A Study of Dōgen

A Study of Dōgen

His Philosophy and Religion

Masao Abe

Edited by
Steven Heine

State University of New York Press

Published by
State University of New York Press, Albany

For information, address State University of New York
Press, State University Plaza, Albany, N.Y. 12246

Production by Dana Foote
Marketing by Dana E. Yanulavich

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Abe, Masao, 1915–
A study of Dōgen : his philosophy and religion / Masao Abe ; edited by Steven Heine.
p. cm.
English and Japanese.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0–7914-0837–X (CH : alk. paper). — ISBN 0–7914-0838–8 (PB : alk. paper)
1. Dōgen, 1200–1253. I. Heine, Steven, 1950– II. Title.
BQ9449.D657A625 1992
294.3'927'092—dc20

90–93566
CIP

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Notes on Abbreviations

Citations from Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* [hereafter SG] are taken from volume 1 of the two-volume *Dōgen zenji zenshū* [hereafter DZZ], edited by Ōkubo Dōshū (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1969 and 1970), unless otherwise noted.

Citations from some SG fascicles are from translations in *The Eastern Buddhist* [hereafter EB] by N. A. Waddell and Masao Abe, including:

SG "Bendōwa" EB 4 (1): 124–157;
SG "Busshō" (1) EB 8 (2): 94–112
(2) EB 9 (1): 87–105
(3) EB 9 (2): 71–87;
SG "Genjōkōan" EB 5 (2): 129–140
SG "Shōji" EB 5 (1): 70–80;
SG "Uji" (tr. Waddell) EB 12 (1): 114–129
SG "Zenki" EB 5 (1): 70–80.

Occasionally minor changes in terminology are made for the sake of consistency.

Additional EB translations:

Fukanzazengi (tr. Waddell and Abe) EB 6 (2): 115-28;
Hōkyōki (tr. Waddell) (1) EB 10 (2): 102-39
(2) 11 (1): 66-84.

Editor's Introduction

One testimony to the greatness of an original thinker is the greatness of his or her commentators. In recent Western thought, for example, Heidegger's two-volume reading of Nietzsche's notions of will to power and eternal recurrence (entitled *Nietzsche*) and Ricoeur's lectures on Freudian analysis from the standpoint of hermeneutics (*Freud and Philosophy: An Essay on Interpretation*) stand out as unique expositions that disclose as much about the views of the commentators as about the source material.[1] In twentieth-century Japan, Dōgen has proven to be one of the major sources or texts taken up for interpretation by leading Japanese philosophers and scholars. The value and significance of Dōgen's thought is evident in the important role it has played in generating discussion and analysis by such key modern figures as Watsuji Tetsurō, Tanabe Hajime, Nishitani Keiji, Ienaga Saburō, Karaki Junzō, and Tamaki Kōshirō in addition to Masao Abe, who for several decades has been helping to disseminate Dōgen's approach to Zen theory and practice in the West. The tremendous interest in Dōgen today has led the "way back" to the original thinker in a manner that will continue to influence the future of Asian and comparative thought. Yet this has been a surprising development, because for centuries after his death in 1253 Dōgen was generally known only as the founder of Sōtō Zen who required strict adherence to zazen practice in contrast to the Rinzai Zen emphasis on kōan exercises, and his works were unfamiliar to those outside the sect. Watsuji's crucial 1926 monograph, "Shamon Dōgen" (Monk Dōgen), part of a series on the foundations of Japanese spirituality, is credited with singlehandedly rescuing Dōgen from sectarian oblivion and appropriating his life and works for their universal relevance in a contemporary,

comparative philosophical setting. Watsuji sought to discover the "truth" (*shinri*) of Dōgen as a "person" (*hito*) who is not just a cult figure but belongs to all humanity. For Watsuji, the true meaning of Dōgen is discovered by grasping the universalizable philosophical, religious, and moral implications of his major work, the *Shōbōgenzō,* rather than following the precepts of the sect founded in his name.

Since Watsuji's monumental initial commentary, Dōgen studies have progressed in two seemingly opposite but complementary directions: speculative, comparative examination by thinkers either in or, like Watsuji, associated with the Kyoto school of Japanese philosophy (also known as the Nishida-Tanabe philosophical tradition); and Tokyo-based scholarship focusing on textual and biographical issues. Nishida Kitarō, founder of the Kyoto school, cited Dōgen in his writings from time to time. Some of Nishida's philosophical notions, such as the "continuity of discontinuity" (*hirenzoku no renzoku*), seemed to be influenced by Dōgen's understanding of time expressed in the doctrine of the "abiding dharma-stage" (*jū-hōi*) encompassing the immediacy of "right-now" (*nikon*) and the continuity of "passageless-passage" (*kyōryaku*). Perhaps the most illuminating early philosophical study is the 1939 essay by Tanabe, Nishida's foremost follower (and critic), entitled *Shōbōgenzō no tetsugaku shikan* (My Philosophical View of Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*). Tanabe analyzed Dōgen's views on language, time, and history in terms of his own understanding of absolute reality, and he situated the original thinker as an important figure not only in Japanese intellectual history but at the forefront of international philosophy. A series of lectures on Dōgen ("*Shōbōgenzō* kōwa") by Nishitani, former "dean" (d. 1990) of the Kyoto school, was published in the journal *Kyōdai* over several years beginning in 1966, and in book form in 1988. Nishitani examined Dōgen's approach to metaphysics, mysticism, meditation, and morality in comparative light with Western thought from the pre-Socratics through medieval theology to existential phenomenology. Karaki's 1967 essay "Mujō no keijijōgaku—Dōgen" (Dōgen's Metaphysics of Impermanence), the concluding section of his monograph *Mujō* (Impermanence), evaluated the Zen master's radical affirmation of impermanence in relation to death and dying, and being and time, as the culminative point in the typically Japanese contemplative view of transient reality. Also, Ienaga's 1955 essay "Dōgen no shūkyō no rekishiteki seikaku" (The Historical Character of Dōgen's Religion) examined

Dōgen's approach to spirituality in terms of the ideological unfolding of medieval Japanese Buddhism.

Tokyo-based studies have been conducted primarily by scholars at Komazawa University, formerly the Sōtō-sect University and now a leading center of Buddhist studies in Japan. These include Etō Sokuō's commentaries on the *Shōbōgenzō* and interpretation of Dōgen as "founder of the sect" (*Shūso to shiteno Dōgen zenji,* 1944), and Kagamishima Genryū's analysis of Dōgen's citations of Mahayana Buddhist scriptures and Zen recorded sayings (*Dōgen zenji to in'yō kyōten-goroku no kenkyū,* 1965). To cite a couple of other prominent examples from amongst the dozens of outstanding works, Ōkubo Dōshū of Tohoku University has collected the definitive version of Dōgen's complete works (*Dōgen zenji zenshū,* 1970) that is cited throughout this volume, and Tamaki Kōshirō of Tokyo University published a challenging philosophical translation of selected portions of the *Shōbōgenzō* in modern Japanese (*Dōgen sho,* 1969).

Masao Abe's method of studying Dōgen is a combination of Kyoto-school speculation and Tokyo-based textual scholarship. In order to assess Abe's contribution to this field, we must take into account his considerable background and wide-ranging interests in Zen and Western thought. A close associate of Nishida, Tanabe, and Nishitani, Abe ranks as one of the leading representatives of the Kyoto school. Like his colleagues, his main philosophical concern is to construct a dynamic synthesis of Western philosophy and religion and the Mahayana tradition. Abe has also been strongly influenced by D. T. Suzuki and Hisamatsu Shin'ichi, and he shares their commitment to Zen as a form of religious praxis over and above philosophical theory. Abe was a visiting professor of Buddhism and Japanese philosophy for over twenty years at major American colleges and universities, and since Suzuki's death he has become the leader in interpreting Zen thought based on traditional sources in comparative light with the West. In addition, he is deeply involved in promoting Buddhist–Christian dialogue. Abe's award-winning first book, *Zen and Western Thought* (1985), a collection of his most important essays, deals with four main areas concerning the origins and contemporary relevance of Zen: a philosophical clarification of Zen awakening against charges of anti-intellectualism or intuitionism; an explication of the Zen approach to negation, nonbeing, and nothingness; a focus on Buddhism as a compassionate way of life; and the proposal of a Zen-oriented new cosmology, rather than humanism, as a

means of establishing the spiritual foundation for the hoped-for unified world.

Abe's studies of Dōgen constitute a minor masterpiece within his overall scholarly production. His efforts have been twofold: translation and interpretation. The first English-language translation of Dōgen was done by Masunaga Reihō of Komazawa University in 1958 (*The Sōtō Approach to Zen*). Since then many noteworthy translations have become available, including several complete versions of the *Shōbōgenzō*. However, the series of translations by Abe and Norman Waddell published in *The Eastern Buddhist* in the 1970s has set a remarkably high standard in Asian studies for precise and reliable yet readable renderings with detailed annotations. Covering most of the important *Shōbōgenzō* fascicles as well as numerous shorter writings, the overall excellence of the translations may never be matched. Coupled with Abe's 1971 essay in the same journal, "Dōgen on Buddha Nature" (chapter 2 below), these works helped stimulate and develop still-formative Western studies in the field.

This volume takes its place among English-language studies of Dōgen that have progressed dramatically since Abe's early essay and translations. Now there are numerous commentaries, comparative studies, and translations of Dōgen's major works. These include a systematic analysis of Dōgen's theory and practice (Hee-jin Kim, *Dōgen Kigen—Mystical Realist*) and several specialized studies, including one each on biography (Takeshi Jamese Kodera, *Dogen's Formative Years in China*), meditation (Carl Bielefeldt, *Dōgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*), poetry (Steven Heine, *A Blade of Grass: Japanese Poetry and Aesthetics in Dōgen Zen*), and philosophy of time (Joan Stambaugh, *Impermanence is Buddha Nature: Dōgen's Understanding of Temporality*). There is also a collection of essays by leading scholars (William R. LaFleur, ed., *Dōgen Studies*), lengthy discussion in a history of Zen (Heinrich Dumoulin, *Zen Buddhism: A History,* volume II), and in a history of Japanese Buddhism (Daigan and Alicia Matsunaga, *Foundation of Japanese Buddhism,* volume 2). The comparative studies, focusing mainly on Western phenomenology, include T. P. Kasulis, *Zen Action/Zen Person;* David E. Shaner, *The Bodymind Experience in Japanese Buddhism: A Phenomenological Study of Kūkai and Dōgen;* and Heine, *Existential and Ontological Dimensions of Time in Heidegger and Dōgen.* In addition, there are two complete translations of the *Shōbōgenzō* (one by Nishiyama Kōsen and John Stevens, and the other by Yokoi Yūhō) and several translations of selected fascicles, including:

Tanahashi Kazuaki, *Moon in a Dewdrop: Writings of Zen Master Dōgen;* Francis Cook, *How to Raise an Ox* and *Sounds of Valley Streams: Enlightenment in Dōgen's Zen;* Thomas Cleary, *Shōbōgenzō: Zen Essays by Dōgen;* Kim, *Flowers of Emptiness: Selections from Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō;* and Yokoi, *Zen Master Dōgen: An Introduction with Selected Writings.* Finally, there are two versions of the *Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki* text—Masunaga Reihō, *A Primer of Sōtō Zen,* and Cleary, *Record of Things Heard*—as well as translations contained in some of the above works of Dōgen's shorter writings, such as *Hōkyōki, Fukanzazengi, Sanshōdōei,* and *Gakudōyōjinshū.*[2]

Abe's interpretations of Dōgen display the comparative philosophical bent of the Kyoto school combined with a mastery of textual scholarship. Throughout the essays in this volume, Abe's scholarly apparatus is sparse; he sticks to the text at hand, and he does not discuss Dōgen as the basis for his own philosophical system. What Abe does provide is a deftly probing analysis that penetrates to the core of Dōgen's philosophy and religion. Abe offers a consistent and coherent portrait of Dōgen's fundamental doctrines of the "oneness of practice and attainment" (*shushō-ittō*) as the resolution of his doubt concerning Tendai "original awakening thought" (*hongaku shisō*), the "casting off of body-mind" (*shinjin-datsuraku*) as the awakening he attained under the guidance of Chinese master Juching, and "impermanence-Buddha-nature" (*mujō-busshō*) as the experience of the eternal now, or reconciliation of time and eternity. Based on an interpretation of the origin and solution of Dōgen's formative "doubt," Abe's essays explore the profundity of the Zen master's philosophy of time, death, Buddha-nature, enlightenment, and morality in comparison with Buddhist and Western thinkers such as Hui-neng, Shinran, Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, and Heidegger. Abe shows how the doctrine of *shushō-ittō* is the crux of Dōgen's unique approach to the Buddhist middle way of nonduality in his handling and overcoming of the conventionally presumed polarities of life and death, space and time, self and world, beings and Buddha-nature, and illusion and realization. Reading Abe on Dōgen, to cite a traditional Mahayana metaphor, is like entering a great ocean with waves rippling in multiple directions. For Abe, a Dōgen quotation concerning death becomes an opportunity for comparison with Shinran, which in turn leads to reflection on the different conceptions of life and afterlife in Christianity and Buddhism. His comparative analysis of Dōgen and Heideg-

ger is thoroughly grounded in an understanding of both thinkers and always retains its critical edge, so that the broader similarities and finer contrasts come into focus in an appropriate and compelling manner.

The articles in this volume were written on major topics in Dōgen's thought on different occasions spanning over twenty years. Thus there is some inevitable repetition, much of which has been edited out—though not entirely, so as not to sacrifice the integrity of the original writings or the sense of the seasoning of the author's perspective. I have tried to be sensitive to Abe's style, which is a kind of meditative approach, "leaping into" key issues and building arguments in a spiral-like fashion that is well suited to the material under discussion. That is, despite some overlap in these essays, the overall effect of the collection is to create a kind of symphony in which various tones and themes in Dōgen's thought resurface and resound upon one another.

The importance of the doctrine of the oneness of practice and attainment highlighted by Abe must be seen in the context of Dōgen's criticism of Tendai original awakening thought, which played a dominant role in the late Heian/early Kamakura era of Japanese religion. The notion of original awakening was initially found in *The Awakening of Faith in Mahayana Buddhism,* and it was refined in the Japanese Tendai school as an extension of Mahayana nonduality by accepting and affirming the concrete phenomenal world as coterminous with absolute reality. Abe shows that according to the traditional biographies, Dōgen deeply questioned during his early monkhood why it was necessary to practice meditation at all if awakening was already provided as an original endowment, as the Tendai doctrine suggests. After his awakening, Dōgen went on to severely criticize Tendai teaching of original awakening as tending toward an heretical or non-Buddhist position by at once hypostatizing an eternal, *a priori* mental nature in contrast to ephemeral phenomena and affirming the natural world in a way that obviated the need for a sustained commitment to religious training.

Yet Dōgen's relation to Tendai is rather ambivalent and complex, for several reasons.[3] First, Dōgen, like other leading thinkers of his day, was greatly influenced by Tendai thought. Although he avoided the notion of *hongaku,* he used similar terms—*honshō,* or "original realization," and *honrai no memmoku,* or "original face"—in the "Bendōwa" fascicle. He

also praised Chih-i, founder of the sect in China, and cited the central Tendai scripture, the *Lotus Sutra,* over fifty times in his writings, endorsing many of its main tenets, such as *shohō-jissō* (all dharmas are true form). On the other hand, Dōgen was certainly not alone in his criticisms, but was joined by other reformers of the "new" Kamakura Buddhism, including Hōnen, Shinran, and Nichiren. Nor was Dōgen the first to raise the issue of practice. An earlier Tendai monk, Shōshin, criticized the *hongaku* mainstream along much the same lines and tended to stress the notion of *genjō* (spontaneous manifestation), which was a central topic in Dōgen's writing. Abe makes it clear that fundamentally Dōgen affirms the notion of original awakening by giving a new interpretation on the basis of his realization of the oneness of practice and attainnment as expressed in the "Bendōwa" fascicle: "In the Buddha Dharma practice and attainment are identical. Because one's present practice is practice in attainment, one's initial negotiation of the Way in itself is the whole of original attainment."[4] To Dōgen, "practicing Buddha [*gyōbutsu*] is...neither *shikaku* [acquired awakening] nor *hongaku*"[5] in the usual sense but is based on original awakening in the above or *genjō*-oriented sense. That is, Dōgen did not try to maneuver from original awakening as one extreme to the opposite extreme of acquired awakening (*shikaku*), which is equally problematic. Rather, while uncompromisingly embracing nonduality, he also thoroughly stressed the differences and distinctiveness of each and every phenomenon that can only be fully realized at each and every moment through continuous, unceasing practice.

As Abe explains in chapter 1, "The Oneness of Practice and Attainment," and chapter 3, "Dōgen's View of Time and Space," the key to Dōgen's breaking through his spiritual impasse concerning original awakening is a clarification of the meaning of time, death, and Buddha-nature. Dōgen realized that the true nature of time is beyond the polarities of now and then, before and after, means and end, potentiality and actuality, and reversibility and irreversibility. Therefore, enlightenment cannot be considered to occur either prior to practice, as an innate potentiality from the past awaiting actualization, or at the conclusion of practice, as a teleological goal to be reached in the future. Dōgen overcame any subtle inclination to hypostatize or conceptualize either practice or attainment as a static occurrence rather than to realize their dynamic unity as a ceaselessly unfolding event fully integrated with all aspects of temporality.

True time encompasses the simultaneity and particularity of past, present, and future as well as the spontaneity of the moment and the fullness of continuity. From this standpoint, life at once contains death and yet is complete unto itself as a manifestation of absolute reality, and death at once contains life and yet is complete unto itself as a manifestation of absolute reality. Dōgen's self-power understanding of the identity-in-difference of life-and-death realized through meditation stands in contrast to Shinran's other-power, Pure Land view that there is no liberation from life and death without the transformative grace of Amida Buddha's compassionate vow. Thus, for Dōgen, "the Buddha-nature is not incorporated prior to attaining Buddhahood; it is incorporated upon the attainment of Buddhahood. The Buddha-nature is always manifested simultaneously with the attainment of Buddhahood."[6] However, at the conclusion of chapter 6, the second essay in the two-part study "The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran," Abe makes a fascinating and important point concerning the relation between self-power (which Abe refers to as "true correspondence to the Dharma") and other-power ("inverse correspondence"). Since both views are encompassed by the Dharma itself, according to Mahayana holistic metaphysics, Abe shows that Dōgen and Shinran must ideologically confront and engage each other as necessary philosophical opposites, and that this encounter allows for the completion of their respective doctrinal standpoints. This section raises some fascinating and crucial questions not only concerning Dōgen, but about Mahayana Buddhist philosophy and religion as a whole.

In chapter 2, "Dōgen on Buddha-nature," Abe explains how Dōgen's understanding of the nondualities of practice and attainment, life and death, and beings and Buddha-nature fulfills the Buddhist deanthropocentric, nonsubstantive, and cosmological approach. Dōgen grasps the world of absolute nothingness unbound by humanly fabricated deceptions or presuppositions, but at the same time he is eminently concerned with the concrete, personal issue of authenticity or attainment. That is, the human dimension is only realized by transcending it, and vice versa. Furthermore, Abe shows that Dōgen's philosophical vantage point of being and nothingness, based on the religious experience of the casting off of body-mind, is the basis of the underlying differences between the Zen master and Martin Heidegger, who is the focal point for comparative examinations in chapter 4, "The Problem of Time in Heidegger and

Dōgen," and elsewhere. Among Western thinkers Heidegger appears closest to Dōgen in stressing temporality as the key to unlocking the question of Being. Like Dōgen, Heidegger penetrates to the inseparability of life and death and the three tenses of ecstatic temporality from a nonsubstantive philosophical perspective. Yet even though Heidegger's insights are revolutionary in Western thought, he remains bound to an anthropocentrism that values thinking over nonthinking, beings over nothingness, or the future over the eternal now, and therefore Heidegger never fully resolves the religious quest for self-awakening.

Acknowledgments

This volume contains articles recently translated from Japanese and revised versions of articles previously published in English. Masao Abe and I thank the respective publishers for the permission they have kindly granted to reprint with some revisions for the sake of consistency and continuity the following articles: "The Oneness of Practice and Attainment: Implications for the Relation between Means and Ends," ed. by William R. LaFleur, in *Dōgen Studies* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985): 99–111; "Dōgen on Buddha-nature," originally published as "Dōgen on Buddha Nature" in *The Eastern Buddhist* 4 (1): 28–71, and reprinted with revisions as "Dōgen on Buddha-Nature" in *Zen and Western Thought,* ed. by William R. LaFleur (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1985): 25–68; "Dōgen's View of Time and Space," tr. by Steven Heine, in *The Eastern Buddhist* 21 (2): 1–35, originally published in *Kōza Dōgen,* vol. 4, ed. by Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōshirō (Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1980): 164–90; and "The Problem of Time in Heidegger and Dōgen," in *Being and Truth: Essays in Honour of John Macquarrie,* ed. by Alistair Kee and Eugene T. Long (London: SCM Press, 1986): 200–244. In addition, my translations of the following articles from Japanese appear by permission of M. Abe: "The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 1" (Dōgen to Shinran ni okeru shi no jikaku) in *Risō,* no. 366 (1963): 75–87; and "The Unborn and Rebirth: The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 2" (Fushō to Ōjō: Dōgen to Shinran ni okeru shi no jikaku) in *Zen no honshitsu to ningen no shinri,* ed. by Hisamatsu Shin'ichi and Nishitani Keiji (Tokyo, 1969): 643-693. Also, we are using Dōgen's calligraphy of "Fukanzazengi" for the book cover through the courtesy of Eiheiji Temple, for which we

are deeply grateful. We are also thankful to Prof. Yasuaki Nara and Rev. Kakuzen Suzuki for their help in this regard.

I express my greatest admiration and deepest appreciation to Masao Abe. Helping to prepare this book with his guidance and support has been a singularly illuminating and enjoyable task both personally and professionally. I began working with Abe in 1985 when he was the Margaret Gest Visiting Professor of Philosophy at Haverford College. Prior to that, I had long been an admirer of his writings, which were a main source of inspiration in my studies of Zen and Japanese thought, as they have been for so many others. For two years Abe conducted biweekly symposia on Japanese philosophy at Haverford that were organized by Ashok Gangadean and attended by a host of engaging scholars in Asian and comparative thought. The substance of the material we discussed was always compelling and challenging, but I was especially struck by Abe's unassuming manner, which attracted a diverse and fascinating group of people who gathered to discuss and debate ideas East and West. Abe's personal and philosophical approach to ongoing dialogue is best characterized by William R. LaFleur in his introduction to *Zen and Western Thought:* "[Abe's] concern to do this was always without discrimination; it included notable philosophers as well as curious undergraduates. He has always been eager to carry on this kind of inter-religious and inter-philosophical dialogue not only with his professional peers but also with the next generation which will themselves take it up and continue it in new ways in the years to come."[7] I was delighted when Masao Abe asked me to assist him with this book, and I hope that my efforts can help in some small way to highlight his invaluable and enduring contributions to the field of Dōgen studies.

Author's Introduction

Dōgen Kigen (1200–1253) has been credited traditionally as being the founder of the Japanese Sōtō Zen sect. However, his importance goes well beyond that historical aspect, for at least the following three reasons. First, Dōgen is a unique figure in the long history of Zen in China and Japan, in that he combined the experience of a profound religious realization with keen philosophical and speculative skills that surpassed his predecessors and followers. Second, on the basis of his penetrating awakening he interpreted Mahayana Buddhism in a radical way that brought its doctrinal standpoint to its culmination. Third, Dōgen's understanding of Buddha-nature, being, time, death, and morality has a philosophical significance that is at once consonant with and yet challenging to some of the key contemporary philosophers and issues. In this book, I seek to elucidate Dōgen's philosophy and religion, keeping these three points in mind.

The terms *philosophy* and *religion* in the subtitle of the book are, however, not used in their strict Western senses. In the West, philosophy and religion are generally understood as two different entities: the former is a human enterprise for understanding humans and the universe based on intelligence or reason, whereas the latter is faith in divine revelation. The intellectual history of the West may be regarded as a history of opposition, conflict, and in some cases synthesis of philosophy and religion. In the East, especially in Buddhism, philosophy and religion are not two different entities. Since Buddhism is originally not a religion of faith in a transcendent deity but a religion of awakening to the true nature of self and others, *praxis* and *theoria,* to use Western terms, are interfused and undifferentiated. In the Mahayana tradition, Hua-yen (J.

Kegon) and T'ien-t'ai (Tendai) Buddhism are particularly strong in terms of doctrinal construction, yet their doctrines are not "philosophy" as distinguishable from "religion," but the self-realization of practice. Perhaps more emphatically than other forms of Buddhism, Zen stresses the priority of direct awakening through concentrated practice, as expressed in the saying "Not relying on words or letters, [Zen is] an independent self-transmitting apart from any doctrinal teaching."

Dōgen, however, is unique even in the Zen tradition, for as already stated, he combined profound religious realization with speculative reflection in a way that exceeded his predecessors and followers. In this book, I refer to Dōgen's speculative aspect as "philosophy" and his practical or soteriological aspect as "religion." However, his speculation is not based on "thinking" in the conventional sense. Rather, it is based on "thinking of nonthinking," which is realized only through the complete negation of ordinary thinking. It is the thinking realized in and though practice ("religion"), which is for Dōgen nothing but "the casting off of body-mind." (See chapter 4 below.) In short, the terms *philosophy* and *religion* in the subtitle of the book indicate the thinking of nonthinking, which is provisionally bifurcated but primordially nondifferentiable, based on Dōgen's enlightenment experience.

This volume has not been written systematically by undertaking a comprehensive plan of research. Rather, it is a collection of my essays on Dōgen written over nearly thirty years on various occasions. The first article, "The Oneness of Practice and Attainment," is relatively recent, written in 1981 and presented at the First International Dōgen Conference held at Tassajara Springs, California, in October of the same year. It was later published along with other papers presented at the conference in *Dōgen Studies,* edited by William R. LaFleur, in 1985. (For more detailed information on this book and the other publications from which these articles are taken, see the Editor's Introduction.) In this essay I interpret the doubt young Dōgen encountered at Mt. Hiei concerning the Tendai doctrine of "original awakening"—that is, the question of why practice is necessary if all beings are originally enlightened—which led him to sail to China to study Zen with an authentic teacher, Ju-ching. The doctrine of *shushō-ittō,* the oneness of practice and attainment, is the solution of the doubt that he attained during his study in China, which became the foundation on which he developed his philosophy and religion after returning to Japan.

It is also perhaps the central idea of Dōgen's that can be applied to contemporary individual and social issues. With this understanding, I have placed the essay at the beginning of the book.

The second essay, "Dōgen on Buddha-nature," was written in 1971 for the 50th Anniversary Special Edition of *The Eastern Buddhist* while at the same time I began a series of translations of Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* and other writings with Norman Waddell (the translation of the "Bendōwa" fascicle appeared in the same issue). Since Dōgen's unique and penetrating understanding of Mahayana Buddhism is most clearly seen in his notion of Buddha-nature (*busshō*), in this essay I examine Dōgen's view by analyzing the "Busshō" fascicle in terms of three main issues: "whole-being is Buddha-nature" (*shitsuu-busshō*), "no-Buddha-nature" (*mu-busshō*), and "impermanence-Buddha-nature" (*mujō-busshō*). I clarify Dōgen's approach by contrasting it with the conventional Mahayana understanding of Buddha-nature, and also by comparing his philosophy of religion to the Christian notion of God as well as to the thought of Spinoza, Hegel, and Heidegger.

The third essay, "Dōgen's View of Time and Space," was originally written in Japanese in 1980 and published in *Kōza Dōgen,* volume 4, in the same year. It was translated by Steven Heine and appeared in *The Eastern Buddhist* (21 (2), 1988). Here, I emphasize that Dōgen's view of time and space cannot be understood properly apart from his standpoints of Buddha-nature and continuous practice (*gyōji*). His view of the identity of being-time (*uji*) does not represent an unmediated unity but an identity realized in and through the Buddha-nature and the self-liberating self, or "the self prior to the universe sprouting any sign of itself." Thus, being-time is not based on philosophical reflection but expresses a deeply religious concern with human liberation.

The fourth essay, "The Problem of Time in Heidegger and Dōgen," was written in 1985 and published in *Being and Truth: Essays in Honour of John Macquarrie* in the following year. The intention of this essay is to clarify the affinities and differences in the views of time and temporality of Martin Heidegger and Dōgen. Paying particular attention to the *Kehre,* or "turn," from Heidegger's early period to the later one, I compare Dōgen to the two stages of Heidegger's thought. I conclude that while Heidegger is closer to Dōgen in his later period than in his early period, the thinkers are still quite different. For instance, for Heidegger being and time do not completely "belong together,"

and time is not understood as completely reversible. All of the differences emerge in the final analysis from the lack, on Heidegger's part, of a thoroughgoing realization of "absolute nothingness" (*zettai mu*), which is beyond the duality of being and nothingness and yet includes both.

The fifth and sixth essays, "The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 1" and "The Unborn and Rebirth: The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 2," were written in Japanese in 1963 and 1964 successively and were recently translated for this book by Steven Heine. They are the earliest essays I wrote on Dōgen included here. Both articles compare Dōgen and Shinran, two outstanding Buddhist thinkers of Kamakura Japan representing, respectively, the "self-power" (*jiriki*) path of Zen and the "other-power" (*tariki*) path of Pure Land. Here I try to clarify their parallels and differences in terms of the problems of death, sin, faith, practice, and naturalness. I interpret Dōgen's standpoint as the true correspondence of the Dharma, and Shinran's as the inverse correspondence of the Dharma. In the concluding sections of "The Unborn and Rebirth," somewhat rewritten in preparing this volume, I explore the possible overcoming of the fundamental differences between these dimensions in Buddhism and suggest the need for an awakening to the most authentic Dharma, which is beyond the opposition between Buddha and Mara (demon).

As I previously stated, this book has not been written with a systematic, comprehensive plan, and it consists of a collection of essays, three in English and three in Japanese, written for various occasions. With the help of the editorship of Steven Heine, I have arranged the essays as systematically as possible. You see the result here before you.

This book could not have been published without the help and advice of many people. My great and sincere appreciation is extended to Steven Heine, who not only translated three essays—"Dōgen's View of Time and Space," "The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 1," and "The Unborn and Rebirth: The Problem of Death in Dōgen and Shinran, Part 2"—but also carefully and appropriately did the editorial work throughout the entire process of preparing the volume. Although I revised his translations considerably, his understanding and translation skill in Japanese philosophical/Buddhist writings is truly admirable. Steve gave me valuable suggestions to improve the essays, and he reconstructed some paragraphs to avoid the repetition inevitable in a collection of arti-

cles written at different times. He also compiled the glossary of Sino-Japanese terms and the index.

I also express my gratitude to William R. LaFleur, Norman Waddell, and Joan Stambaugh, who gave me valuable suggestions at the final stages of writing "The Oneness of Practice and Attainment," "Dōgen on Buddha-nature," and "The Problem of Time in Heidegger and Dōgen," respectively. Dennis Hirota and Eishō Nasu were especially helpful in translating and referencing Shinran's works. We are using Dōgen's calligraphy of "Fukanzazengi" on the book cover through the courtesy of Eiheiji temple, for which we are extremely grateful. We thank Prof. Yasuaki Nara and Rev. Kakuzen Suzuki for their help in this regard. Thanks also go to the San Francisco Zen Center for supporting me as a scholar-in-residence for the academic year 1989–90. I am also grateful for Dr. Muriel Pollia's financial aid, which supported my teaching position at the Pacific School of Religion for the academic year 1990–91. Last but not least, I am deeply indebted to Shin'ichi Hisamatsu-*sensei* and Keiji Nishitani-*sensei* for my understanding of Dōgen and Western philosophy.

I sincerely hope that this small work on Dōgen will contribute to the ongoing Eastern and Western philosophical and religious encounter.

I

The Oneness of Practice and Attainment

Implications for the Relation between Means and Ends

Young Dōgen's Doubt

Dōgen is one of the most outstanding and unique Buddhists in the history of Japanese Buddhism. He is unique in at least the following three senses.

First, rejecting all existing forms of Buddhism in Japan as inauthentic, he attempted to introduce and establish what he believed to be genuine Buddhism, based on his own realization that he attained in Sung China under the guidance of Zen master Ju-ching (Nyojō, 1163–1228). He called it "the Buddha Dharma directly transmitted from the buddhas and patriarchs." He emphasized zazen (seated meditation) as "the right entrance to the Buddha Dharma," in the tradition of the Zen schools in China since Bodhidharma, originating from Śākyamuni Buddha. Yet he strictly refused to speak of a "Zen sect," to say nothing of a "Sōtō sect," which he was later credited with founding. For Dōgen was concerned solely with the "right Dharma," and regarded zazen as its "right entrance." "Who has used the name 'Zen sect?'" he asks rhetorically. "No buddha or patriarch ever spoke of a 'Zen sect.' Those who pronounce a devil's appellation must be confederates of the devil, not children of the Buddha."[1] He called himself "the Dharma transmitter Shamon

(Monk) Dōgen who went to China" and returned "empty-handed" but with the strong conviction that he had attained the authentic Dharma that is directly transmitted from buddha to buddha and should transplant it to Japanese soil. Thus he rejected the idea of *mappō* (final or degenerate Dharma), an idea that had gained wide acceptance in the Japanese Buddhism of his day. It may not be too much to say of Dōgen that just as Bodhidharma transmitted the Buddha Dharma to China, he intended to transmit it to Japan.

Secondly, though Dōgen came to a realization of the right Dharma under the guidance of a Chinese Zen master whom he continued to revere throughout his life, the understanding of the right Dharma is unique to Dōgen. Based on his religious awakening and penetrating insight, Dōgen grasped the Buddha Dharma in its deepest and most authentic sense. In doing so, he dared to reinterpret the words of former patriarchs, and even the sūtras themselves. As a result, his idea of the right Dharma represents one of the purest forms of Mahayana Buddhism, in which the Dharma that was realized in the Buddha's enlightenment reveals itself most profoundly. All of this, it is noteworthy, is rooted in Dōgen's own existential realization, which he attained through long and intense seeking. Based on this idea of the right Dharma, he not only rejected all existing forms of Buddhism in Japan, as stated above, but severely criticized certain forms of Indian and Chinese Buddhism, though he generally considered the practice of Buddhism in these two countries to be more authentic than it was in Japan.

The third reason Dōgen is unique in the history of Japanese Buddhism is because of his speculative and philosophical nature. He was a strict practitioner of zazen who earnestly emphasized *shikantaza* (just sitting). He spent his whole life in rigorous discipline as a monk. He encouraged his disciples to do the same. Yet he was endowed with a keen linguistic sensibility and philosophical mind. His main work, the *Shōbōgenzō* (A Treasury of the Right Dharma Eye), perhaps unsurpassable in its philosophical speculation, is a monumental document in Japanese intellectual history. In Dōgen, we find a rare combination of religious insight and philosophical ability. In this respect, he may well be compared with Thomas Aquinas, born twenty-five years after him.

Dōgen wrote his main work, the *Shōbōgenzō,* in Japanese, in spite of the fact that leading Japanese Buddhists until then had usually written their major works in Chinese. Dōgen made pen-