

# Open, Empty and Other

Leon Redler

Philadelphia Association

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

Henayni! Me voici! Here I am!  
You called.

Where to begin? Perhaps with a 'western' Homage to the Heart Sutra:

Neither absence  
nor presence  
nor both  
nor neither  
(precisely)  
makes the heart  
grow  
fonder.<sup>2</sup>

... With thanks, to scholars and teachers, from diverse traditions, from Nagarjuna to Derrida, who have extended and deepened my understanding of the teachings of the Buddha and their relation to contemporary thought and practice.

How astonishing that with the realisation of the heart of perfect wisdom, the heart should open! How wonderful that with the realisation of dependent origination, of emptiness, with the arising of prajna, there should arise karuna, compassion!

Ontology traditionally speaks of nature, reality, the nature of reality, being and non-being, existence and non-existence. Nagarjuna, however, with his tetralemmas, deconstructs these conceptual constructs. His thought takes us beyond ontology. We can't deeply understand the nature of things merely in terms of being and non-being. To speak *in the wake* of the awakened one's awakening in ontological terms is problematic. Why? Because too much may be assumed and appropriated, and what ontology can't appropriate might be less considered or considered lesser. Might we not then risk being *at the wake* of the awakened one's awakening (rather than enlivening this potential for others, as well as ourselves, in the way we think, speak and act)?

Inspired by the writings of Emmanuel Levinas, I want to consider Buddhist teachings as ethical teachings, pointing to an ethical practice, with pathways to the extinction of ignorance, suffering and toward liberation being derivative of an anarchic call to order, a call to another order, by the Other, and a being ordered by

the call, and chosen to respond, prior to choice.

Levinas's writings have seemed to this student/practitioner of the Buddha way, and physician/psychotherapist responding to the suffering of others, to track, via the trace of the Other, fundamental Buddhist teachings and even to extend and deepen the teaching of the Buddha in a way that might have astonished, pleased and honoured the Buddha.

Levinas studied with Husserl and Heidegger and is credited with introducing phenomenology in France where he'd come, from Lithuania, to study. His thinking was radically provoked by the rise of the Nazis, the war and the holocaust and, following the war, his studies with a Talmudic master. For Levinas, 'first philosophy is an ethics.'<sup>3</sup> He writes of the naked and destitute, perhaps non-phenomenological face of the other as signification. 'The face speaks. It speaks, it is in this that it renders possible and begins all discourse.'<sup>4</sup> We are called upon to respond to the face in responsibility:

... saying is the fact that before the face I do not simply remain there contemplating it, I respond ... saying is a way of greeting the Other, but to greet the Other is already to answer for him ... The first word of the face is the 'thou shalt not kill'. It is an order ... I am he who finds the resources to respond to the call.<sup>5</sup>

The face of the Other is frailty and demand. It demands, it asks something of me, it is a request, an authority, though not a force. The deposition of the sovereign 'I' of self-consciousness is its responsibility for the Other, whom I cannot humanly refuse. The ontological condition is undone in this human, spiritual or ethical uncondition.

The proximity of the Other is not simply close spatially or in familiarity but approaches me insofar as I feel and am responsible for her. The structure is not that of 'the intentional relation which in knowledge attaches us to an object.'<sup>6</sup>

The beginning of language is in the face - it calls. Language is above all the fact of being addressed and responding.

The Infinite, disrupting being, comes in the signifying of the face. The Infinite,<sup>7</sup> and the Good beyond Being,<sup>8</sup> are not manifestations in the sense of disclosures. The 'here I am' in response to the proximity of the Other 'is the place through which the infinite enters language.'<sup>9</sup> It 'testifies to the Infinite'. The testimony is 'not a truth of representation or perception'.<sup>10</sup> Here, in the call and response, are to be found the opening of the heart, of responsibility, of sense, sensibility, thought, mediation and justice - all deriving from the call and response. It may open the way to what for Buddhists would be the realisation of emptiness - via infinite responsibility for the Other - suggesting a 'jewgreek'<sup>11</sup> derivation of and perhaps guide to a Bodhisattva way which invites and provokes us.

To complete this introduction, let's return to and extend the 'Homage':

nor presence  
nor both  
nor neither  
(precisely)  
makes the heart  
grow  
fonder.

In being  
for the other  
before  
whom  
I am  
subject  
I find  
my way  
home  
in welcoming  
the Other  
and responsibility  
for the Other.  
Well come  
Well gone  
Beyond<sup>12</sup>

or perhaps with another verse

(The) Face  
of (the)  
Other  
calls  
'me'  
who  
responds(?)<sup>13</sup>

How to begin? But is it not already in response? Can there otherwise be a beginning, any I to begin or any corpus, as such, to deliver?

### **Itinerary**

Our itinerary will be a questioning quest via considering, first, the relevance of mindfulness (of body, speech and mind) and of responsibility to one another and the relation of the ontological and ethical orders, or disorders. I shall then comment on brief passages from Levinas's *Otherwise than Being, or Beyond*

*Essence*,<sup>14</sup> and there consider proximity as the non-thematisable relationship with the Other; subjectivity as constituted in exposure and response; the possible refusal or repression of a call; recurrence as being sent back to a non-self identical oneself by the assignation of the Other, a being put in question, this 'oneself' as oneself by virtue of being irreplaceable in its responsibilities, and thus of substitution as oneself-for-the-Other. We will consider anarchic obsession for the Other, trace, psyche, chosen-ness prior to choice, restlessness and rest. I'll end with a section on refuge, including a hint of its relevance to a practice of psychotherapy and to responding to others in extremes of mental distress; and with a discussion on the possible priority of giving over taking refuge; on mis-givings and mis-takings, and, returning to our title, conclude with unsaying and resaying the title to you.

What possible meaning could there be to our being if not an *other* meaning? The question is led by and leads us to consider responsibility for the Other - even for the Other's responsibility.

But in order to live, so ordered, in order to renew, again and again, the work of putting my house in order - and is not 'my' house that which, provisionally, houses my ability to respond in responsibility for the Other? - in order to live ethically, must I not attend to and tend my sensitivity and sensibility, cultivating its openness in a world where it and/or I may be so prone to close off? Am I not called upon to be as exquisitely (L. *ex+quaerere*, search, seek) sentient (L. *sentire*, feel), as acutely sensible, as fully open to contact as possible and as fully and freely able to respond, without obstructions or impediments? And if that is the case, must I not be mindful of my body, breath, mind, feelings, attachments, ways of relating? Am I not called upon to move toward freedom from egoistic attachments, toward emptiness, or at least to be mindful of the limitations and conditioning that constrict my responsibility and freedom in an egoic, selfish chamber? Does it not help to be reminded, in my practice, of my relation to the ground and to the sky, to being grounded and to releasing upward, to gravity as well as lightness - able to breathe freely, and be moved by inspiration throughout, at every moment - as opposed to being physically constricted, and sensibly deadened - and able to go beyond current limits and condition? In other words, cannot practices such as Vipassana, Zen, rDzogchen, forms of Yoga and, why not, *perhaps* even forms of psychotherapy that respect a non-substantialised, non-self-identical, inspired psyche, contribute to opening and freeing one for responsibility?

Can we speak, with a measure of poetic licence, of what we take to be the 'ontological' and our attachments to being as being a corrupt 'shadow' of a non-representable *other* order, one we may come to realise, with astonishment and/or paradoxical recognition (paradoxical, as something other than cognition may be involved), as what we've fallen from, and/or are now in ignorance of, as a function of our craving, clinging, naming, fixating, habituating, substantialising and mistakenly regarding the world as full of separate, self-identical identities which we relate to with self-defining, self-seeking, self-serving appropriate attachment?

Our attempts to understand, to comprehend, when uninformed by the ethical, get

in the way of no-standing, no-status, no status, no states of any description, get in the way of being touched and moved and impede a kind of flowering and freedom that may occur in responding in responsibility to she/he who calls, with Levinasian dis-inter-est-ed-ness (ie other than and beyond *esse* or being), which is precisely not indifference. Such a way points to liberation and enjoyment precisely *not* via self-seeking, seeking knowledge or comprehension.

At this point I shall cite some passages from Levinas's paper, *Substitution*, included in *Otherwise Than Being, or Beyond Essence*, and comment on and/or question them.

It is as though subjective life in the form of consciousness consisted in being itself losing itself and finding itself again so as to possess itself by showing itself, proposing itself as a theme, exposing itself in truth. ... to become conscious of a being is then always for that being to be grasped across an ideality and in the basis of a said. ... The detour of reality leads to coinciding with oneself, that is, to certainty, which remains the guide and guarantee of the whole spiritual adventure of being. But this is why this adventure is no adventure. It is never dangerous; it is self-possession, sovereignty, *arche*  
...<sup>15</sup>

For the philosophical tradition of the West, all spirituality lies in consciousness, thematic exposition of being, knowing.<sup>16</sup>

In starting with sensibility interpreted not as a knowing but as a proximity, in seeking a language of contact and sensibility behind the circulation of information it becomes, we have endeavoured to describe subjectivity, as irreducible to consciousness and thematisation. Proximity appears as the relationship with the Other, who cannot be resolved into 'images' or be exposed in a theme.<sup>17</sup>

We are being invited, by this endeavour, to a spiritual adventure that lies beyond knowledge and being, beyond the certainty of an ideality coinciding with itself. No more guarantees. We are at risk, at risk to lose all - all we think we are, know and have. This begins to sound familiar, though not from within the mainstream philosophical tradition of the west, which has usually suppressed the beyond of being and which hasn't been fond of surprises and radical provocations.

Are we in danger of losing our common sense and sensibility? Or of re-connecting with what has been latent, though, perhaps, repressed? Can we speak of the repression of the Other and otherness, of alterity as well as of difference (or indeed, of 'differance')? Or of a cut-off or denial of a call that calls and constitutes one as a subject, subjected as subjectivity? Or perhaps of the non-coming into inter-subjective life of organs of sensibility of one unresponded to as Other - or insufficiently so - and so unable to sense or respond? It seems to me, Levinas is insisting on an all too uncommon sense and sensibility, or uncommonly realised sense and sensibility.

## Recurrence

I am assigned, without recourse, without fatherland, already sent back to myself, but without being able to stay there, compelled before commencing. Nothing here resembles self-consciousness. It has meaning only as an upsurge in me of a responsibility prior to commitment, that is, responsibility for the Other.<sup>18</sup>

Responsibility prior to commitment; being chosen for responsibility prior to choice, a having been chosen that comes before distinctions - this is what Levinas describes and derives, beyond essence. Are we here face to face, with an aspect of 'Buddha Nature' - as what may be awakened to? Is this responsibility of the order of the extraordinarily ordinary, like Buddha Mind, that is not to be attained, but awakened to, realised and cultivated as way-ing, showing/teaching/liberating sentient 'beings' by its way of way-ing on the way which is its way? There is a similarity, yet also an excess - of obligation, of concern, of restlessness, of responsibility - or is there? Is this, perhaps, the ethical aspect of the Bodhisattva's Buddha Mind, derived, magnified and explicated - explicated towards the Other?

In the exposure to wounds and outrages, in the feeling proper to responsibility, the oneself is provoked as irreplaceable ... and thus incarnated in order to offer itself, to suffer and to give. It is thus one and unique, in passivity from the start ...<sup>19</sup>

If the unique one is to suffer, how might this be a pathway to extinguish suffering? Perhaps by the extinguishing of any self other than that constituted as hostage of the Other - to the extent that one is responsible for her, even for her responsibility to respond to the Face of the Other- and by this sacrifice, contributing to sacralising the world we co-inhabit.

## Substitution

...in creation, what is called into being answers to a call that could not have reached it since, brought out of nothingness, it obeyed before hearing the order.<sup>20</sup>

This astonishing, poetic description is well beyond and well beyond comprehension.

Recurrence becomes identity *in breaking up the principle* of being in me, the intolerable rest in itself characteristic of definition. The self is on the hither side of rest; it is the impossibility to come back from all things and concern oneself only with oneself. [my italics]<sup>21</sup>

He later speaks of an inequality vis-a-vis the Other which 'signifies a uniqueness, under assignation, of responsibility, and because of this assignation not finding

any rest in itself.<sup>22</sup> Yet rest is needed, if only for the unique, singular one to be relaxed while vigilant. And rest is possible, though not to be found 'in itself', ie in any self-identical subject, but rather in non-dual emptiness, or at least in beginning to relax, mindfully, or in contemplation, letting go of acknowledged concerns. Such practices are, or ought to be, precisely *not* concerned with oneself. When they are, they are impoverished practice, still limited and conditioned. Here is a point where an ethical way can be nourished, deepened and fine-tuned by such practices.

I exist through the other and for the other, but without this being alienation: I am inspired. This inspiration is the psyche. The psyche can specify this alterity in the same without alienation in the form of incarnation, as being-in-one's-skin, having- the-other-in-one's-skin.<sup>23</sup>

A breath of fresh air, blowing one's egoic mind, filling a vehicle with provocation and access to the Good beyond Being, giving birth to meaning and perhaps a psyche-no-ology.

proximity of ... neighbour, does not signify a submission to the non-ego; it means an openness, in which being's essence is surpassed in inspiration. It is an openness of which respiration is a modality or a foretaste, or, more exactly, of which it retains the aftertaste. Outside of any mysticism, in this respiration, the possibility of every sacrifice for the other, activity and passivity coincide.<sup>24</sup>

Inspiration of/by the other

Expiration of egoic, selfish self

Does this not suggest an other dimension and contribution to deeping and enhancing the excellence of a practice of mindfulness of the body and breath? Could not a practice of mindfulness of the breath enhance openness to the Other, or make one mindful of the constriction of one's sensibility, and to the perverse refusal of alterity and more mindful of the suffering so generated and sustained?

### 'Finite Freedom'

... In responsibility for the other for life and death, the adjectives unconditional, undeclinable, absolute, take on meaning ... And the proximity of the neighbour in its trauma does not only strike up against me but exalts and elevates me ...<sup>25</sup>

The responsibility for the other is a spiritual one - which includes her material as well as spiritual well being, including just treatment toward/for her and by her. My responsibility is for her life and death, my anxiety not in my Being toward death, a death that is 'my own', as such, but in concern over the Other's death and

the insufficiency of my responsibilities towards her, even for her responsibilities to others, including me. 'My own' death, ethically rethought, is that which is for the Other, and never sufficiently so as our task is infinite. This proximity, Levinas says, 'inspires me. Inspiration, heteronomy, is the very pneuma of the psyche,'<sup>26</sup> one never sufficiently free such that the 'for-the-other' could be interpreted as guilt.

The awakened one who has deferred her final liberation from samsara is living unconditionally, in the absolute, seeing the absolute in the relative and the relative in the absolute. 'All that is form, that is emptiness, All that is emptiness, that is form' (Heart Sutra). But though seeing through the maya of distinctions, she is moved to defer final and absolute release from the sufferings and strains of samsara, of relativity. Is it not in responsibility and in other-wise-than-being that we sense and make sense of this deferral? And yet, it seems there's no place in Levinas's description, or rather, there may well be place though it's not made explicit, for stillness and quiet, for the still point of the turning world, free of usual distinctions, a recession out of which such responsibility and compassion could spring forth, free of being contested, being accused, including by 'oneself'. He does elsewhere speak of a 'passivity more passive than passivity' or prior to the distinction active/passive. The welcome I give to the Other, having been called to respond with that welcome, is, for Levinas, prior to that distinction. And while there is no room for complacency, there is the space, indeed, implicitly, the responsibility, to do whatever one can to be able to respond in responsibility ... which, I would say, includes doing one's utmost to touch the unconditional beyond/prior to the conditioned, through Buddhist practices, for example, in order to be (paradoxically) able to do the impossible, that is, be unconditionally responsible for the Other. The Other may be 'in the midst of my very identification', but cannot even this very identification be shed, or self-liberate? Here at least is a question.

And yet it is perhaps this trace of the Other which maintains and allows an experienced continuity of being-for-the-other in responsibility, and which allows the arising, the well-ing up, of karuna - responsibility and compassion which can give rise to a sense-cum-passion of and for justice! And hence, perhaps to what Thich Nhat Hahn has called 'engaged Buddhism'.<sup>27</sup>

... in the irreplaceable subject, unique and chosen as a responsibility and a substitution, a mode of freedom, ontologically impossible, breaks the unrendable essence. Substitution frees the subject from ennui, that is, from the enchainment to itself, where the ego suffocates in itself due to the tautological way of identity, and ceaselessly seeks after the distraction of games and sleep in a movement that never wears out.<sup>28</sup>

At last a break out of one's wretched, self enclosed prison, out of one's selfish, limited conditioned mind and, thus, world! A breathing space, a space of and for inspiration is opened, empty of self-in-itself-for-itself, open toward and for the other. Perhaps that very move of substitution is at some moments what moves and



inspires the student/practitioner of the Way to go beyond her limits and conditioning to a liberated awakening, to a realisation of a supra-essential nature.

Let's return to Levinas's description:

This liberation is not an action, a commencement, not any vicissitude of essence and of ontology ... An anarchic liberation, it emerges without being assumed, without turning into a beginning, in equality with oneself. It is brought out ... in the undergoing by sensibility beyond its capacity to undergo.<sup>29</sup>

This description of 'The suffering and vulnerability of the sensible as the *other in me*' (my italics) is the way of this anarchic liberation. The description as not action, essence, commencement, as emerging without being assumed, sounds right on course with the teachings of the awakened one. And the reference to undergoing by sensibility beyond its capacity to undergo will be a moment recognised by many practitioners from their practice and/or their teachers' exhortations.

In substitution my being that belongs to me and not to another is undone, and it is through this substitution that I am not 'another', but me. The self in a being is exactly the not-being-able-to-slip-away-from-an-assignation that does not aim at any generality. There is no ipseity common to me and others; 'me' is the exclusion from this possibility of comparison, as soon as it is set up.

The ipseity is then a privilege or an unjustifiable election that chooses me and not the ego.<sup>30</sup>

Here we have a non-ethnic and non-egoic description of the chosen people. They are those who accept election to do before hearing or knowing, they who have accepted being chosen, prior to choice, for otherwise than being. The me that's chosen and that accepts is not my ego.

I think the Indian ex-prince, chosen for/as teacher of a way of liberation, long free of thoughts, or of attachment to thinking or no thinking, and the thoughtful Parisian, Lithuanian Jew, perhaps from a lineage (Levites) chosen for priestly duties, would have appreciated each Other.

Levinas's language seems full of attachment, even obsession, *for the Other*. But these are attachments with a difference. They are ethical, not ontological, attachments, attachments of self as for the Other, not self-centred. Or could we consider them as desire without (self-centred) attachment, excessive and beyond anything we 'know' as our (and in each case *my*) possibility?

### **Taking Refuge ...**

... or, on the possible priority of giving refuge over taking refuge, or, giving refuge to the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha, or, giving and taking, mis-givings and

mis-takings ...

Levinas's discourse is a discourse that intercourses and opens out a question, opens out as a question, questions one's being, puts one's being in question, questions one's right to be and one's being as right. The welcome of the Other and obligation to the Other come first, in 'an obedience that precedes the hearing of any order'.<sup>31</sup> May not what we call 'diminished responsibility' often be better understood as a disability in responding to the face of the Other, to the alterity of the Other?

I trained in medicine and psychiatry in New York but left, drawn to London by the late R.D. Laing, his critique of psychiatry and heartening other approach. He taught me the meaning and value of asylum. Psychiatric institutions and practice seldom provided asylum, in a profound sense. Nor could asylum be assured in the psychotherapy consulting room, where the therapist might be too caught up in and by the theory and technique, prioritising knowing over listening and responding, possibly boxing in self and other in ways of seeing, understanding, comprehension and interpretation that diminished the possibility of exposure, contact, hearing, and responding to a call, resisting the immediacy of exposure and response to the alterity and proximity of the other, and often interfering with allowing enough space and time for the other to untwist, to think, to find her own way in her own way and time in a relation of letting be in response and responsibility.

Would not our saying, if more in response and responsibility and mindful of the matters of suffering and justice, not radically transform and contribute to an awakening and metanoia, to a change of mind and change of heart that is so deeply and desperately called for? And especially at times of crisis, when refuge is required, mindfulness and ethical speech are required. The 'speech' may be in the language of silence, but with gestures of welcome, response, respect and thanksgiving - such might be called for in a place of retreat and refuge, in order to help another to get in touch with the potential ethical and aesthetic excellence of speech.

When, in relationship, we maybe caught in separate cells, yet draining each other's energies, banging heads against cell walls - a not uncommon desperate situation - how can we find and/or found another way that's an *other* way - away from the waste and joyless uncreativity of our wayward transgressive way? How can any 'I', in that situation, be responsible? Perhaps by raising the question of responsibility - mine - questioning, questing, re-questing and putting oneself in question - these may be on the way to responsibility. And might not calling on the Other to question and join in such a quest be a move towards responsibility for the Other's responsibility? Would it not be neglect not to do so? ... Beyond immediacy, all kinds of mediations may be necessary.

### **The Virtuous Circle for the Good beyond Being**

The virtuous circle, responsibility for the Other, Openness, Emptiness, is quite other than the habitual way of being. The Levinasian trace is a trace of karuna,

and thus of non-separable prana, within samsara - there to move, and be moved, towards realisation. My subjectivity constituted in response to a call - (perhaps an arousal from slumbering, dreaming, hallucinating) - a call to a higher and other order, higher and other than primarily instinctual, mimetic and appropriative orderings. Perhaps an awakening and response in responsibility is related to gift, gift-ing, (a giving of gift that is free of any (of the elements) I-am giving-this-gift-to-you. It is immediate, spontaneous); is related to thanks, thanksgiving - and hence to something related to but other than Heidegger's meditative thinking.

Perhaps it is (only) through gift-ing and mis-givings of one's right to be, that the mis-taking at the basis of our ignorance, being caught in duality and mis-taking what, as a function of that mis-taking, comes to 'be' a self as separate from the world - perhaps through ethical mis-giving and giving such fundamental mis-taking can be corrected. - A life of sacrifice (holy making) is required. - which also allows for enjoyment via a holocaust of selfishness. Thich Nhat Hahn has written somewhere: 'A look filled with understanding, an accepting smile, a loving word, a meal shared in warmth and awareness - create happiness' - ie toward the Other.

Huang Po said

It is written: to put out of mind even the principles from which an action springs is the true teaching of the Buddhas, while dualism belongs to the sphere of the demons.<sup>32</sup>

The void ... without spacial dimensions ... contains (nothing) that can be viewed spacially - it depends on nothing and is attached to nothing.<sup>33</sup>

Anarchic, infinite openness, emptied of egoic attachments, toward and for the Other, beyond essence, able to respond responsibly!

## Concluding Section

I wondered how to begin, how to respond to you. And I wonder how to conclude this talk. Perhaps by unsaying and resaying the said of the title, 'Open, Empty, and Other' ... saying, perhaps, 'About Face on the way'; or a longer one, 'How we deface, deny and repress Buddha Nature when we refuse to be chosen, touched, moved and ordered by the Good beyond Being, by the Other and the other of knowing and Being; or, a yet longer one, 'The turning around that's called for in a jewgreek, post-modern, ethical metanoia that returns us, always out of, phase and non-coinciding with ourselves, to the diachronic and, immediate, where we can find ourselves by losing ourselves in a non-turning away from the other, in a good turn, a Eu-turn, a turn to alterity, in response to what is never present but always already in passing and/or yet to come, in responsible response, moved, ordered and ordained by trace'; or, perhaps, just 'tracing papers' ...

What's got into me? Am 'I' getting into the spirit (however latent) of our conference and, in my peculiar way, celebrating no-thing whatsoever? Is this inspiration? Or the rhythmic pulsation of inspiration-expiration, a beating heart and

addressing of she-he and you who have constituted me in my response to your call, who have opened for me the possibility of enjoyment, desire and meaning via responsibility? In which case should I not have begun and ought I not conclude with thanking you for the gift of having to welcome you and be responsible even for your responsibility to respond to the Face of the Other, including mine, and now welcome you with open arms and thank you for enabling me to so open by disarming me?

Thankyou!<sup>34</sup>

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> This is adapted from, but retains the general form of, a talk originally given at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, at the International Symposium on Buddhism and Modern Western Thought, in 1992
- <sup>2</sup> author, read at memorial service for R.D. Laing at St James Church, Piccadilly, London, January 6th, 1990
- <sup>3</sup> Emmanuel Levinas, *Ethics and Infinity (IE)*, conversations with Philippe Nemo, translated by Richard Cohen, Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, 1985, p 77
- <sup>4</sup> *ibid*, p. 87
- <sup>5</sup> *ibid*, p 88-89
- <sup>6</sup> *ibid* pp. 96-97
- <sup>7</sup> Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity*, trans Alphonso Lingis, Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, 1969, - various references to Descartes' idea of the infinite from *Meditations*.
- <sup>8</sup> *ibid*, various references to Plato's notion of Good beyond Being in the Republic.
- <sup>9</sup> EI p. 106
- <sup>10</sup> EI p. 106
- <sup>11</sup> Derrida, Jacques, 1978, *Writing and Difference*, translated by Alan Bass, London, Routledge p 153
- <sup>12</sup> author, unpublished
- <sup>13</sup> author, unpublished.
- <sup>14</sup> trans Alphonso Lingis, Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague, 1981
- <sup>15</sup> *The Levinas Reader*, ed. Sean Hand, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1989, p 89
- <sup>16</sup> *ibid*, p. 89
- <sup>17</sup> *ibid*, p. 89
- <sup>18</sup> *ibid*, p. 93
- <sup>19</sup> *ibid*, p. 95
- <sup>20</sup> *ibid*, p. 103
- <sup>21</sup> *ibid*, p. 104
- <sup>22</sup> *ibid* p. 105
- <sup>23</sup> *ibid*, p. 104
- <sup>24</sup> *ibid*, p. 104-105
- <sup>25</sup> *ibid*, p. 113-114
- <sup>26</sup> *ibid*, p. 114
- <sup>27</sup> Thich Nhat Hahn, *Being Peace*, Parallax Press, Berkeley, 1987, p. 45
- <sup>28</sup> *The Levinas Reader*, p 114
- <sup>29</sup> *ibid*
- <sup>30</sup> *ibid*, p. 116

<sup>31</sup> *ibid*, Chapter 11, *God and Philosophy*

<sup>32</sup> Huang Po, *The Zen Teaching of Huang Po*, trans John Blofeld, Grove Press, New York. 1958, p. 93

<sup>33</sup> *ibid*

<sup>34</sup> With thanks to Dr Steven Gans for introducing me to Levinas's work, and to Drs Gans, John Heaton and Noreen O'Connor for their helpful comments on draft of manuscript. And thanks to Dr Michael McGhee for patient help in editing for publication.