

If everyting comes from emptyness than what is energy

buddhism.stackexchange.com/questions/20349/if-everyting-comes-from-emptyness-than-what-is-energy/34880

Asked 2 years, 4 months ago

Active [today](#)

Viewed 204 times

0

Buddha tells that everything originates from nothingness, emptyness, sunyata. but how can that be possible. how can something come from nothing. what is logical meaning of this? he says that space, time and matter/energy is just and illusion because everything originates from sunyata by our conciousness, what is that?

[sunyata](#)

asked Apr 28 '17 at 16:49

user10568

8

Emptiness doesn't mean 'vacuum' or 'nothingness' (this view is refered to as nihilism sometimes in Buddhism). It means empty of self, or 'self-existence'.

In other words things are what they appear to be, and nothing else. The names you give to things, the thoughts, opinions you have about them, woven by your desires, fears, speculations etc. are transitory fabrications of your mind.

These fabrications are useful for remembering where you left your car keys, but become troublesome if you begin to believe in them as reality. So the Buddha reminds us that everything is in fact empty.

answered Apr 28 '17 at 17:10

user10515

3

For a lucid, readable commentary on emptiness, take a look at Guy Newland's Introduction to Emptiness. Therein you will find a clarification of the difference between nothingness and dependent origination, which is another way of referring to emptiness. Jay Garfield's The Fundamental Wisdom of the Middle Way is an exceptional work and most germane when the question of sunyata arises. Another comprehensive tome on the subject is Jeffrey Hopkins' Meditation on Emptiness. Any one of these presentations will address your question as to the origin of illusion like everyday phenomena. On the topic of energy, it is humbling to recall Richard Feynman's remark, that "it is important in physics today

to realize that we have no knowledge of what energy is". - <https://en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Energy>

answered May 17 '17 at 21:09



[Carroll Izard](#)

3111 bronze badge

2

Buddha tells that everything originates from nothingness, emptiness, sunyata.

First, emptiness is not nothingness. Depending on the school of Tenets, emptiness refers to the absence of true existence, or to the absence of inherent existence, or to the absence of self-sufficient substantial existence, or to the absence of external establishment.

Second, emptiness cannot be a cause because a cause must precede its effect, while emptiness and its basis (i.e. the object that is empty) arise, abide, cease simultaneously.

Third, emptiness cannot be a cause because emptiness is permanent and permanent phenomena do not perform a function.

The only context I know of where we find the expression, "phenomena arise from emptiness" is Tantra. In such a context, emptiness does not refer to emptiness itself, but to the mind realizing emptiness. This mind arises in this or that aspect.

How can something come from nothing.

It does not. Whatever is a product is produced by another [existent] phenomena.

Space, time and matter/energy is just an illusion.

Usually, we say that phenomena are "like an illusion", not that they are illusions. If you happen to read a traditional text that says that "phenomena are illusions", it means that they are "like an illusion." What we mean by this is that they do not exist the way they appear.

'Energy' is a word I never came across in any traditional text. However, we speak of 'matter' or 'form'. All objects that are apprehended by sense consciousnesses are 'matter'. This includes smell, sound, taste, etc.

2

The Buddha did not say that 'everything' comes from 'nothing'. Specifically, the Buddha stated that Essential concepts - like 'Everything' and 'Nothing' are mere conceptual constructions, that the notion of independent entities, embodied by the term Self within his argument, are not evident within experience. It's not that everything comes from nothing, it's that neither everything nor nothing are evident as constructs.

This world, Kaccana, for the most part depends upon a duality—upon the notion of existence and the notion of nonexistence. But for one who sees the origin of the world as it really is with correct wisdom, there is no notion of nonexistence in regard to the world. And

for one who sees the cessation of the world as it really is with correct wisdom, there is no notion of existence in regard to the world. [SN 12.15](#)

The above seems like a decent parallel to your question.

Madhyamaka tackles this issue in a more philosophical way though, look into Nagarjuna:

Neither from itself,
Nor from another,
Nor from both, nor without a cause,
Does anything, anywhere, whatsoever, arise.

[Mulamadhyamakakarika](#)

In addition, for energy specifically, Noether's theorem shows that energy is conserved, or more famously that:

Energy can neither be created nor destroyed, it can only change forms.

Emptiness with impermanence!

0

The paradox arises from a failure to differentiate the timeless formative forces which comprise energy versus their timely interactions within a field of change manifesting energy as we know it. To wit...

What is Energy?

Energy – all energy, does not exist as a singularity. Instead, it is a process whereby energy is taken apart, its amplitude is either increased or decreased, and then these ingredients of energy are put back together again. That's it; simple and elegantly charming.

The ingredients of energy are called: reactance, and putting energy back together is called: power factor correction. But, the taking of energy apart is not called “splitting the atom”. It is called: inverting voltage polarity out-of-phase with current by one-half cycle of 180° separation. And time dilation is merely shifting the phase of current relative to voltage, or vice versa, by simply inverting the polarity of either one, or the other, but not both. It is this time dilation which supersedes the Conservation of Energy. For, this Law is predicated upon a constancy of time.

All of these steps are effortless requiring as much energy as it takes to operate a [crystal radio](#) set from the early 1920s to early 1930s and far less than it takes to light an LED.

And all of this is possible due to the fact that the formative forces which comprise energy straddle both worlds: the world of change and the world of non-change.

Change is the consequence of non-changing, complimentary singularities coming together and interacting. Non-change is the field of timelessness wherein the formative forces of two complimentary reactances exist in time without any space. These two complimentary forces are called: capacitive and inductive reactance. Space, electricity, matter, gravity and its analogue of inertia – all of these are the consequences of the formative forces of energy uniting to create all of these correlative features to energy.

But when we look at these formative forces whenever they are not united, but existing separate from one another, then these features of a changing world – which we take for granted – are seen for what they are: illusory. For space and matter are the consequences of energy – not the other way around.

To reiterate...

Energy does not arise from a "void" unless we define this void to be timelessness devoid of space: the eternal now. Then, we could say it is a void. But the problem with the use of this term, void, is that if it cannot be seen, then how do you know it is there? Or, even know enough to inquire? This stance places (and subtly implies that) space, the non-void, is on a footing superior to void which is falsely derived from our experiential existence, aka. our five senses. Nothing could be further from the truth. For, time has always existed apart from, and independent of, space, while space is totally dependent upon time to have any meaning. Ergo, time is inclusive of space (as a consequence of time), yet space is a perspective which is clueless about time all by itself without any space to qualify it. Without space, time has no reference frame. Thus, it is timeless. But this does not mean that time, all by itself, does not or cannot exist. Our reactance formulae vindicate that not all of our science is predicated upon our direct experience. Nay... Some of our science has to be inferred.

Take the square root of negative one. No one has ever seen it, nor touched it, nor tasted it, nor heard it emit any sound. Yet, a mathematician several centuries ago had to fantasize its existence in order to solve certain problems in mathematics which could not be resolved any other way.

See the point? Even with the sciences, sometimes objectivity has to take a back seat to belief systems which, although they demonstrate their reliability time and time again, still remain belief systems. The fact that we upgrade these beliefs to the status of a Theory held in common among us all does not inject any proof of its existence. It still remains a theory, aka belief.

Religion is not far behind every theory. In other words, there may be no proof for a God or for my definition of energy, but does it hold up to experience despite our lack of direct perception with our five senses?

<http://is.gd/reactivemotor>