

Posit 4 — Formula 7

LONG INTRODUCTION — BOOK TEXT RADIANCE — SIMPLY IS

There is a movement in the unfolding of Radiance where even the recognition of presence becomes unnecessary, where the stability of Being requires no reference point, where the openness that allows all appearance is seen not as condition, field, or nature, but simply as what is. Not as something attained, revealed, refined, clarified, embodied, or realised, but as the undeniable fact that stands before all articulation. This Formula does not speak of Radiance as quality, as ground, as constancy, or as field. It speaks of Radiance without form, without attribute, without distinction—even the distinction between presence and appearance falls away. Radiance, here, is simply what is.

In the earlier movements of this Posit, Radiance could be spoken of through articulation. It could be described as Being, as openness, as the unmoved ground. These descriptions were not qualities but recognitions. Yet in this Formula, even recognition is too much movement. Recognition implies two positions: one that recognises and one that is recognised. But Radiance, simply being itself, has no division from which recognition could arise. It does not stand within something else. It does not emerge from anything. It does not present itself through variation. It has no beginning or sequence. It does not arrive. It does not unfold. It does not reveal. It is.

In this Formula, the body is no longer taken as expression of Radiance nor as site of its articulation. The body continues its movements—breathing, shifting, sensing—but these movements do not reflect Radiance, reveal it, or conceal it. They are neither closer to nor farther from Radiance. They arise without relation to it. Radiance is not inside the body, not behind it, not surrounding it. The body simply appears within what is. Radiance does not support the body nor shine through it. Presence does not occupy bodily form. Form appears without implication, and Radiance remains what it is.

Thought moves in this same independence. Thinking arises with patterns and dissolves into quiet, but neither condition stands nearer to Radiance. Radiance is not glimpsed more clearly when thought subsides, nor obscured when thought becomes active. To say thought arises “within” Radiance is already too great a distinction. There is no container and no contained. There is only what is, and thought is one of its appearances. Radiance is not accessed through the mind nor held back by it. It remains untouched by the presence or absence of thinking.

Emotion, too, alters nothing. It shifts with tone and intensity, yet none of these movements alter what is. To say that Radiance remains the same in the presence of emotion is still to imagine a relation. In this Formula, the relation disappears. Emotion arises, displays itself, fades, returns, or becomes quiet. None of this is movement “within” Radiance; it is simply appearance. Radiance is not the background to emotion. It does not hold emotion nor allow it. The idea of allowance itself dissolves. What is does not permit or prevent. It does not respond. It does not remain unaffected. It simply is.

Identity has no special position here. The sense of self may continue to arise with its familiar contours, yet it does not locate Radiance nor separate from it. In previous movements, identity was seen as a contour of openness or as expression of presence. Here, even that

distinction becomes unnecessary. Identity appears without claiming or reflecting Radiance. It does not veil or reveal. It does not stand apart from what is, nor does it merge with it. The sense of self, whether vivid or faint, is simply another appearance without implication. Radiance does not relate to identity in any direction.

The world likewise takes its place without relation. Forms appear, shift, and dissolve. Objects maintain structure, interact, and respond. Environments vary. Yet none of this activity reflects Radiance, expresses it, or stands as its counterpart. To say the world appears “in” Radiance is to attribute position where none exists. Radiance does not contextualise the world. The world does not illustrate Radiance. Appearance stands, and Radiance simply is. They do not touch, for touching implies two. They do not separate, for separation implies two. They do not interact, for interaction implies two. In this Formula, the idea of two has no ground from which to arise.

Stillness and movement hold equal absence of relation. Movement does not disturb Radiance, and stillness does not clarify it. But more deeply than this, movement and stillness do not occur “within” Radiance. They simply occur, and Radiance does not interact with them. Radiance is not constant beneath change; constancy itself is too much articulation for this Formula. Radiance is not stable, for stability implies something that could be otherwise. Radiance is not unmoved, for unmoved implies something that could move. Radiance does not resist change because resistance implies possibility of disturbance. In this Formula, Radiance has no opposite, no contrast, no possible variation. It is not what does not change; it is that for which “changing” has no meaning.

Time offers no distinction here. Time unfolds—moments arise, pass, and line themselves in sequence. Yet Radiance is not timeless as opposed to time-bound. Timelessness is a contrast, and contrast implies two. Radiance is not beyond time, not within it, not beneath it. Radiance does not endure while time moves, nor does it transcend time. To endure is still to relate to duration. To transcend is still to contrast with what is transcended. Radiance simply is, and the appearance of time has no bearing on it.

In this Formula, even the idea of presence becomes unnecessary. Presence suggests something present, and something present implies a position. Radiance occupies no position. It is not here or there. It is not within or beyond. It is not near or far. The spatial language collapses. The conceptual language collapses. The experiential language collapses. All descriptions dissolve into a simplicity where Radiance is not defined, not known, not recognised, not approached. It is neither the ground nor the field nor the essence. It does not support. It does not underlie. It does not permeate. All such descriptions introduce distinctions, and distinctions are foreign to this Formula.

To say Radiance “is” already stretches language to its limit. The verb suggests existence, yet Radiance is not an entity. It suggests stability, yet Radiance is not a condition. It suggests being as opposed to non-being, yet Radiance has no opposite. The simplest articulation—Radiance Is—points, but the pointing does not reach its mark. Nothing in appearance affects Radiance, not because Radiance withstands it, but because Radiance has no relation to it. Appearance unfolds, and Radiance simply is. Appearance dissolves, and Radiance simply is. There is no before, no after, no within, no without.

In previous movements, Radiance could be described in contrast to experience—Radiance as unity, Radiance as openness, Radiance as constancy. But here, contrast dissolves. Radiance

does not differ from appearance; nor is it the same as appearance. Radiance does not stand beyond appearance; nor is it contained by it. These pairs hold no meaning. In this Formula, there is no articulation that can describe Radiance without implying relation, and relation cannot hold.

The purpose of this Formula is not to describe Radiance but to articulate the impossibility of describing it. Not because Radiance is unknowable, but because it is not an object of knowledge. Not because Radiance is beyond language, but because language depends on contrast, and Radiance has none. Radiance cannot be approached because approach implies direction. It cannot be realised because realisation implies time. It cannot be attained because attainment implies distance. It cannot be lost because loss implies condition. It cannot be unified with anything because unity implies division.

The earlier Formulae reveal aspects of Radiance by removing confusion. This Formula reveals Radiance by removing articulation itself. Radiance is not something recognised in experience nor something hidden behind it. It does not stand beneath the world nor extend through it. It does not inhabit the self nor surpass it. It does not hold appearance nor withdraw from it. Appearance does what it does. Radiance remains what it is.

There is no relation.

There is no division.

There is no sequence.

There is no state.

There is no movement.

Radiance simply is.

It is not quality, not condition, not field, not stability.

It is not presence as opposed to absence.

It is not here as opposed to elsewhere.

It is not now as opposed to later.

The articulation of Radiance ends here,
not because Radiance is concluded,
but because articulation reaches its boundary.

What remains is the simplicity that requires no expression,
no recognition,
no refinement,
no frame.

Radiance

—

simply

is.