

Chapter Two

Literature Review

This project is a study by an American of the experience of six Japanese Zen Buddhist masters regarding causality, attachment, and no-self. Of these Zen masters, four are members of the Rinzai sect and two are members of the Soto sect. These two sects are the primary sects of Zen in Japan that have descended from the Chan sects of Buddhism in China. What is being researched is a particular Japanese cultural form of the Buddhist religion, a form that is centered around the practice of Zen focused on self realization. The project is to translate the descriptions of the Zen masters' experience from their Buddhist religious language into Western psychological language.

This project is thus a cross-disciplinarian and cross-cultural study. Relevant literature comes from many sources. Fundamentally as a study of the psychology of Zen it is part of the growing literature on Buddhist psychology in the West. The literature that is most relevant is psychology. Primarily this is a psychological study, not an academic study of Zen or Buddhism. Yet what is being studied is part of a cultural form of a religion. The Zen masters being focused on are situated within Japan within the tradition of Zen Buddhism. To understand their experience, especially for an American coming to Japan, familiarity with more than Buddhist psychology is helpful. Also relevant are cultural studies of the psychology of Japanese people and an understanding of the religion of Zen and how it is a part of the Buddhist religion. As this is a

cross-cultural project it is helpful in all of these studies, psychology, Japanese culture, and Buddhism, to be informed from both American and Japanese perspectives.

Buddhism began 2500 years ago in India. The interaction between Buddhism and the West began not too long after that. Rick Fields (1981) in *How the Swans Came to the Lake* documents the history of this interaction. It began with the Greeks led by Alexander the Great coming to India in the 4th century B.C and continued over the centuries. Buddhism itself gradually expanded outside of India, moving into China and then to Japan. Zen is a sect of Buddhism in Japan that has its roots in the Chan sect of Buddhism in China. The history of Zen in Japan is chronicled in *Zen Buddhism: A History* (Vol. 2), by Heinrich Dumoulin (1990). He describes well how Zen developed from Chan through interaction with various influences to its present day forms. I think it is important for Westerners to understand that Zen is not a monolith, but a religious form of Buddhism that has changed over the centuries. The Zen practice of the Zen Buddhism of Japan of the present era is a form of practice specific to modern day Japan. Dumoulin describes how this practice has evolved and changed over the centuries. As a historical introduction to Zen this book has received good reviews. For example, T. Yamashita (1990) wrote that the information contained was accurate and up-to-date. He asserted that this work was a landmark in the study of the history of Zen Buddhism in Japan.

Another book that describes the history and forms of Zen well is *The Shambhala Dictionary of Buddhism and Zen*, by Ingrid Fischer-Schreiber, Franz-

Karl Ehrhard, and Michael Diener (1991). I particularly like this book because I think it describes well the orientation of Zen to the practice of self realization.

They write:

Zen is a religion, the teachings and practices of which are directed toward self-realization (*kensho*, *satori*) and lead finally to complete awakening (enlightenment) as experienced by Shakyamuni Buddha. ... More than any other school, Zen stresses the prime importance of the enlightenment experience and the uselessness of ritual religious practices and intellectual analysis of doctrine for the attainment of liberation (enlightenment). (1991, p. 260)

It is the experience of this practice of Zen that I want to study in this project. This book is full of useful details and information regarding this kind of Zen Buddhist practice. Another book that has similar information that is written more from a Japanese point of view is the *Japanese-English Buddhist Dictionary*, published by Daito Shuppansha (1999) in Tokyo. Its focus is broader than the Shambhala dictionary. It includes information on all Buddhist sects in Japan and has much Japan specific information, such as Japanese characters. It reflects a broader Japanese cultural form of Buddhism, not just the practice of Zen oriented to enlightenment.

The Zen practice that is being focused on in this project has its historical roots in China in Chan Buddhism. According to the tradition of Zen this practice was brought to China from India by Bodhidharma (d. 520), who became the first patriarch of Chan Buddhism. All present day Zen masters can trace their lineage of dharma ancestors back through Bodhidharma to the Buddha himself. The record of this lineage in Chan and Indian Buddhism is recorded in the *Denkoroku* (Keizan, 1268-1325/1993).

Modern scholars in Japan have challenged the factuality of this lineage. In particular Seizan Yanagida has researched texts that record a different story. In *Daruma* (1998, p. 115), written in Japanese, Yanagida quotes a text that depicts Bodhidharma as coming from Persia, not India. Yanagida, who has been published very little in English, has had a big influence on the understanding of Zen in Japan. Relevant to this study is how he has documented, through writings such as *Daruma*, the many forms and variations that the practice of Zen has had throughout its history. Americans often tend to think of Zen in terms of having only one form. Yanagida has been influential in demonstrating this is not true.

There are several books that I relied on to understand the meaning in Zen Buddhism of the three terms that are being focused on this study. These three are causality, attachment, and no-self. Of course my understanding was formed not just through books, but also through many conversations about these three terms with many different people, including the *roshis* (Jap. 老師 = Zen master). Several of the books that I consulted for this purpose several of the books already mentioned. Other helpful books were *A Philosophical Analysis of Buddhist Notions*, by A.D.P. Kalansuriya (1987); *Basic Buddhist Concepts*, by Kogen Mizuno (1987); *Chie to Jihi* (Wisdom and Compassion), by Fumio Masutani and T. Umehara (1996); *What the Buddha Taught*, by Walpola Rahula (1974); and *Causality: The Central Philosophy of Buddhism*, by David Kalupahana (1975).

All of the Zen masters interviewed for this study rely heavily on Chinese Chan texts for explanations of their experience. The texts vary according to sect

and lineage. Particularly useful, as Zen is a practice focused on enlightenment, are the recorded stories of how people in the past have realized their true self. The primary texts used by the Zen masters interviewed for this purpose were the *Mumonkan* (Huikai, 1228/1977) and the *Hekiganroku* (Yuanwu, 1125/1977). To understand the psychology of Zen familiarity with these texts is essential.

Four of the Zen masters interviewed were members of the Rinzai sect of Zen and two were members of the Soto sect. Familiarity with writings of the ancestors of each of these sects is helpful to understand the present day explanations by these Zen masters. The Rinzai sect began with Lin-chi I-hsuan (Jap. Rinzai Gigen) in China. I-hsuan's recorded teachings, as published in English in the *Zen Teachings of the Master Lin-chi* (I-hsuan, 9th century/1999) are often used in Rinzai practice, referred to as the "Rinzai Roku." The Rinzai sect is particularly well known for its use of *koans*, questions asked by a Zen master to their student that are used as focuses of meditation practice. This *koan* practice in its modern form was particularly influenced and developed by the Japanese Rinzai master Hakuin Zenji (1689-1769). *The Shambhala Dictionary of Buddhism and Zen* (1991) describes well this role of Hakuin.

Soto practice is a different form of practice from Rinzai. As I have had personal experience in both, I know for example that while both use *koans*, how they use *koans* is very different. The founder of the Soto sect in Japan was Dogen Zenji (1200-1253). His voluminous writings are used extensively in Soto practice. Particularly important are the *Fukanzazengi* (1227/1976, 1227/1985, 1227/1994, 1227/1998) and the *Shobogenzo* (1233-1253/1994).

Helpful Zen texts for understanding the *roshis*' frame of reference in psychological terms are scarce. Zen and Chan masters historically have put little importance on psychological explanations as being useful for self realization. This is not surprising as psychology is a Western discipline, not an Oriental discipline. One old Buddhist text that has been used in Rinzai and Soto practice is the Lankavatara Sutra, a text that originated in India and was brought to China. D.T. Suzuki's (1930) *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra* translates this *sutra* into English and has much useful commentary on the psychology that is described in this *sutra*. Suzuki compares the psychology described here with Yogacara psychology. He reports many similarities, as well as differences. Thus, to understand the psychological reference of the roshis in more depth knowledge of Yogacara psychology is useful. For this purpose the main work of this school, Vasubandhu's *Trimsika-karika* (4th century/1973, 4th century/1982, 4th century/1984) is important. Also very useful is William Waldron's (1988) article "A Comparison of the Alayavijnana with Freud's and Jung's Theories of the Unconscious." The *alayavijnana* (Skt., Jap. 阿頼耶識 *arayashiki*) is a part of the Yogacara theory of mind that has attracted a lot of attention due to its similarities with the Western unconscious. This article is useful for understanding these similarities as well as differences.

Further afield the *Abhidhamma*, which is a text in the Theravada Buddhist tradition, has a very developed psychology. Although it is not directly relevant to a psychology of Zen, it is a Buddhist psychology, so it is useful in the sense of understanding common Buddhist ideas. Also what is relevant to this

study is that while there is very little written on specifically the psychology of Zen in the West, there is much written about the *Abhidhamma*. An understanding of the *Abhidhamma* provides a way to understand what Buddhist psychology writings in the West are referring to. There is a tendency in the West to group the various psychologies of Buddhism together and to not understand their differences. This will be discussed in more depth relative to particular publications later in this review. Regarding the *Abhidhamma* itself, the following works are useful: *A Manual of Abhidharma*, by Maha Thera Narada (1956); *Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidhamma*, by Herbert Guenther (1976); and *Abhidhamma Studies*, by Nyanaponika Thera (1965). Also useful are books written about the psychology of the Abhidhamma, specifically Parma de Silva's (1979) *An Introduction to Buddhist Psychology* and David Kalupahana's *The Principles of Buddhist Psychology* (1987).

Since this is a study of six contemporary Zen masters by an American, modern writings by Japanese Zen masters who have been to America are helpful. These are all attempts by various Zen masters to explain Zen in ways that Americans can understand. I make frequent use of the two books by my two teachers: *Buddha is the Center of Gravity*, by Joshu Sasaki (1974), and *The Essence of Zen*, by Sekkei Harada (1998). Also useful in this way are *Zen Mind, Beginner's Mind*, by Shunryu Suzuki (1970) and *Zen for Americans*, by Shaku Soen (1906). The latter book is also interesting from a historical point of view, as Soen Roshi was one of the first Japanese Zen masters to visit America and had a significant role in the coming of Zen to America.

The interaction of Zen with the West began with Christian missionaries to Japan. Bernard Faure (1993) in *Chan Insights and Oversights* details this history; particularly well describing how these missionaries' interpretation of Zen has influenced how Zen and Chan has been understood by the West since the 16th century. Faure is a Western academic who studied under Seizan Yanagida, the Japanese Zen scholar at Hanazono University in Kyoto previously referred to.

Especially relevant for this project was how Chan was interpreted to be a form of Quietism. Faure writes:

The association of Buddhism (and more particularly Chan) with Quietism has persisted until the present day. When applied to Buddhism by eighteenth-century writers, the term quietist was fraught with connotations that can be properly understood only when placed in their Western context. (1993, p. 32)

Faure's work is invaluable in helping Westerners become aware of the lens through which they have historically viewed Chan and Zen. Faure also brings attention to the cultural situatedness of Zen in Japan. In this way he is very critical of the writings of D.T. Suzuki and the Kyoto School, especially those of Kitaro Nishida, the leading philosopher of this school. He asserts that they were trying to promote a culture-blind form of Zen, when in reality Japanese Zen is inherently cultural.

I think that this is a very important criticism of many writings regarding Zen. There has been a tendency within Zen to ignore importance of one's context. This will be discussed in the report. It is very important to be aware of the cultural aspects of Zen. As an American studying Japanese roshis, the more I

can be aware of the cultural aspects of their descriptions, the more I can actually understand their psychology. Faure is very helpful in this way.

Along with a de-cultural approach to Zen a tendency to view Zen as a *philosophia perennis* has been very common in the West. Aldous Huxley (1945) wrote about this philosophy in *The Perennial Philosophy*. It is the idea that there are certain universal themes that underlie all great religions and that the mystical experience of all has fundamental similarities. This philosophy is behind many ecumenical movements around the world. It is important for this study to be aware of the tendency to view Zen this way. The purpose of this study is not to engage this philosophy, but rather to focus on the six Japanese Zen masters being interviewed and to try to understand from their experience what can be deduced about the human mind.

Faure (1991) also wrote another book, *The Rhetoric of Immediacy*, which is relevant to this study. In this book, which he names in the subtitle “a cultural critique,” he focuses on what have been the principle doctrines of Chan and Zen and how these doctrines have been used socially by Chan and Zen priests. It is what I could say is in many ways a cynical book. I think it is very useful in bringing awareness to the cultural history of Zen. Zen has tended to try to be above or apart from its situatedness. One of the results of this was its support of the war effort in Japan during the 1930s and 1940s. This support is described by Brian Victoria (1998) in *Zen at War* and James Heisig and John Maraldo (Eds., 1995) in *Rude Awakenings*. However, Faure tends to give the impression that

there is no value in the Zen practice. This I obviously believe is not true. Thus, I think Faure's writings, while extremely valuable, need to be considered carefully.

Two of the writers that Faure is very critical of have had enormous influence on how Zen is understood psychologically both within Japan and within the West. These are Kitaro Nishida and D.T. Suzuki. I think these two people are particularly influential as there has been so little directly written about Zen psychology. Nishida is not so well known as Suzuki is in the West, but has been very influential within Zen circles in Japan. He was not a psychologist, but a philosopher who tried to express Zen in a Western philosophical way. However, particularly his idea of "pure experience" has relevance for psychology. Nishida (1911/1990) writes about this in his initial book, *An Inquiry into the Good*. This idea addresses what I believe to be a key dynamic in the psychology of Zen, the interaction between pure experience and situated experience. While Faure focuses on situated experience, Nishida focuses on pure experience. I think that the truth is a combination of the two.

D.T. Suzuki wrote many volumes in English, with the purpose of trying to transmit Zen to America. He has had an enormous influence on how Zen is understood in the West. He was a Zen scholar who also practiced Zen; an unusual combination as there long has been a tension between the academics and the practitioners of Zen. His writings were mostly either translations of texts or explanations of Zen philosophy and practice, but included some directly psychological writing. His personal involvement with the Zen East-West

dialogue began with his serving as Shaku Soen's translator to the World Parliament of Religion in Chicago in 1890s and continued until his death.

Relevant to this study Suzuki's (1930) *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra* has already been noted. Several others of his works are also important for this study. One is *Essays in Zen Buddhism: Second Series* (1933). Here Suzuki discusses the psychological aspects of *koan* study and *satori*. This is very useful in trying to understand the roshis' own experience of these two things. Another important work is *The Zen Doctrine of No-mind* (1972). Here Suzuki discusses what he names the Zen "Unconscious." He writes how this Unconscious is different from the Western unconscious. This understanding had a big impact on the appeal of Zen to Western psychologists, but is an understanding that I believe lends itself to misunderstanding what the psychology of Zen really is. This will be discussed in depth in this report. Also very significant is *Zen Buddhism and Psychoanalysis* (1960), which is co-authored by Suzuki, Erich Fromm, and Richard De Martino. In this book Suzuki (1960, p. 5) discusses differences between what he refers to as the Western mind and Eastern mind, but does so in what seems to me to be a way that encourages stereotypes. My experience of Japan and America is not so black and white. He also discusses the Zen Unconscious and the concept of Self in Zen. This latter aspect, the Self, is particularly useful for this study. This is a most difficult aspect of the psychology of Zen to understand, so his attempt at explication is very helpful. His explanation relies very much on Zen concepts, as does most of his writing about the psychology of Zen. I think that his work is a very important step

towards understanding a psychology of Zen. I agree with Bernard Faure that Suzuki tries to universalize Zen in ways that are not true, but in these books when this is taken into account I find descriptions of the experience of *satori* and the Zen Self to be pointing towards what is the psychology of Zen.

Finally, regarding Suzuki's writings, another book that is significant is *Zen Buddhism and Its Influences on Japanese Culture* (1938). This book is not psychologically oriented, but culturally oriented. It describes the interaction of Zen and Japanese culture and focuses on the influence of Zen on Japanese culture. It shows how culturally situated Zen in Japan has been.

D.T. Suzuki is certainly the most well known Japanese person to Americans who attempted to describe the psychology of Zen, but he is not the first Japanese person to do so. Akira Onda (2002) in "The Development of Buddhist Psychology in Modern Japan" chronicles the history of Japanese Buddhist psychology, which he writes was begun by Enryo Inoue (1858-1919). This article provides a good introduction to this history. Also significant for Buddhist psychology in Japan has been *Psychologia: A Journal of Psychology in the Orient*. This journal, published in English by Kyoto University, began in the late 1950s. There have been numerous articles on Zen psychology. Particularly interesting are the reports of scientific tests that were done on some Zen practitioners in the 1960s and 1970s.

There are two Japanese psychotherapies, Naikan and Morita, whose practices are based on principles very similar to Buddhism. Naikan is based on Jodo Shin Buddhist principles. Morita, while not ascribed by its founder to be

based on Zen, is based on principles that are very similar to Zen. A good analysis of this is written by Bruno Rhyner (1988), a Swiss Jungian psychologist who has also written several other articles on Morita and Naikan therapies. The primary exponent of these practices in America has been David Reynolds. His many works include *Even in Summer the Ice Doesn't Melt* (1986) and *Water Bears No Scars* (1987). Reynolds' practices combine elements of both Naikan and Morita. My Japanese mentor, Shoji Muramoto, commented that this is a typically American way of accepting Japanese culture. Of the four reviews I read of Reynolds' work only one, written by Bruno Rhyner (1985), was positive. Regarding Naikan, Rhyner writes that Reynolds has done a rich and descriptive exploration of the practice of Naikan and has contributed significantly to the understanding of the Japanese psyche. He is obviously impressed with Reynolds' knowledge. However, other reviewers criticize Reynolds for a lack of depth. Typical are the comments of T.S. Lebra (1990), who herself has written extensively on the Japanese self. Regarding one of Reynolds' (1989) books, *Flowing Bridges, Quiet Waters*, she writes that this book is primarily a promotional piece for Reynolds' own psychotherapy work.

The value of Naikan and Morita for this study is limited to considering how Japanese Buddhist principles can be practically applied in therapeutic work. They do bring into focus what are relevant Buddhist principles for psychological work. It is helpful to consider these principles and their applications when trying to understand the psychology of the roshis' experience. Reynolds' work,

particularly as an American trying to apply Japanese therapies in an American context, is useful in this way.

Naikan, Morita, and Psychologia are part of the development of the discipline of Japanese psychology. This discipline has some relevance to this study because of the interrelationship of Zen Buddhism and Japanese culture. Writings on the psychology of Japanese people reflect aspects of Zen psychology and can be useful to understand this. I have found particularly useful Takeo Doi's (1971) seminal work *The Anatomy of Dependence*. In this book Doi describes a Japanese self that is fundamentally relationships with others. However, more than relationships developing a sense of self in the object relations theory sense, as Doi describes it a self develops that is fundamentally weak and thereby dependent on others. This is very different than the sense of self I am familiar with in America. Doi's book was helpful in understanding aspects of the relational self that I hadn't considered before. This is relevant to the roshis because I found in this research that their sense of self is basically a relational self. It is important to consider cultural aspects of this relational self.

Alan Roland (1994), whose main work I will discuss later in this chapter, wrote a very positive review of Doi's work. He stated that Doi has worked to develop a uniquely Japanese understanding of self and has insightfully described a self structure that is quite different than that found in Westerners. He wrote that Doi needed to expand his understanding to include self psychological concepts and gender considerations, but that basically he has successfully developed a distinct cultural psychology.

Another Japanese book that I found very useful was Yasuo Yuasa's (1987) book *The Body: Toward an Eastern Mind-body Theory*. This book is a study of the philosophical traditions of Japan. It helped me get a fuller understanding to some of the ideas expressed in Zen that are particularly difficult to grasp. Particularly useful was his idea of the spatial self juxtaposed with a time or historical self. This idea served as a basis of my understanding of how the Zen idea of causality can function as a psychological self. This is discussed in chapter four.

Not everyone else who read this book was as positive as I was. G. Ebersole (1988) was, writing that Yuasa has brought into clear focus what is the central informing assumption of the Eastern philosophical traditions. He asserts that Yuasa clearly and forcefully presents his case. However, W. Ludwig (1991) is a bit lukewarm about the work. Although he considers it to be well written and very thoughtful, he is very doubtful about the value of the work. He believes that the West and the East have very different fundamental principles and that bridging them is not ultimately possible or valuable. Interestingly, David Reynolds (1988), whose work I just discussed, is very negative about Yuasa's work. He writes that the book is unclear, written in a meandering style, and mixes too many ideas in too broad a way.

Of the many Western psychological theories, the one that probably has had the most interaction between Japan and the West has been Jungian psychology. This is due to both the influence of Hayao Kawai, a Japanese Jungian therapist, and to the interests of Jung himself. Jung was very interested

in Eastern religions and was very influenced by them, including being influenced by Buddhism. The story of his interest and interaction with Buddhism, including Zen, is recorded in many books, including H. Coward (1985), *Jung and Eastern Thought*; Meckel and Moore (1992), *Self and Liberation: The Jung-Buddhism Dialogue*; and J. Clarke (1994), *Jung and Eastern Thought: A Dialogue with the Orient*. Meckel and Moore focus specifically on Jung and Buddhism, while the other two books also include much on Jung's interest with India and yoga practices. Others have widely varying opinions of Meckel and Moore's book, which perhaps reflects Jung's own very mixed relationship with Eastern religions. D. Biddulph (1994) writes that this book is confusing, not clear, has a lack of details, and should not have been written. On the other hand, R. Sears (1993) writes that both Jung and Buddhism were fairly represented in the book and he claims that both sides of the dialogue between Jung and Buddhism were competently presented.

Of relevance to this study are the questions of what is possible in a cross-cultural psychology and what specifically of Buddhism is relevant to Western psychology. Jung had very strong opinions about both of these questions. He believed that while Westerners could learn from Buddhism and integrate this learning into psychology, they should not attempt to practice Buddhist disciplines and should not practice psychology from a Buddhist perspective. Perhaps if Jung were alive today and had witnessed the increased contact between East and West he would not so strongly believe this. My work is based on the premise that Westerners can and may benefit from practicing psychology

based on Zen. Nevertheless, I think it is important to consider Jung's views while engaging this project. These books are useful for this purpose.

Particularly relevant to this study is the conversation that Jung had with Shin'ichi Hisamatsu at his home in Switzerland on May 16, 1958. Hisamatsu was a leading philosopher of the Kyoto School and a disciple of Kitaro Nishida. He was very interested in articulating a Zen philosophy. The Japanese version of the transcription of this discussion was first published in 1959, but Jung refused to allow the English translation to be published in *Psychologia*. His letter explaining his refusal, along with the English version, is in Meckel and Moore's book. A revised translation in English of this conversation, along with explanatory notes, was done by Shoji Muramoto (1998).

What is significant about this conversation is the attempt of a Western psychologist and a Japanese Zen Buddhist to communicate and understand each other. It is an example of the type of cross-cultural endeavor that this study is engaging. The result of this attempt was not particularly good; hence I understand Jung's not wanting the transcript published. Thus, this conversation points to some of the difficulties that can occur in the dialogue between psychology and Zen. This will be further discussed in chapter five.

Jungian psychology is very popular in Japan. Part of the reason for this is the influence of Hayao Kawai, who was trained in the West and returned to Japan. He has written extensively on the Japanese psyche from a Jungian perspective. Two of his works that have been published in English are *The Japanese Psyche: Major Motifs in the Fairy Tales of Japan* (1996b) and *The*

Buddhist Priest Myoe: A Life of Dreams (1992). The latter book analyzes the dream journal of a Buddhist priest. C. Schooler (1989) is very critical of *The Japanese Psyche*, writing that Kawai displays a lack of concern for methodological issues and that he is not open to explanations other than Jungian explanations. However, S. Nagatomo (1994), who has written on Japanese somatic psychology, writes that *The Buddhist Priest Myoe* is a “shining marble” (p. 589).

Kawai is thus a controversial writer. His explication of the Japanese psyche in Jungian terms is very relevant to this study. Studying Kawai’s work has helped me understand the Japanese psyche much more. Especially relevant to this study is Kawai’s (1966a) work in English, *Buddhism and the Art of Psychotherapy*. Kawai considers in a thoughtful way how Buddhism is useful in psychotherapy. It is a good book. J. Johnson (1997) concurs, writing that Kawai must be a compassionate and humble person and that he has a religious approach to psychotherapy. However, what is striking to me is how firmly rooted in Jungian practice Kawai is. His approach is to integrate Buddhism into Jungian work. The purpose of this study is not to interpret the roshis’ experience from any already existing psychological perspective, but to let the psychology of Zen emerge from the roshis’ descriptions of their experience.

Another Japanese Jungian therapist, Mokusen Miyuki (1994), has also co-authored a book, *Buddhism and Jungian Psychology*, with J. Marvin Spiegelman on Buddhism and Jungian theory. Interesting and useful in this book is his comparison of the Jungian idea of Self with the Buddhist realization of no-

self. However, Miyuki also interprets Buddhism from a Jungian point of view. Again, this study is attempting to let the psychology of Zen show itself in its own terms rather than a pre-existing Western theory.

While Kawai and Miyuki are Japanese who have examined Buddhism from a Western psychology theoretical perspective, there are many Westerners who have either attempted the same project or have tried to examine what is a Buddhist psychology itself. The Western psychological interest in Buddhism begins with the early days of psychology in the West. William James was one of the first psychologists interested in Buddhism. James was interested in the psychology of religions in general, writing a book, *The Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902/1961b), about this subject. This study is this same type of study that James attempted, that of examining the implicit psychology in a religious practice. Another more recent attempt by a Westerner of this type of study was done by Han de Wit (1991), *Contemplative Psychology*. Both of these books demonstrate the possibilities for psychology in examining religious practices and provide support for my project.

Some of James' ideas were understood by others to be very congruent with Zen ideas. In particular his idea of "pure experience," about which some of his writing is published in *Manuscript Essays and Notes* (James, 1988), was very influential. This idea influenced both Kitaro Nishida and D.T. Suzuki and is very heavily criticized by Bernard Faure (1993). This will be discussed in chapter seven. This idea points to a fundamental dynamic for the psychology of Zen; that is, first is pure experience possible, which Zen philosophy generally

asserts that it is, and second, if it is possible, then what is the relationship between situated experience and pure experience. Western relationship-oriented psychologies have generally emphasized situated experience. The psychology of Zen is also a relationship-oriented psychology, but it introduces a new element, that of pure experience. The situated experience/pure experience dynamic is one of the important issues that this study addresses.

In the Western academic field there are a few works that address the Buddhist/Zen understanding of what is a person and/or self that were helpful for this study. In particular Thomas Kasulis' (1981) *Zen Action, Zen Person* was useful. In this book he explains how the non-conceptual mind is at the base of what a person is from a Zen perspective. He gives a clear analysis of what is the healthy role of thinking for a person, an important consideration because of the Zen approach to conceptual thought. Another very useful book was *Encounter with Enlightenment: A Study of Japanese Ethics*, by Robert Carter (2001). One of the findings of this study is that the self as the roshis understand it is a social and relational self. As such ethics are very important to them. Carter's book was helpful in understanding the roshis' sense of ethics. Also helpful was David Loy's (1996) *Lack and Transcendence: The Problem of Death and Life in Psychotherapy, Existentialism, and Buddhism*. In this book Loy presents a strong argument for the role and importance of emptiness for a person. Joan Stambaugh (1990) in *Impermanence is Buddha-nature: Dogen's Understanding of Temporality* offers a very thorough consideration of Dogen's philosophy of impermanence. This idea is basic and very important to understanding the Zen

Buddhist view of person. Dogen was the founder of the Soto sect of Zen Buddhism, so this book was very relevant as an explicator of Dogen's understanding of time. Sally King (1991) in *Buddha Nature* includes a chapter on the Buddhist concept of person. Her discussion addresses the existential and ontological aspects of a person in Buddhist thought in a way that seems to me to be very true to the intentions contained in the Buddhist sutra that she is explicating.

One book that is not a study of Buddhist psychology, but rather a cross-cultural psychology book, that was important for this study was *In Search of Self in India and Japan*, by Alan Roland (1988). This book was a groundbreaking book in America in the field of cross-cultural psychology. Written from a psychoanalytic perspective, it expands the applicability of psychoanalysis from Western culture to non-Western cultures. I found his analysis of the Japanese self very useful for my own understanding of this same topic. However, I also found that some of his conceptualization lends itself too easily to stereotypes, so I used his ideas with caution.

Of those who have reviewed this book, I found that Westerners tended to be very favorable towards the book, but among Asian reviewers there was much less enthusiasm. A representative Western point of view was that of M. Weiss (1989), who asserted that Roland has made some important adjustments to psychoanalytic theory. He claims that this work "demolishes worn-out assumptions and sets the standard for further research in cross-cultural psychology" (p. 465). However, F. Oshikawa (1989), a Japanese, writes that

Roland makes many generalizations, hastily jumps to conclusions, and has so simplified the Japanese character that she believes such work can only lead to the formation of new stereotypes. S. Kakar (1993), an Indian, writes that Roland has not presented anything new, only old familiar ideas, and that his methodology is faulty. Kakar asserts that Roland tends to view people through pre-conceived ideas and his case studies demonstrate that he misses much of the humanness of clients from other cultures. Although I am not as negative as Oshikawa and Kakar are, my own experience does support their assertion that Roland's ideas easily can be stereotypical ways of viewing Asian people. This is discussed in chapter four.

Within the field of psychology in the West after William James interest continued in Buddhist psychology, although not quite as James had envisioned. A very useful book that provides writings from psychologists throughout the 20th century is *The Couch and the Tree*, edited by Anthony Molino (1998). This book gives a cross-section of different approaches to Buddhist psychology, including some on psychology and Zen. It also has some articles written by Japanese psychologists.

One of the essays in this book is by Jack Engler, "Buddhist Psychology: Contributions to Western Psychological Theory." Engler is a psychologist who is very favorably inclined to Buddhist psychology. From the concepts he presents his frame of reference appears to me to be Theravada Buddhism, not Zen. This is the frame of reference of most Western writings on Buddhist psychology. Thus, this study is filling a gap in Buddhist psychology in the West.

Engler also presents some ideas in this essay about Buddhist psychology that appear in many Western writings on this subject. One is that he understands no-self to literally mean no self. This reflects his understanding of emptiness as literally being emptiness. A second common idea is the relationship between Western psychology and Buddhist psychology is that Western psychology develops a self, while Buddhist psychology develops letting go of this self. A third common idea is that a person must first become a self, then become a no-self. This is an idea that the Buddhist self is a higher and further development of the Western self.

These ideas do seem to reflect the understanding of Buddhism in the West as “Quietism” that Bernard Faure (1993, chapter 1) writes about. All three of these ideas will be challenged in this study and alternatives will be proposed.

Two books that have been a very significant part of the growing interest in Buddhist psychology in the West are Mark Epstein’s (1995) *Thoughts Without a Thinker* and Jeffrey Rubin’s (1996) *Psychotherapy and Buddhism: Toward an Integration*. The Buddhist perspective of both is Theravada Buddhism. I especially like Epstein’s book. It is written with gentleness and clarity. It was very useful in serving my understanding of the ego as a function of the psyche that all people have. Epstein attempts to integrate Western psychology and Buddhist meditation practice as complementary practices. He tries to develop a Buddhist psychology that can be integrated with Western psychology in clinical work.

I think he is very successful in this attempt. However, in particular the first two elements that I found in Engler's work also are in Epstein's writing. He identifies the Buddhist self with change and with literal emptiness. The findings of this study indicate a different understanding. This will be discussed in chapter four and chapter seven.

Reviewers of Epstein's book were mostly very positive. A representative view was that of S. Jacobson (1996), who enthusiastically endorsed the book as an "important, groundbreaking book" (p. 123). However, J. Low (1997), writing for a Buddhist society in London, panned the book, saying that not only was there nothing new in it, that it also misrepresented Buddhist thought. He said that it is a terrible book.

Jeffrey Rubin (1996) in *Psychotherapy and Buddhism* challenges the stereotypes of both Western and Buddhist psychology. Because of this, the reader must think to engage Rubin's writing. For this it is valuable. However, while Epstein clearly writes as a practitioner of Buddhism, Rubin writes more as a psychoanalyst who is well read in Buddhism. The result is that Rubin misunderstands many Buddhist ideas and presents them in a very literal way. For example, his understanding of emptiness and no-self are both very literal and thus certainly at least misrepresentations of Zen psychology, if not all of Buddhist psychology. This will be discussed in chapters six and seven.

Interestingly, both reviews that I found on *Psychotherapy and Buddhism* were very positive. Both M. Finn (1998) and D. Morgan (1996) had a positive impression of the book. They both wrote that the book was candid and fair to

both traditions. They also both thought that the book was a good guide in how to synthesize Buddhist thought with psychoanalysis. In my opinion this points to the need for this study, as Buddhist psychology as represented by Rubin has many misunderstandings.

One book that does purport to be about Zen psychology is David Brazier's (1996) *Zen Therapy*. I like this book. It has many ideas that I feel a kinship with. For example, Brazier writes about psychological disease in terms of attachment, an idea that I found in the roshis' experience. However, this book is not really about Zen psychology. Brazier relies heavily on the Abhidhamma from the Theravada Buddhist tradition. It is more a blend of various Buddhist traditions. In this way it reflects a common Western approach, which is to view Buddhism as a *philosophia perennis* and to blend the different sects together through finding common themes. This study, in contrast, aims to stay within Japanese Zen as much as possible.

Marsha Linehan (1993) is one Western psychologist who has made an effort to integrate Zen ideas into her therapeutic work. In particular I like her use of acceptance as a necessity for change. She has written about this often. One book in which she describes this very well is *Cognitive-behavioral Treatment of Borderline Personality Disorder*. Her writing is very useful in terms of considering how Zen ideas can be utilized in Western therapeutic work.

Another book with this same kind of intention is Polly Young-Eisendrath's (1996) *The Gifts of Suffering: Finding Insight, Compassion and Renewal*. Young-Eisendrath is a Jungian therapist. Within her work she finds

significant ways to use the Zen approach to suffering and Zen koans. In particular suffering is discussed several times in this report. How to be with one's suffering I think is fundamental to Zen practice.

Finally, in this consideration of literature on the psychology of Zen I want to examine *Awakening and Insight: Zen Buddhism and Psychotherapy*, edited by Shoji Muramoto and Polly Young-Eisendrath (2002). This book is a collection of articles, including articles by the editors, from both academic and psychotherapeutic perspectives. These articles shed new light on many aspects of the psychology of Zen and are valuable for that reason. For example, there are two articles on the Jung-Hisamatsu conversation, one of which (Muramoto, 2002) is Muramoto's translation of this conversation that was also published in *The Couch and the Tree* (Molino, 1998). Since this book is new, it provides an opportunity to see how people in the West are continuing to try to understand the psychology of Zen and how they are trying to integrate it into psychotherapeutic work. Two of the articles in particular, by Melvin Miller and Adeline van Waning, are based on an understanding of Zen that reflects the themes that I discussed in Engler's work. This will be discussed in chapter eight. This points to the situation that Zen psychology continues to be understood in terms of a literal emptiness and passivity of self. The findings of this study point to a different understanding of the psychology of Zen. These findings will be elaborated in the following chapters.

Contribution of this Dissertation

In this literature that I have reviewed I believe what is missing is a work that specifically articulates a psychology that is based on the experiences and expressions of those who are living the practice of Zen Buddhism that is founded on the realization of the true self. This is a psychology that is “within” Zen, a psychology based on the Zen understanding of mind. In Japan a Zen psychology has been articulated in various academic ways. However, a study specifically focusing on the experience of Zen roshis, Zen priests who have been acknowledged by others to realize the truth of the Buddhist teachings, has not been done. As the scholar Te-shan Hsuan-chien (Huikai, 1228/1977, case #28) realized, Zen is to be lived, not just analyzed. My hope is that how Zen is lived will reveal new aspects of Zen psychology.

In the West the general direction in the literature on Zen and psychology reflects two trends that are both the opposite of developing a psychology “within” Zen; that is, the attempt is to integrate Zen ideas and practices into an already existing Western psychological system and to interpret Zen in terms of no-self literally meaning no self. In so doing aspects of Zen are lost and there is an implicit devaluing of Zen. To fully appreciate Zen and to consider the value it can have for psychological work I believe the words of Husserl need to be heeded – “to the thing itself” (Spiegelberg, 1982, p. 680). My hope is that by allowing the experience of traditional Japanese Zen practitioners to be expressed new understandings of the workings of mind will emerge and psychology will thus be enriched.