psychological mind functions according to Mind, as it is Mind.

Rather than trying to resolve this debate academically, the intention of this study is to find out how Zen practitioners live and understand the law of cause and effect, attachment, and no-self. The focus is on how causality is understood and lived in everyday life. Then, on that basis, try to understand mind and formulate how cause and effect, attachment, and no-self function psychologically.

There is not an agreement within Buddhism as to how cause and effect functions in time and space. Some schools emphasize the sequential time relationship and assert that cause necessarily precedes effect. Other schools

insist that cause and effect exist simultaneously and claim that their relationship is more spatial than linear (Mizuno, 1987, pp. 55-57).

In either of these two cases cause and effect does not function linearly, but circularly. This is due to the interdependent nature of phenomena. Interdependence means that a phenomenon is not limited to itself. Part of it is actually in other phenomena. Thus, to understand cause and effect it is necessary not to think dualistically with boundaries and separateness. Cause and effect can only be understood in the Buddhist sense through “holistic thinking”, or, as Dogen wrote in the *Fukanzazengi* (1227/1998, p. 117), thinking that is not thinking. Thus it can be said that cause always has effect within it and vice versa. Cause and effect are one and not separate things. Thus, cause and effect arise and disappear together.

This “not thinking” way of Dogen is based on non-separateness, oneness, and non-interference by any of the delusions in which people habitually believe. This is different from the common way of thinking, which is greatly influenced by delusions, dualism, and discrimination. Dogen writes in the *Fukanzazengi*, “Think of not thinking. How is this done? By leaving thinking as-it-is. This is the essential method of *zazen* (Jap. 座禪 = Zen meditation)” (1227/1998, p. 117). Leaving thinking as-it-is means to not interfere through delusions with the natural function of thinking. The ramifications of this kind of thinking will be explored in this study.

En 縁.

En is the cause part of the law of cause and effect. It describes the types of causes as understood in Japanese Buddhism. *En* (縁) is a Japanese word that is a translation of the Sanskrit word *pratyaya* and is defined by the *Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary* as “a contributory cause, as distinct from a direct cause (*in* 因). For example, a plant is produced from a seed (*in*) and various contributory causes such as rain, soil, etc. (*en*)” (1999, p. 59). *Pratyaya* itself has been defined as “a co-operating cause; the concurrent occasion of an event as distinguished from its approximate cause” (Nishijima & Cross, 1994, Book 1, p. 339). The Japanese word *en* was originally a Chinese word, *yuan*. Its Chinese letter 縁 consists of two parts: the left part denotes thread, and the right part is a sign for the sound meaning (Chinese characters have two meanings, one that is written meaning and the second that is a sound or aural meaning) edge, verge, brink, or margin. Therefore the letter as a whole originally expresses “the edge of a texture or cloth” (*Bukkyo Gaku Jiten*, 1995, p. 41) and “the edge of a thing” (*Bukkyo Gaku Jiten*, 1995). From this comes the meaning of “depends on ...” or “be connected with” (*Bukkyo Gaku Jiten*, 1995).

Buddhist thought identifies four types of cause or *en*, called *shi-en* (四縁) in Japanese and *catvarah pratyayah* in Sanskrit. The first of these is direct and indirect causes, Japanese *innen* 因縁, Sanskrit *hetu-pratyaya*. *In* 因 is defined by the *Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary* as “the direct cause, e.g., a seed as ‘the direct cause’ of a plant, as distinct from earth or water which are contributory causes” (1999, p. 140). Together *in* and *en* form the word *innen*. In this word “*in* is the inner and direct cause by which the result occurs, while *en*

means the external and indirect one. According to the Buddhist doctrine, every action occurs in the harmony of both *in* and *en*” (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 142). *In* is the direct inner cause for bringing forth an effect, while *en* is an indirect cause that facilitates bringing forth an effect from the outside. While *in* and *en* are distinguished from each other in a narrower sense in the word *innen*, they are often not distinguished from each other in a wider sense and used interchangeably. It is important to note that in Buddhism a result does not occur by a single cause. There must be the influence of contributory causes as well. Thus, a result (Jap. 果 *ka*, Skt. *phala*) always happens due to a combination of causes.

The second type of cause is *to-mu-ken-nen* (Jap. 等無間縁) or *samanantara-pratyaya* (Skt.). This cause is that “the disappearance of the first moment of thought serves as the cause for the appearance of the second moment of thought” (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 304), because in Buddhist thought the first moment of thought in mind must pass out of existence before the next moment of thought can occur in mind.

The third type of cause is *sho-ennen* (Jap. 所縁縁) or *alambana-pratyaya* (Skt.). This cause refers to “the necessity for an object to be present before a *vijnana* (Skt., Jap. 識 *shiki* = the mind faculty of discrimination that functions through the six senses) can function” (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 304). Thus, for example, the *vijnana* of sight can only function when there is an object to be seen.

The fourth type of cause is *zo-jo-en* (Jap. 増上縁) or *adhipati-pratyaya* (Skt.). This cause refers to all causes other than the previous three “which contribute to the emergence of a thing or at least do not hinder its emergence” (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 304).

En can also be used as a verb in the sense of to perceive (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 58). In this sense *en* denotes a mental act in which the mind or the state of mind works upon outer reality, or an object to the mind, and perceives, grasps, takes, or receives its form and appearance. Because consciousness *ens*, or does *en*, it is called *no-en* (Jap. 能縁), the agent of *en*. Because the outer or objective world is *ened*, or is done *en*, by consciousness, or is subject to *en*, it is called *sho-en* (Jap. 所縁), the object of *en*.

Engi 縁起 and *ka* 果

All phenomena in the world appear according to the concept of *engi* (Jap. 縁起, Skt. *pratiya-samutpada*). This is how the result or effect part of the law of cause and effect is understood to occur. The *Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary* defines *engi* as “arising from causation. A central concept in Buddhism, that all phenomena are produced by causation” (1999, p. 61). This means that all phenomena are dependent on various *innen* conditions and are happening or appearing precariously. Phenomena arise conditionally as a composition of various *innen*. Therefore phenomena are mutually dependent on other phenomena (codependent origination), change according to conditions (transient), and lack an essential self-nature (no-self).

Engi is how truth appears in Buddhism. All phenomena appears as-it-is, as truth, and not as a construct made by each person. Zen distinguishes between that which is reality and that which is created by a person through their ignorance, attachment, and/or suffering. *Engi* is the functioning of the law of cause and effect. As such it is completely separate from any ignorance, attachment, or perception of each individual self. Its functioning is neutral and purposeless. In this sense it is mechanical, outside of the interference of individual self-delusions.

Due to the effect of *innen*, causal relations are inexhaustible; the result being that there is a mutual interpenetration of all things. This is the nature of all appearance, that appearance is always an inter-appearance, relative, and codependent on other appearances. There is no first cause as everything is interconnected and interdependent. There is also no essence of an appearance. It is empty, *ku*, non-substantial, without an organizing principle at its foundation. Thus in truth it is impossible to say exactly and completely what a phenomena is. This is the truth that Zen masters express through their various non-rational and idiosyncratic means.

Ka 果 (Skt. *phala*) is a Japanese word that means “fruit or result” (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 171). It expresses the nature of the effect part of the law of cause and effect. This nature is that each effect is the resultant of a combination of causes. All phenomena are an effect, a *ka*. This means that all phenomena are an *engi*, occurring only as the result of various causes and never existing independently of causal factors.

No-self (muga 無我).

The psychological mind functions according to *engi*. The focus in Buddhist psychology is how mind manifests this law of cause and effect. The fundamental way that this occurs is described as *anatman* (Skt., Jap. *muga* 無我). *Muga* is translated as non-self, non-ego, or no-self. It means that there is no permanent or unchanging self or soul. Non-self means non-substantiality. There is no fundamental substance to the self. *Muga* refers to both the non-existence of a permanent self and the non-substantiality of phenomena. As there is no self, mind is composed only of phenomena. Phenomena itself exists only by means of the union of conditions and there is no eternal and unchangeable substance in it (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 224).

No-self means that the self is emptiness. Emptiness is the true nature of the self. Psychologically the self as emptiness means that the self is not an entity, but an activity. What no-self is is a coalition of *engi* that arises, is always changing, and eventually passes. This activity of self does not have a center, a container, or an organizing principle. Rather, its center, container, or organizing principle is emptiness. To understand this activity of self it is necessary to understand this emptiness.

This is a fluid understanding of self. Identity in no-self is not fixed. However, in the Zen understanding fluidity does not mean being amorphous and not really being anything at all. What “I” is is what “I” is in the moment – completely and fully that without reservation. “I” is not detached, but rather the

opposite – completely involved, fully participatory, with the understanding that in the next moment “I” can be different. This is expressed in Zen practice as doing things sincerely or as fully as one can. To be no-self is to be fully alive.

The Buddha’s solution to the problem of life and death was that death is already present in birth. Birth and death are one. They are cause and effect, interrelated and not separate. Because we are born, we die. There is an objective, necessary, invariable, and conditional relationship between birth and death. This is the main concept of *engi*. What arises necessarily and always passes. Arising is a conditional composition and thus is suffering unless this truth is realized. The realization by a person of this truth is no-self. No-self is the psychology of *engi*.

Attachment (shujaku 執着).

Between birth and death the main element in causation is attachment. Attachment is what causes conditions to bond together and form a phenomenon. Attachment is the affiliation that conditions have for each other. Human beings, however, commonly and easily misunderstand attachment. People become attached to attachment. As all arising is transient, people do not recognize when it is time to let go of attachment, to let something end. Attachment thus becomes an obscuration of no-self, of emptiness, of the fundamental nature of things, and one of the fundamental causes of suffering in human beings. Thus it can be said that there are three basic elements in *engi*--birth, attachment, and death (Masutani, 1996, pp. 109-127).

Attachment is translated in Japanese as *shu-chaku* 執着, but in Japanese Buddhism is pronounced *shu-jaku*. *Shu* (Jap. 執) means to catch, hold, take, fix, retain, keep, and *chaku* (Jap. 着) means to put A to B, connect A with B, wear, cloth, dwell, or inhabit. *Shu* in its Buddhist sense can refer to (1) attachment to the various sense data; (2) love of self, including desire for fame, wealth, and carnal pleasure; and (3) a general term for illusion (Jap. 煩惱 *bonno*, Skt. *klesa* or *kilesa*) (*Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, 1999, p. 332). Thus, *shu-jaku* means attachment to or clinging to things, ideas, self, etc.

The twelve-linked chain of dependent origination.

One of the principle ways that has evolved in Buddhism over its history as an explanation of cause and effect in terms of people and their suffering is the Twelve-linked Chain of Dependent Origination, which is found in the Pali text *Samyutta-nikaya*. Earlier versions of this Chain were the six sets of six mental elements in the *Discourse on the Six Sixes* and ten links, leaving out the first two, instead of twelve (Mizuno, 1987, pp. 62-64). The twelve links are: 1) ignorance (Jap. 無明 (むみよ う = *mumyo*) Skt. *avidya*), 2) by reason of ignorance, conditioned volitional actions or karma formations (Jap. 行 (ぎよ う = *gyo*) Skt. *samskara*), 3) by reason of volitional action, conditioned consciousness (Jap. 識 (しき = *shiki*) Skt. *vijnana*), 4) by reason of consciousness, conditioned mental and physical phenomena (name and form) (Jap. 名色 (みよ うしき = *myoshiki*) Skt. *nama-rupa*), 5) by reason of name and form, the six senses (five physical

sense organs and mind) (Jap. 六入 (ろくじゆ = *rokujyu*) Skt. *sad-ayatana*), 6) by reason of the six senses, conditioned (sensorial and mental) contact (Jap. 触 (しよく = *shyoku*) Skt. *sparsa*), 7) by reason of contact, conditioned sensation or feeling (Jap. 受 (じゆ = *ju*) Skt. *vedana*, 8) by reason of feeling, conditioned desire or craving (Jap. 愛 (あい = *ai*) Skt. *trsna*), 9) by reason of craving, conditioned clinging, taking, or grasping (Jap. 取 (しゆ = *shyu*) Skt. *upadana*), 10) by reason of taking and grasping is conditioned the process of coming into existence (Jap. 有 (う = *u*) Skt. *bhava*), 11) by reason of coming into existence, conditioned birth (Jap. 生 (しよ = *shyo*) Skt. *jati*, 12) by reason of birth, conditioned aging, death, sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief, and despair (Jap. 老死 (ろうし = *roshi*) Skt. *jaramarana*) (Mizuno, 1987, pp. 63-69; Nishijima & Cross, 1994, Book 2, p. 61; Rahula, 1974, pp. 53-54). Suffering results in ignorance, which starts the whole chain all over again.

This Twelve-linked Chain is value-oriented and moralistic. Cause and effect is neutral and purposeless, apart from the desires and delusions of people. This Chain focuses on these desires and delusions, explaining how these create suffering. It is the series of causes and conditions that result in suffering. This is how suffering arises, exists, and continues. Each link in the Chain operates according to the law of cause and effect; that is, each link objectively, necessarily, invariably, and conditionally produces the next link. Ignorance always produces karma formations and so on. It is a chain that continually

produces suffering at each link. Eliminating suffering comes by eliminating each link.

Each of these twelve chains is a psychological function. It is through mind that people experience suffering. This Chain is a way to approach understanding Buddhist psychology. Each link can be explored in great depth. This study is limited to the two links that relate to attachment. These are the eighth, craving (Jap. *ai*, Skt. *trsna*), and the ninth, taking and grasping (Jap. *toru*, Skt. *upadana*). These two links amplify how attachment is understood in Buddhism.

The Sanskrit *trsna*, the eighth link, is often translated as craving or desire. The sense of desire in this usage is that of a thirsty person, who craves water. Such a person's desire is instinctual only, with no understanding of the conditioned nature of such desire. The Chinese character that is sometimes used to translate *trsna* literally means either desire or thirst. This kind of desire is an instinctual passionate yearning. Sometimes in Japanese it is represented by 愛 (*ai*) "love." Love in this context is understood as this kind of passionate attachment to something. This is not Western romantic love. This understanding of love is common in Zen and is something that will be investigated in this study (Mizuno, 1987, p. 67; Nishijima & Cross, 1994, Book 2, p. 296; Rahula, 1974, p. 53).

Craving is an internal mental activity. It is the psychological activity of attachment to something. It is divided into three subcategories. The first is physical craving, the desire for sensual things. The second is the craving for

existence, the desire to be free of the sufferings of this world and live in a paradise. The third is the craving for non-existence, the desire for emptiness or nothingness (Mizuno, 1987, p. 67). This is the desire of the ascetic, who seeks to escape suffering through annihilation. As Nansen was earlier quoted as saying that “the Way is neither knowing nor not knowing,” the Way is also neither existence nor non-existence. Both are conditioned phenomena, *engi*, the arising of cause and effect, and neither is the essence of Buddhism.

The Sanskrit *upadana*, the ninth link, means to take or to cling to existence. The Japanese word that is used as the translation of *upadana* is *toru*, which literally means to take and implies the act of taking for one’s self or appropriating to one’s self. With Buddhists this means grasping or clinging to existence. This taking is also referred to in Japanese as attachment. This is the nature of attachment as an external behavior, physical and verbal behavior--as clinging or grasping phenomena to one’s self. It is the outward manifestation of the inward craving. It is based on preference and discrimination, liking and not liking. What one likes one attaches to and what one does not like one discards (Mizuno, 1987, p. 68; Nishijima & Cross, 1994, Book 2, p. 296).

The six states.

Another common way of discussing how cause and effect functions in mind is the six states (Skt. *gati*, Jap. *rokudo* 六道). The souls of living beings

transmigrate through these six states, from one to another, according to the law of cause and effect. These are the state of beings in hell, state of hungry ghosts, state of animals, state of angry demons, state of human beings, state of gods (Harada, 1998, p. 36; *Japanese English Buddhist Dictionary*; 1999, p. 264). It is important to note that these states are not simply states that souls pass through, but also are psychological conditions. There is no separation between these two. When a person is in hell, that person is psychologically experiencing hell. Thus, a person who is having an internal conflict is in the state of angry demons. As psychological conditions, though, these states are not fixed. They can rapidly change based on the effect of a new cause appearing. Thus, a person can pass through all of these states according to the conditions of their life. The state of hell is pure suffering. The state of hungry ghosts is having a great desire, but being unable to satisfy it. A hungry ghost is a ghost with a big belly and a very thin neck. The hungry ghost is very hungry, but is unable to get food into his belly because his neck is so thin, thus being perpetually unsatisfied. The state of animals is the state of instinct without reason. The state of human beings is the state in which both pleasure and suffering are present. This is said in Buddhism to be the only state of the six in which realization of the Truth is possible. It is thus the most highly valued state. In the state of gods there is only pleasure and no suffering, but also no realization is possible.

The four noble truths.

While the law of cause and effect is the basic Buddhist understanding of how phenomena appears to mind, the fundamental way of how to live this

Buddhist understanding is expressed in the Four Noble Truths. This is the classic Buddhist statement of how to eliminate suffering and realize peace of mind. It is based on the insight gained through the law of cause and effect and expresses the basic Buddhist values and purpose. The essential understanding is that since all phenomena is conditional and transient, to be free of suffering one must not get attached to that which has no enduring substance and will inevitably change.

The First Noble Truth is that life is suffering. This does not mean that life is only suffering. It does mean that suffering is inherent to life. Regardless of how much pleasure one has in their life, suffering will still arise according to circumstances. The focus of Buddhism is on how a person deals with their suffering. It is easier to be happy when one has pleasure, but much more difficult when one has suffering.

The Second Noble Truth states what is the cause of suffering. This cause is translated from the Sanskrit *dukkha* in various ways, as desire (Nakajima Roshi, interview, 6-26-2001, p. 5), thirst (Rahula, 1974, p. 29), craving (Mizuno, 1987, p. 49), or attachment (Harada, 1998, p. 69). The basic understanding is that of clinging to transient phenomena and discriminating among phenomena according to this clinging. This is the understanding of attachment (*shu-jaku*) as defined earlier. Each of these translations of the Pali word *dukkha*, particularly desire and attachment, can be natural functions of mind and don't necessarily result in suffering. The Buddha, for example, by means of his attachment to wanting to solve the question of life and death realized great tranquility. Trying

to understand the subtleties of attachment will be one of the purposes of this study. There are other causes of suffering, as described in the Twelve-linked Chain of Dependent Origination, particularly, ignorance, action, and becoming. However, in the Second Noble Truth attachment is singled out as the fundamental cause of suffering.

The Third Noble Truth is that freedom from suffering is the cessation of attachment. When a person gives up their attachments, their cravings, they eliminate all obstructions in mind, they realize peace of mind, and they can function harmoniously in accordance with the natural principles of the universe. These natural principles are based on the law of cause and effect. Thus, this Noble Truth expresses the psychological relationship between mind and phenomena that is necessary for psychological health and happiness.

The Fourth Noble Truth is that the way to eliminate suffering is through the practice of the Eightfold Path: right views, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right meditation (Mizuno, 1987, p. 122). This is what is referred to in Buddhism as the Middle Way, the way that is between the extremes of hedonism and asceticism. This way is the basis for the various Buddhist practices that have as their purpose the realization of peace of mind, which is nirvana or tranquility.

The terms that were chosen as the focus of this study, causality (Jap. 縁起 *engi*), attachment (Jap. 執着 *shu-jaku*), and no-self (Jap. 無我 *muga*), were chosen because of their fundamental importance to Buddhist psychology. The law of cause and effect is the basic Buddhist view on how all phenomena

appears to mind. It describes how phenomena are related to each other. For psychology the significance particularly pertains to the social aspect of a person and to the relationships of the various functions of mind. The law of cause and effect also expresses the Buddhist view of time, or, psychologically speaking, how past, present, and future function in mind. This is the historical aspect of a person. Time, as arising phenomenon, is not viewed linearly, but holistically in the manner of the oneness thinking described earlier. Western psychology has put a lot of emphasis on development and the influence of past history on the present. Understanding the law of cause and effect in psychological terms will assist understanding the Buddhist view on development and personal history.

Attachment is one of the fundamental psychological functions that result in suffering. There are several causes of suffering as described in the Twelve-linked Chain of Dependent Origination. However, in the Second Noble Truth attachment is singled out as being the cause of suffering. I also have long been fascinated with the various nuances of attachment as it is not just a negative function. Attachment has a primary function in the Western psychology Object Relations theory. Understanding how attachment functions in mind according to the Buddhist view will illuminate a different function of attachment than that which Object Relations theory describes.

Both the law of cause and effect and attachment function within emptiness (Jap. 空 *ku*). They arise from emptiness, as phenomena they are essentially empty, and they disappear into emptiness. How this can occur can be very challenging to understand for those who think of phenomena as substantial.

Emptiness is the pre-referred to mystery and the not knowing of Bodhidharma. The fundamental way that emptiness functions psychologically is no-self. It is because of this importance of no-self that it also is included as one of the psychological functions focused on in this study.

Goals of this Study

The purpose of this study will be to describe a Zen Buddhist lived experience of the Zen ideas of causality, attachment, and no-self in Western psychological language. This study will elucidate based on Zen Buddhist expressions of experience how causality, attachment, and no-self function in mind and will also explore based on these reports how pathology and healing occur.

I consider this study to be a translation project. Zen masters express their experience in cultural metaphors and Zen Buddhist language. I want to translate the language used by Zen masters regarding causality, attachment, and no-self from cultural and Buddhist language into Western psychological language. My understanding of translation is in agreement with that of Raimundo Panikkar (1988, p. 125), who asserts that translation requires “a triple understanding,” a grasping of meaning in two languages, in this case the languages being Zen and psychology, and a creative intuition that will allow the translator to stay with both meanings for a while before the right or approximate expressions emerge.

At this time there is not in the Western forms of psychology a psychology founded on the Zen realization of freedom from suffering. The implicit

psychology within Zen Buddhism has not been clearly explicated and understood. It has been my experience of often reading academic or psychological writings on Zen by Westerners and finding misunderstandings or feeling the essence of Zen missing in the writings. I hope to translate the experience of Zen masters into a form that can express functions of mind that have not been attended to by the various forms of Western psychology.

Significance of this Work

As of this date a specifically Zen Buddhist psychology has not been articulated in the West. Causality, attachment, and no-self are basic ideas to the Zen teaching and thus are keys to a Zen psychology. Both Zen Buddhism and psychology have in common the purpose of alleviating the suffering of people. Psychology in the West has become one of the primary means within the secular world of addressing people's suffering. I contend that the practice of Zen focuses on a different aspect of mind than is addressed by Western psychology. If this aspect of mind can be understood by Western psychology, it will broaden the applicability and usefulness of psychological work.

Zen focuses on the mystery of the self, on no-self, and how to realize this no-self in life. In terms of psychology one way to state this is that Zen focuses on the deconstruction of the self, while Western psychology is more concerned with the development and construction of the self. A Zen psychology would not dispute many of the theories of mind developed in Western psychology, such as the role of object relations in mind. Zen asserts that these structures of mind

develop naturally when a person grows up in a healthy environment. Instead, Zen attends to how, given these structures of mind, mind can function optimally and most healthily. No-self is the full realization of the Absolute Truth in mind and emptiness (Jap. 空 *ku*) is the deconstruction of all factors that interfere with this realization. Zen practice cultivates living this fundamental condition and removing mental factors that interfere with this optimal functioning. It could be said that the perspective of Western psychology is the normal person, while the perspective of Zen is the superior person.

An example from clinical psychotherapy practice will help distinguish the significance of this difference of emphasis. A suicidal client is viewed through the lens of object relations or self psychology as someone who could be described as having decompensated, fallen apart, lost their self, or become fragmented; having a lack of autonomy and appropriate boundaries; or an inability to constitute their self. The Zen perspective on such a person is that a suicidal person could be described as having created a self; become attached, self-centered, or fixated in one of their functions; become limited and separate from their environment and life or out of harmony; having lost their natural openness; or is suffering from some kind of craving or desire, possibly a craving for security.

The significance of this difference in perspectives is that in clinical work the interventions of the therapist are based in part on their perspective on the problem. Thus, a therapist who views a suicidal person as having fragmented will work to help this person to stabilize and re-constitute their self. A therapist

who views such a person as being fixated in one of their functions will work to help this person open and re-participate in life.

It is my contention that Zen Buddhism, although an old tradition, expresses an understanding of mind that is very complementary to psychological theory in the West. In the previous discussion of interventions both types of interventions could serve a distressed suicidal client. I think that each of the perspectives discussed address different aspects of the mind. The Zen perspective, however, is not understood in the West. By being based on a different focus of the functions of mind, Zen broadens psychological theory and thereby broadens its usefulness. Explicating three of the key elements, causality, attachment, and no-self, of this understanding in Western psychological terms is my goal in this dissertation.