

MUTŌ Kazuo\*

## “Watch Your Step!”\*\*

Translated by Jan van Bragt

### I

When visiting a Zen temple, you will often see in the hall, where you have to take off your shoes, a wooden tag with the words “Watch your step!” (*kyakka shōko* 脚下照顧) written on it. I do not know which Zen text this saying is taken from, but somehow I sense a deep meaning in it. In the context of the hall, though, it seems that it simply wants to warn the visitors to take care where they put down their feet and to put away their shoes in good order. However this may be, it is deemed important, in whatever circumstances, to pay attention to the place (topos) where one is situated.

I myself have become sensitive to expressions that have topological implications since the time that I was taught about the “topos of nothingness” by Tanabe Hajime. There are, for example, the Chinese character 間, pronounced *ma* or *aida* in Japanese, and everyday expressions such as “to be situated” or “to be in.” And in the New Testament, we find the expressions “in Christ” and “in the Spirit” (that can be considered as practically synonymous), which Paul often uses and which are considered to eminently express his “Christ mysticism.” I am convinced that the clarification of the true meaning of these expressions is very meaningful and important for theology and for the philosophy of religion as well.

Supposing that “Watch your step!” tells people in general to pay attention to the place in which the self is presently located, for Christians it means in particular that they must be in the clear about the fact that they are placed “in Christ” or “in the Spirit.” It is precisely for the Christian – for instance, a Christian like Saint Paul

---

\* Mutō Kazuo (1913-1995) was professor for Christian Studies at Kyoto University (1962-1977). After retiring from Kyoto University he taught at Kwansai Gakuin University (1977-1982) and Ryukoku University (1982-1987). As a student of Tanabe Hajime and close friend and colleague of Nishitani Keiji, he is one of the few Christian representatives of the Kyoto School of Philosophy. For more English translations of his articles see *Japanese Religions*, vols. 12 (1), 15 (4) and 25 (1 & 2).

\*\* The original title is *kyakka shōko* 脚下照顧. This article was published in: Mutō Kazuo, *Shingaku-teki – shūkyō-tetsugaku-teki ronshū* II 神学的・宗教哲學的論集 II [Collected essays on theology and philosophy of religion], Tokyo: Sōbunsha 1986, pp. 101-121.

– that the fact of these two being practically synonymous obtains. The “Spirit” spoken of here is, of course, the “Holy Spirit,” the Spirit of God” or rather “God-in-Spirit” (John 4: 2-4), and is also the Spirit of Christ, or Christ himself as Paraclete (helper) (John 14-16 and I John 2: 1). Therefore, in theology, to speak in pneumatological terms must, in fact, be to speak in trinitarian terms. Moreover, while it is true that the three treatises on God, on Christ, and on the Holy Spirit can only exist as mutually mediated, it cannot be negated that pneumatology has a significance of its own. Could it not also be said that pneumatology, while being the mediator of the doctrines of God and of Christ, also has the significance of being their embracing ground?

Indeed, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God [“Since God is spirit, his worshippers must worship in spirit and in truth.” (John 4: 24)], and at the same time also the Spirit of the Son (*filioque*) [The Spirit of Christ, the Son, is “the spirit of truth,” who is also called the Paraclete (consoler) (cf. John 14: 16-17 and I John 2: 1-2)]. When we say that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, while being three, each a different person, are one, it must be possible to understand this oneness as first of all a oneness in the Holy Spirit.

“All things are from God, through God, and to God. To God be glory forever. Amen.” This doxology, found in Paul, at first sight strongly resembles the doxology of the Stoa, “All things are from you, in you, and return to you.”<sup>1</sup> The resemblance is so strong that even a scholar like Edward Norden, in his book, *Agnostos Theos* [The Unknown God], considers the two as homogeneous and calls Paul’s doxology “the Stoic doxology in Paul.” However, according to Albert Schweitzer, these two doxologies are fundamentally different in thought and faith, the decisive difference appearing in the fact that in Marcus Aurelius the second clause reads “all things are *in* God,” while in Paul it reads “all is *through* Him.” In Schweitzer’s opinion, there lies an abyss of difference between this “in” and this “through,” and it is this difference that separates the static mysticism of the Stoa from the dynamic mysticism of Paul. He contends, moreover, that the words in Paul’s sermon on the Areopagus (according to Acts 17: 28), “in Him we live and move and have our being,” betray the “God mysticism” of the Stoa and are far removed from Paul’s Christ mysticism. Therefore, the sermon on the Areopagus itself must be ascribed to Luke, the author of Acts, and the words so-called of Paul are in fact very un-Paulinian.<sup>2</sup>

Schweitzer distinguishes “God mysticism” and “Christ mysticism,” and states that in Paul we find Christ mysticism but no God mysticism. The reasons why he says this are worth looking into. Among the several reasons he adduces the most important one may be the following. Paul’s thought and faith are thoroughly eschatological, and God mysticism is possible only at the time of the parousia “when God will be all in all” (I Cor. 15: 28). God mysticism, according to which all things

---

1. Marcus Aurelius, *In se ipsum*, IV, 13.

2. Cf. Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle I: The Particularities of Paul’s Mysticism*.

are in God, does not obtain as long as in this world all kinds of "angelic beings" (here taken in a very pejorative sense) exert some power over us human beings. Christ mysticism ("living in Christ") and God mysticism ("living in God") cannot co-exist in parallel. The latter is realized only on the basis of the former and in a chronological before-after relationship with it. The former is dynamic mysticism that progresses toward an eschatological goal; the latter is a static mysticism that can be characterized also as God-in-nature (*Deus sive natura*). In the former, God is still transcendent – he is finally a hidden God; in the latter, God does away with all historical progression and is, as it were, a pantheistic God, who is immanent in all things.<sup>3</sup> According to Schweitzer, it cannot be denied that one aspect of Paul's thought and faith is an apocalyptic eschatology, and that his kerygma, correspondingly, has the character of a christological kerygma.

However, Schweitzer's thesis that, therefore, we cannot recognize Christ mysticism and God mysticism as existing at the same time, since they do not go together, is apt to be considered somewhat questionable, and may be difficult to accept. True, for the Christian, it is not permissible to speak about God mysticism without mediation by a Christ mysticism, since that would probably amount to defining Christian mysticism in the framework of a natural theology. However, could we not be allowed to say the following? Christ mysticism is the cognitive basis (*ratio cognoscendi*) of God mysticism; God mysticism, on the other hand, is the ontological basis (*ratio essendi*) of Christ mysticism. Therefore, the two are not merely connected in a chronological order, historically and temporally, or again, in the history of salvation (*heilsgeschichtlich*). We must say that they are already inseparable within the "saving event" (*Heilsgeschehen*) itself of Jesus Christ. The 27 books of the New Testament are eminently books of christological faith and, especially in the Pauline kerygma, which focuses on the proclamation of the "word of the cross," it is not surprising that the expression "in Christ" is chosen rather than the expression "in God," to denote the ground of the *Existenz* of the Christian. However, as I already intimated, at the ground or in the background of being in Christ, there must be the ontological fact of "being in God." The idea of "being in Christ" constitutes the reason for speaking of Christ mysticism but, at its ground or in its background there must lie a God mysticism – even if, in this case, God must be said to be a "hidden God," who appears only eschatologically.

As the Creator, God is, of course, transcendent to all creatures. He is the "God hidden in majesty," who cannot be caught in language (*logos*); and the Word who is said "to be with God at the beginning," is not the revealed Word of God, but the "uncreated Word." And all things are "in the powerful hands" of this hidden God, who is "all in all." In other words, the God who is hidden in the depths of his divine transcendence, is nevertheless immanent in all actual reality, and all things are in his hand. The advent of this hidden God is called the descent of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God. In that sense, it is precisely the Holy Spirit who is the greatest "all-embracing reality" (*das Umgreifende*).

---

3. Cf. *ibid.*, chapter 1.

The above sentences contain a measure of criticism of Schweitzer's interpretation of the apostle Paul. Namely, God mysticism, which Schweitzer calls stoic and according to which "all is *in* God," is certainly not contradictory to a Christ mysticism, which holds that "everything comes from God, exists *through* God, and returns to God." Christ mysticism certainly contains the teleological intention "that God may become all in all things" but, seen from the viewpoint of the present reality of the eschaton, God is "all in all" already now. Thus, Christ mysticism and God mysticism can be held together at the same time. As I said already – and this applies first of all to the Christian "who is in Christ," – Christ mysticism has the meaning of being the cognitive ground of God mysticism, but we should not overlook the truth that, at the same time, the latter is the ontological ground of the former.

Of course, both mysticisms are never without mutual mediation. To hold God mysticism with suppression of Christ mysticism is nothing but a pantheistic position that has lost sight of the "word of the cross," and has, as it were, rejected the theological standpoint. Still, God mysticism is the embracing one which, while being mediated by Christ mysticism, cuts off that mediation – the supreme embracing reality. From there, in fact, the exclusivist attitude towards other religions, which sticks to the absoluteness of Christianity, can be overcome.

There is also the panentheistic conception, which was first introduced by Malebranche (1638-1715) and later defended by Krause (1781-1832). In connection with the foregoing, I want to draw attention to the following point in this conception. According to it, a transcendent and personal God embraces the whole universe and, at the same time, penetrates it through and through. God is thus immanent in the world, but does not evaporate into it; God keeps his transcendence. In this way, panentheism wants to be the synthesis of pantheism and theism. While things are in God, God transcends all things. In this conception, pantheism and the doctrine of a transcendent God are not incompatible. In regard to the foregoing, we could then add: God mysticism and Christ mysticism are not mutually contradictory.

In an essay of his final years, entitled "The Logic of Locus and a Religious Worldview," Nishida Kitarō touched on panentheism and wrote the following:

A God merely transcendent and self-sufficient would not be a true God. God must also be radically kenotic; he must empty himself. Precisely a God who is radically transcendent and at the same time radically immanent would be the truly dialectical, paradoxical God, and could be said to be the true Absolute.

If it is said that God creates the world out of love, then God's absolute love must be essential to God as his own absolute self-negation. The creation is not to be conceived of as an *opus ad extra*. My idea here is not pantheistic. Perhaps you will call it panentheistic.<sup>4</sup>

(Also Tanabe Hajime, in his book *The Dialectics of Christianity*, admits that the concept of panentheism is a relatively fitting concept "to show that God's

---

4. Nishida Kitarō, *Last Writings – Nothingness and the Religious Worldview*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987, p. 70. [In a few places I made the translation more literal]

relationship to the world is a relationship of dynamic mediation wherein God is immanent while transcendent, transcendent while immanent."<sup>5</sup>)

## II

If the saying "Watch your step!" means, in general, that I myself should pay attention to the place in which I am standing, it means for Christians that they must make it clear for themselves that they are "in Christ" or "in the Spirit. This would then correspond to the "mysticism of being in Christ." Albert Schweitzer makes it clear, however, that this mysticism, more concretely, is the mysticism of "having died and been resurrected with Christ."<sup>6</sup> In other words, "being in Christ" does not signify a comfortable static situation, but is, in Plato's words, "the practice of dying."

Paul says "I am dying daily" (I Cor. 15: 31), and again,  
 We are all the while bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, so that by our bodies the life of Jesus may also be shown. In the midst of life we are constantly handed over to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may yet be evidenced through our mortal flesh." (II Cor. 4: 10-11)

To paraphrase, we constantly gain victory "in Christ" or "in the Spirit" over the powers of death at work in our bodies, and the life of Jesus' resurrection lives and strives to appear in us. As indicated by the expressions "all the while" and "constantly," this must constitute a "repetition" in a fundamental sense, prior to all ethical action.

In his *Commentary on Psalm 90*, in the section "on the title of the psalm," Luther sets up a contrast between the "voice of the Law" which, as rendered in the medieval Hymns of Sankt Gallen, admonishes us that we are in death in the midst of life (*media vita in morte sumus*) and the "*evangelica vox*," the voice of the Gospel working as the power of life, which proclaims that we are in life in the midst of death (*media morte in vita sumus*). The power of death is, indeed, at work in the midst of our lives, but the power of life, namely the power of the Gospel or the power of the Lord's Spirit, is at work to overcome death. Thus we must say that the two powers tend to suppress one another and recognize that there exists a "dialectics of life and death." As the ontological basis of this dialectics there lies a Christian mysticism that practically can be called a mysticism of union (*unio mystica*), which in an ongoing process is forever mediated by a mysticism of communion (*communio mystica*) and is thus led to transcend it by pushing it to its extreme limit. In Paul, this is expressed most emphatically in the following sentences: "Through the Law I died to the Law in order that I may live to God. I have been crucified with Christ. I no longer live as I myself, but Christ lives within me. (Gal. 2: 19-20)

The eminent and famous Luther scholar, Erich Vogelsang, stresses the role of the mystical union in Luther, as appears from the title itself of his book, *The Unio*

5. Tanabe Hajime, THZ [*Tanabe Hajime Zenshū*], Vol. 10, p. 186.

6. Albert Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. VI.

*Mystica in Luther* (1938), but I shall abstain from commenting on this book here, because I did that already in an earlier essay.<sup>7</sup>

I cannot but think that Schweitzer's remark that the mysticism of "being in Christ" is none other than the mysticism of "having died and been resurrected with Christ," is very right, but what I want to pay attention to here is that the mysticism of "being in Christ," becomes "Christ living in me" in Galatians 20. And also in Gal. 1: 16, reflecting on the experience of his conversion, Paul writes that "God revealed his Son in me."

A. Deissmann, for one, contends that the event of the manifestation of Christ to Paul on the way to Damascus – the event of the Son being revealed in Paul – is the original experience of Paul's Jesus mysticism: the very beginning of his mystical experience, and the experience that determined his mysticism as a whole.<sup>8</sup> At any rate, the mysticism of "being in Christ" and the mysticism of "Christ being in me (Paul)" are two sides of the same reality and cannot be separated from one another.

I already intimated that the expressions of "being in Christ" and "being in the Spirit" are not heterogeneous, and in a way denote the same reality. Moreover, also there, "being in the Spirit" and the "immanence of the Spirit" – namely, everybody receiving the working of the Holy Spirit within themselves and being given a manifestation of the Spirit, thereby being inspired to work vigorously – are certainly not separate realities. As I said already above, there is certainly no necessity to interpret, as Schweitzer does, all "God mysticism," according to which all things are in God, as static pantheism. And certainly pantheism does not sweep away all mysticism in Christ, which is eschatological and historical, and consequently far from being static, is dynamic (active).

Still, Paul's mysticism can certainly be characterized as a mysticism of "being in Christ," or a mysticism of "being in the Spirit," and this *being in* Christ, *being in* the Spirit can be conceived of as showing a topical character. Thus, for instance, Werner Schmauch, in his book *Being in Christ*, studies in detail Paul's usage of "in Christo," and stresses that the preposition "in" has a topical meaning. He thinks that it points at Jesus Christ as the "place of divine positing" (*Ort der göttlichen Setzung*).<sup>9</sup> However, as we saw already, "being in Christ" does not point to a different reality from "Christ living in me;" and this applies equally to "being in the Spirit." When we look carefully at our being in the Spirit, that is, in a true *self-awareness* of this fact, the Spirit is immanent in the self and at work in the self.

The "in-dweller" (Paul, for instance) dwells in the "in-dwelt" (the Spirit) and, in turn, the in-dwelt (the Spirit) at the same time dwells in the "in-dweller" (for instance, Paul). Supposing that we can speak of a topological consideration of the Holy Spirit, this would not mean looking at a place outside of the self where the

7. "Rutā ni okeru shinkō to shinpishugi" ルターにおける信仰と神秘主義 [Faith and mysticism according to Luther], in Mutō Kazuō, *Shingaku-teki – shūkyō-tetsugaku-teki ronshū* II, pp. 53-99.

8. A. Deissmann, *Paulus*, p. 113 f.

9. Cf. Werner Schmauch, *In Christus. Eine Untersuchung zur Sprache und Theologie des Paulus* [An inquiry into the language and theology of Paul], 1935, pp.42 ff.

Spirit would reside objectively. Werner Schmauch appears to imagine a kind of Christ metaphysics in the *topos* of divine positing (being in Christ).<sup>10</sup> But I ask myself whether one cannot detect therein a kind of contemplative attitude toward a metaphysical world. But, in the case of "being in Christ" or "being in the Spirit," even when we provisionally use the expression, would not the so-called *topos* of divine positing denote a world different from a world that is dualistically imagined to be divided between the phenomenal and the metaphysical, the Kingdom of the world and the Kingdom of God, darkness and light?

As was said in connection with pantheism, the space where God's Spirit or Christ's Spirit is present everywhere as the greatest embracing reality, is a limitless space that sweeps away all dualisms, and thus implies the immanence, even the deepest immanence, of the Transcendent (including even the so-called hidden God) and the self-transcending of the self itself. If we grant that pantheism is a kind of pantheism that is at the same time a theism of a transcendent God, we may be entitled to say that therein a monistic dualism, or a dualistic monism, obtains. It is not hard to see that this kind of thinking leads to expressions like those found in Nishida Kitarō. Thus, for example:

I have likened the *topos* of absolutely contradictory self-identity, the world of the absolute present, the space of history, to an infinite sphere, in which, because there is no circumference, every point is the center. It is a bottomlessly contradictory sphere that reflects itself within itself. In this infinite *mandala*, as it were, the centripetal direction is the transcendent God, wherein we discover the absolute subject of the historical world. The centrifugal direction, that opposes it, is thought of in extreme negation as demonic. We, the individual many of this world are both demonic and divine. A theology in line with a topical logic is neither theistic nor deistic; it is historical.<sup>11</sup>

In the world of the absolute present, as an infinitely vast circumference-less globe, all points become the center.<sup>12</sup>

Since this infinite globe, which can also be associated with the "topos of absolute nothingness" as historical space, includes also the dynamic historical dimension, it can also be considered as a four-dimensional sphere. At any rate, as for me, it makes me think of the following words of the letter to the Ephesians:

That the Father may grant you, in keeping with the wealth of his glory, to be empowered with strength in the inner self by his Spirit; that through faith the Christ may dwell in your hearts, that you may be rooted and grounded in love, in order that you may have power to understand with all the saints what is the breadth, the length, the depth, and the height, in fact to know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge, so that you may be filled up to the whole fullness of God. (Eph. 3: 16-19)

10. Werner Schmauch, *ibid.*, chapter 8 – see also Ernst Lohmeyer, *Grundlagen Paulinischer Theologie* [Bases of Pauline Theology], 1929, p. 145.

11. *Op. cit.* [Last works], p. 76.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

One could go so far as to say that, in this Bible word, there is in fact expressed in a compact way about all that I am trying to say, in a wordy way, in this essay.

The cited texts of Nishida Kitarō remind me also of Dostoevski's saying that our hearts are originally the battlefield of God and the devil. For sure, the space wherein we are placed is a holy space, since it is a place where the Holy Spirit is everywhere present. At the same time, however, it is a world pervaded by the evil spirit as a demonic power that revolts against the Holy and opposes it. The Holy Spirit and the evil spirit are powers that dwell in us, but at the same time transcend us and dominate us from the outside. I do not subscribe to a dualism of good and evil, light and darkness but, on the other hand, I cannot agree either with a purely negative conception of evil, as if it were only a "lack of the good" (*privatio boni*). At the ground of the opposition of good and evil there lies an opposition of the divine and the demonic. Evil, while certainly being something of a naught (*das Nichtige*), can wield a real power – on the other-side of good and evil, or rather on the this-side of it – that voids our value judgments of good and evil. But, as long as we do not lose sight of the eschatological-teleological intention "that God may be all in all" (I Cor. 15: 28), we cannot consider the dualistic opposition of good and evil, light and darkness as final. Seen from the viewpoint of the eschaton in the present, we can say with John: "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (John 1: 5).

At this point, I want to draw attention to one more of Nishida's ideas, namely, the idea that, in the extreme point of his self-negation, God can descend all the way into the demonic.

A God who is only a transcendent Supreme Good is a mere abstraction. The absolute God must include absolute negation within himself, and must be a God who can descend into ultimate evil. He is truly absolute God as the God who saves the absolutely evil person. The highest form must be the one that informs the lowest matter. Absolute *agape* must reach even the absolutely evil person. God is hidden even within the heart of the absolutely evil person, and the two relate to one another in an inverse polarity.<sup>13</sup>

These words belong, of course to Nishida's topological logic, but I see no difficulty in considering them, rather, as belonging to evangelical theology. By penetrating self-negatingly into the demonic world, and – in such a way that He appears at first sight to collaborate with the devil – putting people, and even the God-man Christ himself, to the test,, God saves us humans and drives out the devil. At the beginning of his public life, after having fasted for forty days and nights, Jesus was confronted with God's trial, the devil's temptation. "Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil" (Matt. 4: 1).

The New Testament uses the Greek word *peirasmos*, which is usually translated as "test," but has at least the double meaning of "trial" and "temptation." When translated as trial, it denotes something given or imposed by God; when translated as temptation, it is seen as coming, finally, from Satan. In the New Testament,

---

13. *Op. cit.*, pp. 74-75.

there is also mention of a blasphemous trial, namely, humans putting God to the test, but here I do not want to go further into this. With regard to the trials imposed by God, it is said to be necessary that we endure them always with hope, and there is the promise that "he who endures to the end shall be saved" (Matt. 10:22). With regard to the temptations by Satan, on the contrary, we have to overcome them by all means. Furthermore, as shown in the Lord's Prayer, we must pray: "Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil."

There may, however, be "tests" of which our human eyes cannot clearly decide whether they come from God or from Satan. The sufferings, inner and outer, experienced by people in these tests evoke grief, doubt, agony, disquiet, and even despair, because they are accompanied by the mournful feelings of being estranged from God's love and, conversely, being driven toward "resignation to hell" (*resignatio ad infernum*). While being a spiritual trial, it may at the same time take on a demonic or satanic character. I think that both Luther and Kierkegaard had a profound experience of this kind of test.<sup>14</sup>

I do not have the time here to discuss in detail the trials and tests encountered in the spiritual life. The reason why I touched on this question at all is that I want it to be understood that divine trial and demonic temptation are often hard to differentiate from one another, at least as they appear to human eyes and are experienced by human hearts. In the "despair," which Kierkegaard discusses, and especially in what he calls "demonic despair," there is an ineradicable self-affirmation, carried along by demonic temptation. Moreover, this demonic despair, as the extreme form of despair, by way of despairing of despair itself, can become the axis of a turn-about to faith and hope, in an inverted polarity. Would there be any human being who can call the atrocity of the atomic bomb a divine trial? Is not the dropper of the atomic bomb an "angel of Satan" rather than a messenger of God? The terrible suffering of the just man Job, in the Book of Job, must certainly be called a divine trial. Still, there is interference by Satan in that divine trial and in Job's suffering. Satan's attack on Job happens with God's permission. "The Lord said to Satan: see, he (Job) is in your hands" (Job 2: 6). The Holy Spirit sends his trials, even while using the power of the evil spirit. We must endure them and also overcome them.

The world, wherein the Holy Spirit is everywhere present, is also the world where the evil spirit dwells, in a hidden way, everywhere. Why would the "tests" be carried out apparently by God and Satan in collaboration? It is a mystery that resists all human understanding. At this point, I want to call to mind once more a word by Nishida that I quoted earlier:

The absolute God must include absolute negation within himself, and must be a God who can descend into absolute evil. As the God who saves the absolutely evil person, He is truly the absolute God.

---

14. Cf. Kierkegaard, *Sickness unto Death*, and Kaneko Tokio, *Rutā no ningengaku* [Luther's anthropology], Part 2, chapters 4 and 5.

I want to paraphrase this a bit with words nearer to the Christian tradition. The God who is just and the highest good is a God who self-negatingly descends into the extreme depths of evil, in order, by doing this, truly to overcome evil *from the inside*. The Jesus, who called out, "My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?" descended into the abyss of abandonment by God and godless nihilism, as deeply as the demonic powers can reach. However, as it is written, "He would not be abandoned to the realm of the dead, neither would his flesh see corruption. This Jesus God has raised." (Acts 2: 31-32) God was, after all, present in the abyss of godless nihilism, and was at work there as the Spirit of resurrection. The collaboration of God and Satan is, in fact, only outward appearance. Satan's schemes and his provisional apparent victories must ultimately be overcome, "so that God may be all in all."

A last remark may be in order. I have been using the expression, "a world wherein the Holy Spirit is everywhere present," but we should not misunderstand this. The *working* of the Holy Spirit does not occur by somebody contemplating a world wherein a static Holy Spirit is everywhere present. The Holy Spirit is like air and wind, and visits in a form that lies beyond all human expectations; in some cases as a soft breeze, and in some cases as a violent gust of wind. And it is because this happens at sundry times and sundry places that we must speak, existentially and ontologically, of a universal presence of the Holy Spirit.

### III

Let me repeat. Supposing that "Watch your step!" tells us in general to pay attention to the place in which we are actually standing, for Christians in particular it means that they must be in the clear about their "being in Christ" or "being in the Spirit." The "Spirit" or "Holy Spirit" referred to when we speak of "being in the Spirit" must, of course be understood in the framework of the Trinity. The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ and, at the same time, the Spirit of God. The Holy Spirit, while being the Spirit that proceeds from God and is given to Christ, is *also* the Spirit that proceeds from the Son. The Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ are "one soul" and are not-two not-one, not-one not-two.

They are said to be "not-one," insofar as the Spirit of Christ is understood from a christological-ecclesiological viewpoint, in other words, in the framework of a kerygmatic theology. The saying, "no one is able to say, 'Jesus is the Lord,' except by the Holy Spirit" (I Cor. 12: 3) is a truthful statement. In Paul's letters, in his theology, there is an amazing christological-ecclesiological focus, a strong concentration on the "Word of the Cross." Prompted by the words of the Bible, and especially by the words of Paul's kerygma, we too have become people who confess, in the Spirit, that Jesus is the Lord. And therein occurred a turn-about or leap from the standpoint of "natural theology" to that of a revelational theology, which is characterized by faith only, grace only (*sola fide, sola gratia*). By this turn-about, and as an ecclesiological consequence, a distinction is made between

believers and unbelievers. The "communion of saints" comes to form a sanctuary.

One must say that, for a Christian, this is a matter of course. However, would there not be a problem left, even theologically speaking, in this eschatological focus on the Lord of the Cross, and in the theological upholding of it? Paul himself wrote: "To both Greeks and barbarians, to both learned and unlearned I have a responsibility" (Rom. 1- 14); and again: "I have become everything to everybody." (I Cor. 9: 22) And this, he said, was for the sake of propagating the Gospel as widely as possible. It is clear that, at least for Paul, the apostle to the gentiles, the *ecclesia* [church] was not the closed and self-sufficient community of a new chosen people (and this was made clear, for example, in the conflict with the church in Jerusalem). As I stated already, the sermon on the Areopagus of Acts 17 may have been composed by the author of Acts. But, even granting this, would it be impossible to detect therein the extraordinary spiritual insight of Luke, the author of the Acts of the Apostles *sive* the "Acts of the Holy Spirit?" Moreover, could we really maintain that the sermon on the Areopagus is totally unmediated, or alien, to Paul's thought and faith? The fact that, in the same chapter 17, Paul is said to have been discussing, before the sermon on the Areopagus, with philosophers of the Epicurean and Stoic schools at the least provides food for thought.

In the religiosity of the Athenians, who worshipped an unknown god (the "hidden God"), Paul, or Luke, appears to have seen the working of the Holy Spirit, and to have tried to detect therein something that would connect this religiosity with the Christian faith. The fact that this sermon on the Areopagus did not sound convincing to many Athenians in the audience, as the end of chapter 17 shows, does not do away with this.

If the above interpretation is permissible, could we not then recognize in Paul the figure of a theologian, who certainly practiced kerygmatic theology to the full, but nevertheless, at the same time, wanted to function as an apologetic theologian? It can be considered that, without containing any apologetic elements, the preaching of Paul to the gentiles of nearly the whole Mediterranean region would not have born much fruit.

"Apologetic theology" bases itself firmly on the truths of salvation, which fall within the "field of theology," but tries to immanently transcend that field, and to stand also outside it. Seen from a topological logic of the Holy Spirit, it can be said to find its standpoint, by emptying itself, in the place where the Holy Spirit is everywhere present. The Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ, as the "one soul," are called the Holy Spirit (and in the writings of John also the Paraclete), because the former is immanent in the latter. But, as already said before, if the "Spirit of Christ" is understood exclusively in a christological-ecclesiological way, that is, within the framework of a kerygmatic theology, it can harbor a kind of closure that never allows it to be a truly open space. Such a closure must be immanently transcended – which then implies an immanent transcendence of the theological field.

The topos, in which the self stands, while precisely being one's own standpoint, is not a topos that one can oneself occupy at will. It is a true standpoint as a standpointless standpoint, wherein all the own standpoints are reduced to nothingness, because

it depends on the free and autonomous topos of the Holy Spirit.

The wind blows where it pleases and, though you hear the sound of it, you neither know where it comes from nor where it goes. It is the same with everyone who is born of the Spirit. (John 3: 8)

No matter how slight the breeze is, we must have the ear to hear its whispering sound, namely, the voice of God.

We can say that the topos where the Spirit is omnipresent is analogous to the “topos of nothingness” in Nishida’s philosophy. We, who are pilgrims and foreigners on earth (Hebr. 11: 13), do not have any being-like base on this earth. Paul also says that “we have our citizenship in heaven.” (Phil. 3: 20) Does this mean that we cannot but become nihilists wandering in a nihilistic world? Not so, to have no being-like base anywhere means to stand, in the Spirit, on the standpoint of nothingness-like subjectivity, of which it is said: “if you are the master wherever you are, whatever place you are in is true reality.”<sup>15</sup> This is precisely the situation wherein Paul could say: “I no longer live as myself, but Christ lives in me.” (Gal. 2: 20) And Dōgen says something to the effect that “if you know the mind, the Great Earth does not have an inch of land.”<sup>16</sup>

The spiritual world, as the topos wherein I am located, which is also likened to the topos of absolute nothingness, is precisely my standpoint – thus, as already said, we do not simply wander in a nihilistic world –, but it is not a place that I myself can occupy at will (“Let him, who feels sure of standing firm, beware of falling” – I Cor. 10: 12) This is because the locus of nothingness – whatever place one further imagines it to be – is precisely “the world of things themselves,” “the world of reality as it is,” as the topos that upholds the particular places wherein things stand while doing away with them.

From where (*woher*) do you come? Where (*wohin*) do you go? Wherein (*worin*) do you stand? These can be called the three great questions of human life. “From where?” asks about my place of origin (*Herkunft*); “whereto?” asks about my horizon or future (*Zukunft*); and “wherein” asks about my present place (*Präsens*). I probably tend to go to the place I came from. That, however, is also the place of judgment and salvation. At any rate, these three great questions can be considered as ultimately reducible to one. For, the spiritual place, as the greatest all-embracing reality, contains past, present, and future; the present of past, of present, and of future. I have cited the Zen word, “If you know the mind, the Great Earth does not have an inch of land,” and the “topos of nothingness” means that the place where I stand, the place where I come to rest – where I can say, “here I stand” – is determined for the first time by my *living* while being subjected to absolute negation. Indeed, there is not a particular place where a particular human being stands. “For the Lord is Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom.” (II Cor. 3: 17) It is the freedom that Luther calls the freedom of a

15. See *The Record of Lin-chi*.

16. Cf. Dōgen, *Shōbōgenzō*, see chapters Uji, Sokushin zebutsu, and Ango.

Christian. "A Christian is a perfectly free lord of all, subject to none. A Christian is a perfectly dutiful servant of all, subject to all."<sup>17</sup> It is the paradoxical freedom of dwelling in the topos of "Nothingness-in-Love."

The voice of God calling out, "Adam, Adam, where are you?" (Gen. 3: 9) is the voice that calls the first man, Adam, out of the place to where he fled from God, and back to the topos where he originally had to be and live. The space of the Spirit is none other than the space where the voice of God is present and can be heard. We too, like Adam, live while constantly hearing the voice of God.

Where could I go to escape from you?  
Where could I get away from your presence?  
If I went up to heaven, you would be there;  
If I lay down in the world of the dead, you would be there."  
(Psalm 139: 7-8)

---

17. Martin Luther, *The Freedom of a Christian*.

