The Triangle and The Blob

Andrew Duncan

Andrew Duncan lives in Tokyo, Japan
with his wife and will be looking to plant a Church in Japan in 2010.

A man in hopes of building a house goes on a journey looking for a structure with which to build his house. On his journey he comes to two bodies sitting in the midst of the way. He stops and looks at these two beings.   One is a triangle; the other is a blob. Seeing that these two entities appear to be noble structures he asks both of them, "Which of you is a proper structure with which to build a house?" Both reply that they in themselves are the only true structures with which to build a proper house. First talking to the Blob the man asks, "How is it that you are the true house building structure?" The Blob replies, "With me, you will realize that houses do not exist and that you do not exist. Once you understand this properly you will neither want, nor desire a house, and when this is experienced you will be free to have no-house which is in fact the true house. Once you have this, you will realize that you always had a house because the only thing which truly exists is houseness." Amazed and confused by this answer the man turns to the triangle and asks, "How would you say that you offer the true structure for a house?" To this the triangle replies, "I offer parts and a whole to your house. Only from parts unified in a whole can you have a house." Not knowing everything about the nature of parts and wholes but much more capable of understanding that parts and wholes make houses, the man picks up the triangle and builds his house. Later that day the rain comes. While the man sits happily in his house he perchance looks out the window. At that very moment he sees the Blob placidly being washed away into nothing.

It will hopefully be noted by the reader that the above illustration is an illustration of final rejection of the Zen position in favor of the Christian one and not an overly accurate allegory encompassing all the tenets of Zen or Christian theism. The writer does not interact with Zen in this paper because he "sees" Zen as an easy target, but rather because he has deep respect for proponents and adherents to this system of thought. This respect is such that he sees this interaction as a good and necessary challenge.

That being said, the writer will now give a general outline of what will proceed. This paper will interact (through the lens of what is hopefully the accurate application of Van Tillian apologetics) with the underlying epistemological strand within the Zen system. First, an outline of basic Zen structure will be given. This will come primarily through condensed works of Shinegori Nagatomo. This overarching structure will provide us our basic foundations for understanding how Zen itself is internally understood. Following will come an interactive section that will engage a chapter taken from T.P. Kaulis' work. This piece in itself sought to present the basic philosophical suppositions by

which Zen epistemology is substantiated.

To begin, as stated above, we will attempt over the next few pages to articulate the basic shell teaching structures of Zen Buddhism. Even more concretely, we will be looking at the philosophy developed by the Soto school of Zen Buddhism as brought to the Western world by D.T. Suzuki[1].

Shinegori Nagatomo in writing for the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy encapsulates Zen in the opening to his lengthy article in the aforementioned publication. He states: "Zen aims at perfection of personhood.   To this end sitting meditation called 'za-zen' is employed as a foundational method of praxis across the different schools of this Buddha-Way, through which the Zen practitioner attempts to embody non-discriminatory wisdom vis-à-vis the meditational practice known as 'satori' (enlightenment). A process of discovering wisdom culminates in the experiential dimension in which the equality of thing-events is apprehended in discerning them… It also understands a specificity of thing-event to be a recapitulation of the whole; parts and the whole are to be lived in an inseparable relationship through an exercise of nondiscriminatory wisdom, without prioritizing the visible over the invisible, the explicit over the implicit, and vice versa. As such Zen maintains a stance of 'not one' and 'not two,' i.e. 'positionless position' where 'not two' signals a negation of the stance that divides the whole into two parts, i.e., dualism, while 'not one' designates a negation of this stance, when the Zen practitioner dwells in the whole as one, while suspending judgment in meditation, i.e., non-dualism. Free bilateral movement characterizes Zen's achievement of a personhood with a third perspective that cannot however be confined to either dualism, or non dualism."[2]

This concrete paragraph represents in kernel reduction what this Buddhist school teaches. What follows will be a more developed digest of the seven wheels that carry Zen forward.

First, the meaning of "Zen." This worldview developed out of an ancient Indian articulation of particular Buddhist teaching. It traveled through China and reached its most fully articulated form in Japan. In Buddhism generally, there are 3 main applications of human existence that need to be cultivated: meditation, adherence to ethical precepts, and "nondiscriminatory" reasoning. In Zen, meditation is of particular importance because through this practice the historical Buddha himself is claimed to have achieved "enlightenment" or "Nirvana" (the third perspective mentioned above). Thus through meditation one achieves in similar manner to the Buddha, true knowledge (non discriminatory wisdom) which is practical and experiential while only being

---

[1]It was in the early 1930s that Japanese Zen Buddhism made its first detailed interaction with the West with the publication of *Introduction to Zen Buddhism* and *Training of the Zen Monk*. In 1960 D.T. Suzuki published his landmark *Manual of Zen Buddhism*. His works, and particularly his *Manual,* continue to be cornerstones in the Zen body of literature as well as in Eastern studies in general.
[2]Nagatomo, Shinegori. *Zen*, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2006. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/japanese-zen/

theoretical or intellectual as an undesirable side effect. This distinction between practical/experiential and theoretical/intellectual knowledge is rooted in the Zen practitioner's belief that language and linguistic distinction are the basis for discriminatory reasoning, which is a hindrance to the full existential experience of the human being, and as such, should be rejected. In contrast, Zen, at its base, desires to push the human being in the direction of holistic mind-body unity where the former radically affects the latter. Making, in the end, practice more valuable than propositional theory.

Second, we describe what constitutes the methodological approaches of Zen meditation. First is the practice of "Koan." Highlighting this practice helps to illuminate for the reader the epistemological method involved in Zen's rejection of linguistically based theoretical knowledge. A Koan is a verbal riddle given by a Zen master to one of his disciples (i.e., "What is the sound of one hand clapping itself?") These riddles have no "rational" answer and therefore defy linguistic explanation. They are posited in an attempt to free the disciple from his ego or self individuating consciousness which is itself based on faulty dualistic cognitive categories. These cognitive categories create an existential paradigm that is not fully reflective of true reality. These riddles are not solvable in the ordinary right/wrong sense, thus, an adequate answer can only be recognized by a master who has already attained his Buddhahood (an inherent quality or state of being, which is the third perspective).

More relevant to the Soto sect is the practice of "just sitting." This particular system was emphasized by the founder of the Soto school, Dogen (1200-1254 ACE).[3] This practice was founded on the belief that there is no distinction between potentiality and actuality, any position that holds to that duality is not truly reflective of reality and thus must be rejected. Existentially "just sitting" is a process in which, over time, something greater takes place. It is a gradual method that forces the adherent to let go of his ego/self-consciousness for the more pure realization of an already existent Buddha nature.

Third, we will briefly discuss how Zen describes itself as "anti-philosophy." This is of particular importance to the reader because here it is noted that Zen claims to most thoroughly and uncompromisingly reject Aristotelian logic. The Zen world view as noted previously rejects any dualistic distinction and as such, finds no more egregious offender than the linguistic theoretical word game offered in the logic based epistemology of Aristotle. As such, Zen tries most emphatically to reject propositional statements based on subject-object distinctions adhering rather to experiential knowledge, which transcends linguistic categories of the West. In rejecting this false ego-consciousness, Zen thinks itself to more fully understand reality as an organic whole without holding to one defective aspect as is done in dualistic separation.

Fourth, we will summarize what is meant in Zen by "overcoming dualism." The development of a practitioner of this system is gauged by his ability to "embody" the stance of "not two." This "not two" statement is the rejection of

---

[3]Dogen Kigen. *Dogen zenji zenshu* (Complete works of Zen Master Dogen). Edited by Okubo Doshu. 2 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969-1970.

subject-object distinction related in the preceding paragraph. This "not two" stance wishes to do away with dualistic reality conceptions which falsely divide inner and outer worlds. Zen *in toto* rejects the notion that "I" exist. An "I" stance existence sees itself as a self-contained unit separated from everything else. Nagatomo in his essay states: "The inability to go beyond these experiential domains, Zen explains, occurs because ego-consciousness is physiologically rooted in the body and psychologically in the unconscious."[4] Zen believes that because of parallel natures of reality, the physical and psychic, man falsely concludes that that there is a dualism with respect to himself and extrapolates this to mean that there must therefore be a dualism with respect to everything else, i.e., evil vs good, I vs nature, etc.   In so doing man must therefore fail at his attempt to understand reality because the reduction or division of the whole into abstract competitors is absurd, leading to materialism or idealism[5].

This subject-object rejection comes on the grounds that the false dichotomy maintained in that system creates an unfordable divide between the two, making real interaction impossible, because by definition a subject cannot be the object and vice versa. Holding to this system then will lead only to incomplete, and therefore useless, knowledge. Contrastingly, true knowledge requires total "experiential" absorption of subject and object in an undivided unity. The Zen master Dogen encapsulates this teaching when he says, "when one side is illuminated the other side remains in darkness."[6] This one sidedness in epistemology according to Zen can only lead to prejudice, bias and incompleteness. Thus, as Nagatomo says, Zen teaches that one must "forget the I."[7] In this manner, Zen, as it relates to logic, hopes to provide a constructive mental framework for reality. "If you become a master in any place, wherever you stand is true."[8]

Fifth, now that we have seen how "not two" stands as one epistemological foot within the system, we may shift our weight to Zen's other foot, its experiential dimension. This is perhaps the most confounding aspect of Zen to the Westerner because at its very base Zen acknowledges that involved in this is what we in the West would call a contradiction. In Zen, a "law" of non-contradiction is fully acknowledged but also fully dismissed. To experience Zen as the teachers mean for it to be experienced, one must embody the "no-thought, no-image"[9] stance. This mental framework is a Zen state of being which comes in direct contrast to the stance of the everyday man described earlier. This everyday man state, as developed through this essay, is one that is grounded in dualistic distinctions and as such does not reflect reality. Ultimately Zen self-consciously claims that articulation of no-thought and no-image is linguistically impossible relying on its system of non-

---

[4]Nagatomo, Shinegori. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*
[5]Nagatomo, Shinegori *The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A is not A, therefore it is A.* (Asian Philosophy, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2000).
[6]Suzuki, D.T. *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1976.
[7]Nagatomo, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*
[8]Iriya, Yoshitaka (ed). *Rinzai roku* [The Records of Zen Master Rinzai]. Tokyo, Iwashami shoten, 1989.
[9]Nagatomo *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.*

dualistic/pantheistic ontology inherent to many Eastern worldviews. In reference to why Zen holds that one must follow this no-thought, no-image posture, Nagatomo states: "Zen explains that both 'there is' and 'there is not' (or more generally 'being' and 'non-being') are intellectually framed from within the everyday standpoint by accepting the oppositional ontology where the meaning of 'is' is predicated on the meaning of 'is not' and vice versa."[10] Thus Zen maintains that the epistemological/experiential element of no-thought, no-image is the only path to true understanding of the object.

As this no-thought, no-image doctrine is processed and more fully embodied by the Zen disciple, it produces the ability of Zen "seeing." Once again, Nagatomo in his work gives the clearest expression possible to what is meant by this term: "The experiential dimension in which Zen's 'nothing' becomes understandable refers to a quiescent state of meditation in which is arrested the activity of an individual practitioner's ego-consciousness that functions in a close correlation with his or her body. Upon reaching such a meditational state, the Zen practitioner comes to experience an event generally known as 'seeing into one's nature…'"[11]

The sixth principle parts of Zen are timelessness and spacelessness.   These two terms obviously reflect and highlight one another within the system. These two terms are used to indicate Zen's position of existence in the "here and now" while also existing in integrated time and space. The space element refers to the practitioner's point of reference while the time element refers to the nowness of the "eternal stream of the present."[12] Zen has previously wanted to articulate a doctrine of "not two," but here they shift to put forward a doctrine of "not one." In this way the Zen teaching tries to maintain the affirmation of nothing at the expense of something else. This timelessness/spacelessness category is an attempt to articulate something which is said to be purely existential. These two terms relate a reality in which both time and space are relativized with respect to the Zen practitioner. They are not outside of time but beyond it. Time and space as realized to the enlightened practitioner are integrated realities by which we mean they are not containers of linear progression dividing the parts from the whole and vice versa. They are rather terms which indicate the recognition of the singularity of all things.

Seventh, Zen has a basic teaching on the "Zen person." This relates to one who has experienced this third position and is "really" in the world being holistically intact. This is an interesting aspect that ties the other portions together but is not essential to our interaction in the next section so we will not spend time discussing it.

As our focus shifts from laying out the tenants of Zen as a whole to an interaction with and critique of this system in particular aspects, the language used will change correspondingly. The authors with whom this paper will now deal will at times use different terminology than was previously laid out, but

---

[10]Ibid
[11]Ibid
[12]Ibid

hopefully as the discussion continues the sources used to paint Zen and the sources used to engage that system will (if I have done a good job) reflect one another such that the difference in terminology will be seen as merely cosmetic not substantive.

Now, in Van Tillian apologetic discourse the aim is to find the basic presuppositions of an interlocking system. This apologetic task was made significantly easier for this writer because Dr. T.P. Kasulis, professor of philosophy at University of Hawaii has written a book entitled *Zen Action/Zen Person*[13] that lays out the two strands of thought which are foundational for the Zen worldview. The first comes in his chapter on Nargarjuna: The Logic of Emptiness, and second is his chapter on Chinese Taoism: The Pre-ontology of Nonbeing. We, wishing to focus on Zen epistemology, will deal solely with the former chapter.

Nargarjuna is reported to be the founder of an Indian Buddhist sect that predates Zen, nevertheless he is considered a patriarch in the Zen system. In an attempt to formulate a coherent system based on a doctrine of "sunyata," or emptiness, he developed his "Middle Way."[14] This Middle way challenges the "problems" of language and the philosophy built on an inadequate understanding of language. As seen through the lens of Romans chapter 1, these "solutions" to "problems" betray the following presuppositions within Zen: 1) I recognize that God is whole. 2) I recognize that I am composite. 3) I want to be God so I must find a way to get rid of my parts. Because of this, Zen and Nargarjuna, although wishing to understand reality, never can because by starting with a position of man and ending with a position of man, they loose the definitive perspective.

According to scholar T.R.V. Murti, Nargarjuna's genius is shown by his systemization of "emptiness" principles. Murti condenses Nargarjuna's teaching in the following way: "Relation has to perform two mutually opposed functions: as connecting two terms, in making them relevant to each other, it has to identify them; but as connecting the two, it has to differentiate them. Otherwise, expressed, relation cannot obtain between entities that are identical with or different from each other."[15] Some of this claim seems reasonable. Language relation, as it is used, does double duty of specifying and tying together mental concepts in an organized communicable linguistic way such that it has specific relevance but has specific relevance in relationship to the whole. The problem for the Christian is "relation cannot obtain between entities that are identical with or different from each other." A questioned begged at this point is why not? Relation has obtained enough at this point to carry on a meaningful conversation. Has it not? This betrays how Nargarjuna's thought moves forward too quickly, starting from the observation that something complicated in language is going on, to a conclusion that rejects complication and refuses to embrace what it cannot understand fully.

---

[13]Kasulis T.P. *Zen Action/Zen Person*. The University Press of Hawaii, 1981.
[14]Translation for the entire MK is found in Streng, Frederick J. *Emptiness* pp. 183-200.
[15]T.R.V. Murti *Central philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of the Madhyamika System* p.13, London: Allen & Unwin 1960.

Nargarjuna carries out this argument in his Mulamadhyamakakakarika (Fundamentals of the Middle Way, henceforth: MK).[16] In this piece, Nargarjuna discusses how language is used "commonly." He tries to persuade that if language as it is used commonly cannot in each of its parts obtain relation to the reality as a whole, then it lacks the capacity to obtain relation at all. Zen philosophy wishes to posit that because language is limited and built of parts, it is not therefore holistic "true knowledge." This is because true knowledge can only be whole or unparted knowledge. As such it is supposedly beyond communicable cognitive categories.

What started out as a claim needing justification ("relation cannot obtain...") became itself the interpretive epistemological principle. It is from this wrong presupposition, that proponents of Zen philosophy make invalid epistemological claims on the nature of reality as a whole.

On page 19 of Kasulis' book is the translation of Nargarjuna's argument in MK against a linguistic understanding of time:

1. If the existence of the present and the future depends upon the past, then present and future should be in the past.

2. For if present and future were not there, how could present and future be dependent on the past

3. Moreover, without dependence upon the past, there is no occurrence of present and future. Thus present as well as future times would not exist.

4. In the same manner, the remaining two periods [of time], as well as [concepts such as] above, below, and middle etc., or identity, etc. should be characterized[17]

In concluding this argument Kasulis feels safe in assuming that since each of these terms carry meaning only in relation to the other and since the referents "never exist simultaneously," therefore language cannot be used to state an objective reality outside itself. If the terms did refer to "nonlinguistic" bits of reality then they cannot have connection because they do not exist simultaneously, thus holding to past, present and future, as a knowable objective reality is absurd.[18]

What in this layout can Christian theism agree to? First, time language itself is an interconnected set. Second, without something beyond language to ground it, it breaks apart into floating bits of abstract meaninglessness. Third, language does not exist as an independent, uninterpreted, perspectiveless objective reality.

---

[16]Streng, Frederick J. *Emptiness* pp. 183-200. This work contains the whole translated MK.
[17]Kasulis p.19
[18]Ibid

In contrast, what can Christian theism not agree to? First, an assumption that the content of linguistic referents never exist simultaneously. The Christian would hold that they do in fact exist simultaneously, but not for us, only for God.

Second, the dependent and interconnected composite nature of language referents does not negate their true representational reality. The Christian will base his understanding of the relation of particulars—"obtaining" through referential linguistic categories—on his understanding of the Trinitarian God. As revealed, God exists both as a whole unified one, and also as three distinct, true, coequal, coexistent persons. This three in one God is both subject and object of His own internally self-recognizable communication. This is a mystery but it alone can act as an accurate interpretative grid by which everything else can be understood.

God is a divisionless three-in-one being. Because God uses language and does so with reference to both intrinsic ("And God said, 'Let Us make man in our image after our likeness'" Gen 1:26a) and extrinsic things ("And God said, 'Let there be light: and there was light.'" Gen 1:3), relation necessarily obtains because it first obtained within the Godhead and then carried over into the created order. God's language is part of His very being (John 1:1 "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God") and as such relates to His self-sustaining self-understanding Trinitarian nature. This creates for us context as His image bearers to understand composition in "parts and wholes" and how they work together. Humans as His image bearers are designed to live in constant state of reflection. This Reformed theology has been called living by *analogy*[19]. This term in theological circles means that God is the base for everything else. Man, more than anything else in creation, bears the Divine image (Gen 1). This being the case, what we do is what God does, just on a human not a divine scale. Thus, man uses language in similar fashion to show how God uses language (this can be seen from God's interaction with man in Gen 2:16 "And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat").

For God, His unique "Word" is an instance of his essence such that the "Word" as it is revealed is the second person of the Trinity. This in the Orthodox Trinitarian schema implies that if we are dealing with one aspect of God (His Word) we are dealing with the whole of His person (John 1). For humans as created in the "image" of God, our coherent understanding of language is a reflection of God's very unified coherent identity. This requires from us an understanding of language that is compositely coherent. We as the created are to reflect His nature (Gen 1) by utilizing and conceiving of language in an analogous fashion to the one internally utilized by the Godhead. Zen, purporting itself to be a transcendent/immanent whole representation of reality beyond language, denying the existence of its actual particulars, does dishonor to its Trinitarian Creator.[20]

---

[19]For fuller development of the theology of analogy see K. Scott Oliphant: *Reasons For Faith* (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R 2006).

[20]None of this section explicitly quoted the work of Vern S. Poythress, but the

Zen in its epistemological methodology attempts to provide rationale for the dissolution of the particulars through its destruction of language. This is done so as to emphasize some conception of whole/universalness. They maintain that this alone provides for complete, unbiased and "holistic" understanding of everything. However, we maintain that if Zen cannot allow for a referential communication system of meaningful, true particulars unified into a true, meaningful whole then it cannot be. Zen as it stands is left with only an attempt at destruction. In so doing they destroy themselves. This will be flushed out in the following pages.

Emptiness doctrine, as seen above, articulates its opponent through only one opposing view of language (one with which the Christian would also take issue). Having rejected that singular opponent position, it thinks it can jump to assertion without checking where it came from.

As they have laid out, language concerning (in this case, time) is dependent and interconnected, thus they try to persuade that each of its constituent parts is deficient and not truly referential to any extralinguistic reality. For Zen, if language were accurate, should only reflect some notion of wholeness, in this case the "eternal present." Since it cannot (by their accounting), any epistemological referencing between subject (man) and object (time) based on language is ruled out, thereby ruling out time and, by implication, language itself. However, when a system only allows for accurate communication to be had in an unchallenged category of "wholeness," it loses its own ground. This is because within the Zen system there are no epistemological grounds independent from what is ascertainable to the Zen practitioner himself in an enlightened state. Now, as Zen teaches, the enlightened man is not distinct from regular man, only a more "souped up" version of him. So by necessity, it means that there is nowhere that epistemological categories of the biased everyday man and unbiased Zen man are not co-mingled. This is because all categories are inherently one in the same as seen from not one, but two positions stated above. If all there is in the Zen system is what is ultimately is accessible to man, whether enlightened or unenlightened, then the established categories of a third perspective are inherently tied to and identical with the faulty incomplete categories of the dualistic perspective. So, in the end, any "third perspective whole knowledge" is itself nothing more than the reworded faulty system set of the partitioned everyday man. With Zen, we are left with a product of "whole" knowledge that is justified and built on defective particulars. Thus they undercut themselves. If nothing surpasses the categories expressed by the finite men of this locked system, then nothing in its epistemology can "free" them from their locked system. Zen is doomed to incomplete, detached, and useless knowledge, being left in the same state as the everyday man.

Having now seen Zen's approach to methodology, let us now look at their epistemological product. Zen, as laid out, allows for only co-mingled categories of knowledge. Even if we allow for their unfounded conclusion of

some third perspective, they are still lost. As with their methodology, the rejection composite parts will take them nowhere. A third perspective whole knowledge acts as a shell. Now this shell, wishing to deny anything but itself as "real," must in this system deny its own yolk, because its yolk is distinct and not shell. So what we have before us is some kind of whole knowledge structure that has no use for anything but the structure itself, rejecting any composite knowledge that it might encapsulate. Having denied its yolk content, what is left? Obviously, the shell alone. What value is a shell with no yolk? Perhaps it will make a pretty Easter egg, but it will not do for nourishment. So too with Zen's epistemological stance. Zen denying its composite content, leaves itself meaningless and its practitioners starved. It has nothing to define itself with or against, nor does it have anything to reflect on, so it cannot even really acknowledge itself. It must simply exist as an unknown shell. Further, it would be difficult to see how it could continue to hold to its shellness because to do so would be to require it to have something within and without to define it. Sadly, because nothing surpasses man's enlightenment, we are allowed only a man-centered whole knowledge shell category without any nest to lay that shell knowledge in. So our shell knowledge must fall eternally, having nowhere to rest. In the end, the shell of Zen epistemology truly does dissolve into a self-refuting and self-denying blob.

Language, as reference to reality understood by the Christian man, is accurate and true. Language represents extralinguistic, actual sequences and events which have, do, and will take place. Each component part is not individually comprehensive but, through ordered construction held together by God, reflects and communicates the experiential dimension of reality. For us this means that we may truly, although not comprehensively, know and communicate by once again referring back to man's state of dependent analogical existence. The point made by Zen, that there exists that which is outside of language reference, is certainly agreed to because the Christian theist sees this as the unique domain of God. However, trying to intermingle that which alone belongs to God and that which belongs to man on the basis of what man can comprehend, must be rejected as not reflective of reality. Exclusive epistemological categories of God and man can be brought together (and have been so), but this is alone an act of God, who is wholly other and can do what is beyond our comprehension.

Dr. Kasulis in summing up his thrust says, "We have seen that nothingness is the relativity or emptiness at the ground of thought, that very analysis of language and thought is a maelstrom, pulling us down into nothingness. But we have yet to see how nothingness emanates toward us beckoning us to return to the very source of all existence."[21] This author would agree that we have not seen how nothingness "emanates toward us," but would add that it has not been shown that nothingness has any power to pull us anywhere, because it doesn't exist.

It is not necessary to continue interacting with particular manifestations of Zen epistemology. At this point we can now recognize an epistemological attitude

---

[21]Kasulis p. 28

which pervades and defines the questions asked and answers given by the Zen non-man. The existential stump speech for the Zen-man revolves around this attitude: "If I can't understand things exhaustively, then I will create my own world where I can." This can be seen in each of the tenets developed by Dr. Nagatomo in his digested article above.

The philosophy/religion of the Zen non-man was born in an attempt to "free" himself from the tyranny of composite discriminatory knowledge and the divisive nature of language. He thought these had hindered his knowledge of mind/body unification. The Zen-man's methodology took anything that based itself on language mechanics and subject-objects (which he knew to limit himself) and marginalized it by saying they did not really exist because they did not reflect his desired "wholeness". Then, having established himself an "anti-religion", he created for himself a supposed world "beyond" his formerly meager place in creation. In doing so, he made for himself a new creation order. Having established this new world order of one, he needed only to destroy all of the other "everyday men". Once this was done he could then peacefully live in his own world, established by his own rules never coming into contact with any claimant to his throne. The Zen-man had destroyed all the others by dissolving them all into non-existence, leaving himself to be the god of his own non-existing universe. Unfortunately in the end, what the man of Zen did was to cut off his own life source by isolating himself from the ultimate and primary subject/object person of God. When he had made himself god, he realized that he was not really God and was not fit to rule his universe. Still, refusing to live as a creature in God's world, demanding independence from his self-attesting God, he has tried to "not be" ever since.

In the end, an apologetic discourse must defend from and attack opposition. While doing this, it must also address the concerns of the ones with whom it is engaged because they are lost sheep needing a shepherd. Zen, in analyzing reality, understood that what it "saw" in the world around it needed an interpretive model, an epistemological structure to live in beyond itself. In building its house, Zen recognized certain logs of truth but instead of turning to the Triune God for authoritative construction, it kept these solitary logs of truth, holding them so tightly that they could not be built into the house that God had designed for them.

Christianity offers a home to the Zen practitioner by offering the following: 1) A recognition that temporal, composite categories are not comprehensive of reality *in toto*.   2) A recognition that the eternal/whole category is the backdrop for a true understanding of reality.   3) The eternal/whole category is the three in one, one in three God who, in His being, is wholly other (eternal/transcendent), distinct from humanity, yet covenantly (temporally/immanently) joined to and knowable to them.   4) God can truly and accurately communicate things concerning himself to us.   5) This communication has come to us in a fully divine yet fully human written document, The Bible. This inscribed communication relates to us the fully divine and fully human God-Man, the person of Jesus Christ, who himself is coherent word. If we look to Him as embodied wisdom, he will build a house on solid rock that is furnished with true knowledge.

Bibliography

Dogen Kigen. *Dogen zenji zenshu* (Complete works of Zen Master Dogen). Edited by Okubo Doshu. 2 vols. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1969-1970.

Iriya, Yoshitaka (ed). *Rinzai roku* (The Records of Zen Master Rinzai). Tokyo, Iwashami shoten, 1989.

Kasulis T.P. *Zen Action/Zen Person*. The University press of Hawaii 1981.

Nagatomo, Shinegori. *Zen, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* 2006. http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/japanese-zen/

Nagatomo, Shinegori. *The Logic of the Diamond Sutra: A is not A,therefore it is A.* (Asian Philosophy, Vol. 10, No. 3, 2000).

Poythress V.S. *Reforming Ontology and Logic in the Light of the Trinity: An Application of Van Til's Idea of Analogy [Westminster Theological Journal 57:187-219.]*

Streng, Frederick J. *Emptiness* pp. 183-200. This work contains the whole translated MK

Suzuki, D.T. *Essays in Zen Buddhism*. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc., 1976

T.R.V. Murti *Central philosophy of Buddhism: A Study of the Madhyamika System* p.13, London: Allen & Unwin 1960