

Zen Body, Zen Mind:
Dōgen and the Question of Licensed Evil

Carl Alexander Leslie
Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal
August 2007

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the
requirement of the degree of Masters of Arts.

Copyright © Carl Leslie 2007

This, monks, is the Holy Truth of the cessation (*nirodha*) of *dukkha* [suffering]: the utter cessation, without attachment, of that very craving, its renunciation, surrender, release.

The Buddha, *Dhammacakkapavattana Sutta* (Harvey 60-1)

We understand that birth-and-death itself is nirvana: thus we neither loathe birth-and-death nor long for nirvana. Only then, for the first time, are we free in birth-and-death.

Dōgen, *Shōbōgenzō* “Shōji” (Kim 2004, 166)

Table of Contents	
Abstract	iv
Résumé	v
Acknowledgments	vi
Conventions	vii
Introduction: Dōgen’s Response to Licensed Evil in the <i>Zuimonki</i>	1
Chapter One. The Problem of Licensed Evil	8
Introduction	
Tendai <i>Hongaku shisō</i>	
Ch’an/Zen: The <i>Platform Sutra</i> and Beyond	
Ju-ching and Original Enlightenment Thought	
Daruma-shū: Antinomian Zen	
Dōgen’s Continuity with Original Enlightenment Thought	
Conclusion	
Chapter Two. Practice and Enlightenment in Dōgen	27
Introduction	
<i>Jijuyū Zanmai</i>	
<i>Shinjin Datsuraku</i>	
Embodied Enlightenment	
Practice and Verification: <i>Shinjin Datsuraku</i>	
Practice and Verification: Wholehearted Effort	
Original Enlightenment and Original Practice	
Original <i>Shinjin Datsuraku</i> and Original Effort	
Realizing Original Enlightenment	
Becoming a Buddha	
Conclusion	
Chapter Three. Zazen	51
Introduction	
Undefined Zazen	
Defiled Zazen	
Do Not Seek to Become a Buddha	
Undefined Practice-Realization	
Wholehearted Effort	
Why Choose Zazen?	
Conclusion	
Chapter Four. Rituals and Precepts	68
Introduction	
Transmitting Ritual	
Ritual as Non-Seeking	
Purification as Realization	
Why Emphasize Ritual?	

Precept-Practice
Shoakumakusa as Relative and Imperative
Shoakumakusa as Realization
Shoakumakusa as Wholehearted Non-Seeking
Conclusion

Conclusion. Birth-and-Death	89
Bibliography	94

Abstract

Zen Master Dōgen (1200-1253) lived and taught at a time of when certain people understood the teachings of “original enlightenment” as license to ignore Buddhist moral constraints. In response, rather than rejecting original enlightenment teachings altogether, Dōgen rejects this antinomian “licensed evil” interpretation by teaching the oneness of practice and original enlightenment. For Dōgen, there can be no enlightenment outside practice because practice and original enlightenment are inseparable; moreover, practice must be wholehearted and without seeking in order to be the realization of enlightenment. By describing the practices of seated meditation, monastic ritual, and the moral precepts as precisely situations of wholehearted non-seeking, Dōgen justifies the need to engage in these activities of practice-enlightenment, and thereby responds to the question of licensed evil.

Résumé

Le Maître du Zen Dōgen (1200-1253) a vécu et a enseigné pendant une ère où quelques personnes entendaient que les leçons de « l'illumination originelle » leur donnaient la permission d'ignorer les contraintes morales du Bouddhisme. En réponse, au lieu de rejeter complètement les leçons de l'illumination originelle, Dōgen rejette cette interprétation antinomique d'un « mal licencié » en enseignant l'inséparabilité de la pratique et de l'illumination originelle. Pour Dōgen, on ne peut pas avoir l'illumination en dehors de la pratique, car la pratique et l'illumination sont inséparables; en plus, on doit entrer dans la pratique sans réserve, avec tout son enthousiasme et sans chercher un but en particulier, pour être la réalisation de l'illumination. En décrivant les pratiques de la méditation assise, la rituelle monastique, et les préceptes morales comme étant des exemples parfaits des situations de rien-chercher, Dōgen justifie le besoin d'engager dans ces activités de pratique-illumination, et ainsi il répond à la question du « mal avec licence ».

Acknowledgements

Thank you to all my teachers, friends, and family who supported me in countless ways during the writing of this thesis. More than a few deserve special attention.

Thank you to my supervisor Victor Sōgen Hori for your truly heroic efforts and tireless dedication to teaching me the Way of Zen.

Thank you to everyone inside and outside academia who taught and teach the Buddha-Way, especially Zengetsu Myōkyō, Joshu Sasaki, Shōhaku Okumura, Reb, Fu, Paul, Goenka, Lara Braitstein and Ravi.

Thank you to Lauren for everything from throwing the first draft of this thesis out your window at Green Gulch to meticulously editing the final draft at Fishpeddlers.

Thank you to Stefan and Heidi for providing me with an ideal setting to write a thesis.

Thank you to the folks at SSHRC for your belief that this thesis was worthwhile.

Thank you to Chris, Melissa, Erin, Meera, and all my fellow graduate students for all your support, advice, and friendship.

Thank you to Jessica for quickly translating my Abstract into a Résumé during the middle of her summer vacation.

And finally, thank you Mor and Peter, and Erik and Adrian, for supporting me as I try to find my way.

Conventions

The Wade-Giles system for Romanization has been used for Chinese names and the Hepburn system of Romanization for Japanese names and words. Chinese monks' names are given using Chinese pronunciation. Since the Sanskrit terms "samsara" and "nirvana" are now commonly found in English, they appear without diacritical marks. In-text citations follow the pattern (Author page), or (Author year, page) when necessary. Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki* is referred to only as *Zuimonki*. *Shōbōgenzō* fascicle titles appear in "quotation marks" but not in *italics*. The common terms "zazen," "kōan," "Buddhadharma," "Dharma," and "dharma" and are also written without *italics*, except when I cite texts which *italicize* these terms.

Introduction

Dōgen's Response to Licensed Evil in the *Zuimonki*

How should I live my life? And why should I live that way? These ethical questions have led me from a study of Western thought to a study of the world's religions, especially Buddhism. It has led me here, to a Zen training temple, organic farm, and retreat centre in northern California, and it has led me to write this thesis on the ethics of Eihei Dōgen (1200-1253), the founder of Japanese Sōtō Zen and author of *Shōbōgenzō* (Treasure of the True Dharma Eye).

Immediately, I face a basic and important problem. As Donald Swearer states in his essay in *The Blackwell Companion to Religious Ethics*, people involved in religious ethics risk “imposing Western analytical models and formal structures of moral reasoning onto richly diverse, historically and culturally embedded indigenous religio-ethical systems” (Swearer 139). To apply the term ‘ethics’ to a medieval Japanese Buddhist religious thinker is problematic because he was not engaged in the discourse of ‘ethics’ as it currently exists and as I know it. To write a thesis on Dōgen's ‘ethics’ may be to inappropriately impose foreign concepts onto Dōgen's thought in such a way as to seriously distort and misrepresent its meaning. Moreover, Dōgen was not a systematic philosopher, providing logical arguments leading from premises to conclusions. As Hee-Jin Kim notes in his seminal work *Eihei Dōgen: Mystical Realist*, “What Dōgen presents to us is not a well-defined, well-knit philosophical system, but rather a loose nexus of exquisite mythopoetic imaginings and profound philosophic visions” (Kim 2004, 9). Like Kim, in this thesis “I am not hoping to present a system by which to study Dōgen – there is none” (Kim 2004, 11).

Cautious of this situation, and aware that I can have only a partial point of view of Dōgen, constructed of my own particular historical consciousness, I have tried to write with the least amount of distortion possible by considering Dōgen's teachings within their own particular historical and doctrinal context. I do not try to imagine its contemporary relevance or to try to formulate a contemporary ethics based upon an

interpretation of Dōgen. I leave these constructive tasks to those whose understanding and courage surpass my own. Rather than considering “ethics” as “a system of moral reasoning,” this thesis simply considers “ethics” to be teachings that respond to my questions, “How should I live my life? And why should I live that way?”

There are, of course, many ways of considering Dōgen’s ethics. It is possible to emphasize his teachings on the precepts (the moral and ethical imperatives he taught); the importance of this way of considering Dōgen’s ethics is apparent from the fact that three important contemporary American Zen teachers – Robert Aitken in *Mind of Clover*, John Daido Looi in *Heart of Being*, and Reb Anderson in *Being Upright* – use Dōgen’s precepts to structure their exposition of Zen ethics. Another way of approaching Dōgen’s ethics is to emphasize his teachings on the bodhisattva (the selfless compassionate being whose primary concern is the liberation of others); this approach is the central focus of Douglas Mikkelson’s “The Cardinal Virtues of the Bodhisattva in Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki*”, and Robert Aitken’s *The Practice of Perfection: the Paramitas from a Zen Buddhist Perspective*. Dōgen’s teachings concerning *karma*, or moral causation, provide another way of seeing his ethics; in *Shifting Shape, Shaping Text*, Steven Heine spends some time discussing this aspect of Dōgen’s teachings, as does Douglas Mikkelson’s essay “Who is Arguing About the Cat? Moral Action and Enlightenment According to Dōgen.” Interestingly, both Heine and Mikkelson also discuss the importance of confession and repentance, and its relationship to ethics, in Dōgen’s thought. Another popular way to consider Dōgen’s ethics – found in Francis Cook’s essay “Dōgen’s View of Authentic Selfhood and its Socio-ethical Implications,” Christopher Ives’ *Zen Awakening and Society*, and David Loy’s “The Lack of Ethics and the Ethics of Lack in Buddhism” – is to argue that Zen practice and wisdom lead to a weakening or elimination of the individual’s selfish desire and hatred, resulting in compassionate behaviour.

I acknowledge, value, and sympathize with these ways of examining Dōgen’s ethics, but none of them explicitly address what I consider to be the primary ethical concern of Dōgen’s time, which was the heresy of what I will call “licensed evil.” The term “licensed evil” was coined by Dobbins in his

examination of the Buddhist Pure Land traditions of Hōnen (1133-1212) and Shinran (1173-1262) to “denote offensive or even malicious conduct stemming from the presumption that one is guaranteed birth in the Pure Land” (Dobbins 48). Dobbins explains that a number of disciples of Hōnen and especially Shinran engaged in behaviour contrary to traditional Buddhist morality by claiming that their “assurance of birth in the Pure Land” gave them “liberty to do whatever they please” (Dobbins 48).¹

Examining the Ch’an/Zen tradition, I see a parallel situation: certain people within the Ch’an/Zen tradition have interpreted the teaching that sentient beings are “originally enlightened” as a license to ignore Buddhist moral constraints. Indeed, just as Hōnen and Shinran faced people who disregarded moral practices because they considered themselves guaranteed of birth in the Pure Land, so too did Dōgen confront people who ignored moral practices because they considered themselves to be originally enlightened. During Dōgen’s life he studied and encountered people who described enlightenment as already present, original, sudden, and not requiring the elimination of the defilements (greed, hate, and delusion). Since the moral component of Buddhist practice has traditionally been appreciated as a way to gradually remove the defilements in order to lead the practitioner towards awakening understood as the end of defilements, to describe enlightenment as original, sudden and with defilements is to throw into question the importance of observing moral guidelines. Indeed, this idea of enlightenment led some to abandon traditional Buddhist moral constraints. “Licensed evil” is precisely this situation when the teachings of original enlightenment are interpreted to justify behavior contrary to conventional Buddhist morality. Thus, “licensed evil” is an “antinomian” interpretation of original enlightenment teachings: it asserts that because enlightenment is original, enlightenment does not depend upon moral practice or status. Thus, the proponent of licensed evil would respond to my ethical questions by saying, “You can do whatever you want because you are originally enlightened.”

¹ Dobbins notes, “The idea of licensed evil existed under a variety of names.... The most common expression used for it was *zōaku muge* (‘committing evil without obstruction’)” (Dobbins 48). For Shinran’s response see Dobbins and section 13 of the *Tannishō (Jōdō Shinshū Seiten 149-152)*.

This thesis looks at Dōgen’s response to licensed evil, and thereby to imagine his response to my ethical questions. It is, in some sense, an extended explanation of a passage found in the *Zuimonki* (a collection of student-teacher dialogues recorded by Dōgen’s disciple Ejō), which I will now briefly examine in order to introduce the basic outline of Dōgen’s response to licensed evil.

The *Zuimonki* recounts an instance when Ejō actually asked Dōgen about the problem of licensed evil:

If the followers of Buddhism are told that everyone has Buddha nature and should not search after the truth of Buddhism anywhere else they may rely upon these words, give up their past studying and training and lead a life of virtue and vice as they please. What do you think of this view? (Shoyu 63)

Masunaga’s translation of this question is slightly different, perhaps due in part to the fact that he is translating from a later version of the *Zuimonki*:

Supposing a student, hearing it taught that he himself is the Buddhadharma and that one must not seek it outside, should acquire great faith in these words, abandon the practice [and] study under a teacher that had occupied him until then, and spend his life, doing both good and bad in accordance with his own inclinations. What would you think of this? (Masunaga 43)

Ejō is asking Dōgen: If Buddha-nature / Buddhadharma / original enlightenment is already present, why is it necessary to engage in certain activities and refrain from following our own personal inclinations?

To this question of licensed evil, Dōgen responds by referring to his key teaching of the oneness of practice and realization, and the need for wholehearted practice without seeking:

This view fails to match the words with their meaning. To say, ‘Do not seek the Buddhadharma outside,’ and then to cast aside practice and study, implies that one is seeking by the very act of casting aside. This is not true to the fact that practice and study are both inherently the Buddhadharma. If, without seeking anything, you detach yourself from worldly affairs and evil actions, even though they may attract you; if, even though you may not feel like practice and study, you carry it out anyway; if you practice wholeheartedly with this attitude and still gain the good rewards – then the very fact that you have practiced seeking nothing for yourself accords with the principle of ‘not seeking the Buddhadharma on the outside.’

When Nan-yüeh made his remark about not trying to polish a tile to make a mirror, he was warning his disciple Ma-tsu against striving to

become a Buddha by practicing zazen. He was not trying to proscribe zazen itself. Zazen is the practice of the Buddha. Zazen is the ultimate practice. This is indeed the True Self. The Buddhadharma is not to be sought outside of this. (Masunaga 43-4)

To begin, note that in Dōgen’s response he does not reject original enlightenment teachings, but rather the antinomian interpretation. Whereas Ejō proposes an interpretation of original enlightenment teachings in such a way as to deny the need to engage in the disciplines of practice, for Dōgen the correct interpretation of these teachings affirms the need to engage in practice.

Dōgen’s response to licensed evil is first and foremost to say, “practice and study are themselves inherently the Buddhadharma.” With this phrase Dōgen is mentioning his central teaching that practice and enlightenment are one and the same (*shushō ittō*). For Dōgen, practice is necessary because practice is the activity of enlightenment, because there is no enlightenment outside practice. For Dōgen, “practice” is usually thought of overwhelmingly as “zazen” (seated meditation), and Dōgen’s school is often considered to be the sect of “just sitting” (*shikan-taza*). Indeed, in his response to Ejō, Dōgen states, “Zazen is the practice of the Buddha. Zazen is the ultimate practice. This is indeed the True Self. The Buddhadharma is not to be sought outside of this.” By saying that “Zazen is the practice of the Buddha” Dōgen is justifying the need to engage in zazen. However, Dōgen not only emphasized zazen-practice, but also the importance of monastic ritual. As a response to Ejō’s notion of “doing both good and bad in accordance with [personal] inclinations,” Dōgen advocates detachment from “worldly affairs” and engagement in “practice and study.” That is to say: Dōgen advocates the monastic life over and against a life lived according to personal inclination. For Dōgen, monastic life is considered to be realization itself, such that students cannot “lead a life of virtue and vice as they please.” Finally, for Dōgen, “practice and study” also involves detachment from “evil actions,” a shorthand for engagement in moral precept practice. Dōgen also considers precept-practice to be realization itself, meaning that students, once again, cannot live according to personal inclination.

Dōgen’s response to licensed evil also emphasizes the importance of non-seeking in the midst of wholehearted practice and study. He advocates detachment from “worldly affairs and evil actions, even though they may attract you” and carrying out “practice and study” even if we don’t want to. For Dōgen, zazen, monastic practice, and moral practice should be engaged in without seeking to satisfy our own inclinations. Moreover, he says there should be no seeking for “good rewards” – a point emphasized in Shoyu’s translation: “practice the austerities without any anticipation” (Shoyu 63). Okumura’s translation is even more direct: “Practice without even seeking after the completion of the Way or the attainment of the result” (Okumura 101). Thus, Dōgen mentions that zazen should be practiced without seeking to become a buddha: “When Nan-yüeh made his remark about not trying to polish a tile to make a mirror, he was warning his disciple Ma-tsu against striving to become a Buddha by practicing zazen.” For Dōgen, “practice and study” should occur in the context of complete non-seeking; this “seeking nothing for yourself ... accords with the principle of ‘not seeking the Buddhadharma on the outside.’” Moreover, in his response to Ejō’s question Dōgen also says that we should engage in practice and study “wholeheartedly.” Okumura’s translation emphasizes this point: “Just practice wholeheartedly” (Okumura 101). Although Dōgen does not mention the logic behind his emphasis on non-seeking and wholehearted practice, this thesis will demonstrate that it is precisely because practice is wholehearted non-seeking that it is the activity of enlightenment.²

In sum, Dōgen’s response to licensed evil does not deny original enlightenment teachings but says that we cannot live a life of virtue and vice as we please because original enlightenment is the wholehearted practice of non-seeking. Thus, Dōgen would respond to my questions “How should I

² The problem of licensed evil is also presented in Question Sixteen of *Bendōwa* (A Talk About Pursuing the Truth), but I find Dōgen’s response in *Bendōwa* to be not as helpful as his response in *Zuimonki*. Like the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil, *Bendōwa* does not deny original enlightenment teachings but rejects the antinomian interpretation, stating that the correct interpretation of original enlightenment thought affirms the need to practice. *Bendōwa* presents practice as “the way of zazen” and “the manners and standards for practice” (Okumura/Leighton 39) but does not mention precept-practice or the importance of wholehearted non-seeking. However, the *Bendōwa* response does have the merit of mentioning the importance of “truly giving up the view that discriminates between self and other” (Okumura/Leighton 37), which is not explicitly mentioned in the *Zuimonki* response, and which this thesis will discuss.

live my life? and why should I live that way?” by saying, “You should, without seeking, wholeheartedly do no evil, live a monastic life, and just sit because those are the practices of enlightenment.”

As mentioned, this thesis is, in some sense, an extended explanation of Dōgen’s response to Ejō’s question of licensed evil recorded in the *Zuimonki*. Chapter One provides a detailed exposition of the problem of licensed evil that Dōgen faced – the historical context and doctrinal logic of licensed evil – as well as demonstrating Dōgen’s continuity with original enlightenment thought. Chapter Two explains Dōgen’s basic response to licensed evil: his teaching of the oneness of practice and enlightenment (*shushō ittō*) and its relationship to wholehearted non-seeking. Chapter Three explores *shushō ittō* with reference to Dōgen’s central practice, zazen, in order to explain in greater detail the importance of non-seeking and effort in Dōgen’s thought. Chapter Four examines *shushō ittō* in relation to monastic practice and precept-practice, explaining that these practices are also the activities of enlightenment because they are activities of wholehearted non-seeking. Dōgen describes zazen, monastic-practice and precept-practice in the same way: all these various practices are considered necessary because they are themselves the activities of enlightenment.

Chapter One

The Problem of Licensed Evil

Introduction

This chapter explores Dōgen’s historical and doctrinal context, arguing that licensed evil was a major concern in Dōgen’s life, both as a student and as a teacher. I begin by arguing that licensed evil is intimately entwined with the network of teachings that constitute *hongaku shisō* (original enlightenment thought), which dominated the Tendai establishment at the time of Dōgen’s studies on Mt. Hiei. I then demonstrate that Dōgen continued to face the problem of licensed evil during his studies of Ch’an/Zen under Myōzen (1184-1225) in Japan and Ju-ching (1163-1228) in China. I also consider the fact that when he accepted disciples coming from the Daruma-shū Zen sect, of which Ejō was a member, Dōgen confronted an interpretation of original enlightenment Buddhist teachings. Finally, I end by considering those elements in Dōgen’s own teachings that parallel original enlightenment teachings, and which therefore seem to be open to an antinomian interpretation.

Tendai *Hongaku shisō*

When Dōgen was thirteen years old (1212) he became a Tendai monk on Mt. Hiei, where *hongaku shisō* (original enlightenment thought) would have dominated his study, since it was “the intellectual mainstream of medieval Japanese Tendai Buddhism” (Stone 3). *Hongaku shisō* has an extensive genealogy that includes *The Awakening of Faith* as well as the intellectualist Chinese traditions of Hua-yen and T’ien-t’ai before it flourished and developed within medieval Japanese Tendai (Stone 3-39). *Hongaku shisō* developed, in large part, out of the earlier Indian Buddhist notion “of the *tathāgata-garba* [often translated as ‘Buddha-nature’], the originally pure, enlightened mind intrinsic to all sentient beings” (Stone 5). While in India the notion of Buddha-nature was largely conceived as the potential for enlightenment, in China (and subsequently in Japan) it often came to be considered not as a potential but as already actual and accessible.

Thus, the crucial point of *hongaku shisō* is that “enlightenment or the ideal state [is conceived] as inherent from the outset and as accessible in the present, rather than as the fruit of a long process of cultivation” (Stone 3). This view “contrasted sharply with the views of the [earlier Japanese Buddhist] Nara schools, which emphasized gradualist models” (Stone 31). Within Tendai *hongaku shisō*, since “all beings are considered to be enlightened from the outset,” all that is necessary is to realize “one’s originally enlightened nature. Thus medieval Tendai texts would speak of ‘realizing Buddhahood in a single moment’ (*ichinen jōbutsu*)” (Stone 33). Enlightenment is not presented as the end result of considerable practice; rather, in *hongaku shisō*, everyone is originally enlightened such that awakening can occur in a single instant.

Within *hongaku shisō*, to awaken to one’s original enlightened nature is to awaken to the original enlightened nature of the entire phenomenal world. In this awakening there is a negation of not only “any ontological difference whatsoever between the ordinary person and the Buddha” but also between “the mundane world and the pure land, self and other, and so on. All conventional distinctions of the phenomenal world are thus collapsed in a breakthrough into an undifferentiated, nondual realm” (Stone 50). Subsequently, “based on this insight into absolute nonduality, one ‘returns,’ as it were, to the phenomenal world, affirming its relative distinctions, just as they are, as expressions of ultimate nondual reality or original enlightenment” (Stone 50). In this way, the phenomenal world is considered “the locus of truth” which is “expressed in the Tendai tradition by such terms as ‘the real is identical with the phenomena’ (*sokuji nishin*)” (Stone 29). Within Tendai *hongaku shisō* “the moment-to-moment arising and perishing of the phenomenal world is none other than the true aspect of original enlightenment” (Stone 30).

This affirmation of phenomena as manifestations of original enlightenment includes “not only the ‘existential’ aspects of that world, such as ‘birth’ and ‘death,’ or ‘self’ and ‘other,’ but also its delusive aspects, such as ignorance and the mental defilements” (Stone 51). Within Tendai *hongaku shisō*, ignorance and the defilements are affirmed as expressions of original enlightenment. “Thus the deluded ordinary worldling *qua* ordinary worldling

and the Buddha *qua* Buddha are both affirmed as manifestations of the nondual original enlightenment” (Stone 51).

This teaching that affirms ordinary deluded and defiled sentient beings as themselves aspects of true reality is also present within another important concept associated with *hongaku shisō*, that of *sokushin jōbutsu*, a phrase most often translated as ‘realizing Buddhahood with this very body’.³ The basic idea of *sokushin jōbutsu* is that this very human body, as it is, is itself the body of Buddha. “This means that all beings are in themselves, as they are, the embodiment of enlightenment. They are substantially the Buddha” (Kiyota 124). The identification between sentient being and Buddha is total, so there is no process of transformation of a sentient being into a Buddha (Kiyota 127). “This tenet [accepts] the immediate enlightenment of the psycho-physical existence with all its particularities... Mundane existence [is] sanctified” (Kim 2004, 23). Even evil karma is sanctified, as demonstrated by such statements as “evil karma is precisely liberation” (Stone 218). In these ways, the world and the self, inclusive of its particularities and problems, are affirmed as themselves the body of original enlightenment.

This affirmation of the particularities of the self within *hongaku shisō* constitutes a re-imagining of enlightenment. Unlike in earlier forms of Buddhism, enlightenment is no longer the elimination of the defilements. In *hongaku shisō*, “all forms of daily conduct, even one’s delusive thoughts are, without transformation, the expressions of original enlightenment. Liberation is reimagined, not as the eradication of mental defilements ..., but as the insight ... that one has been enlightened from the very beginning” (Stone 3). Thus, in awakening, neither the world nor ourselves are transcended, or even transformed; within *hongaku shisō* everything, as it is, is affirmed as already enlightened.

These teachings of *hongaku shisō* can be easily interpreted “as an absolute affirmation of the phenomenal world that in effect denied the necessity of Buddhist practice and legitimated evil conduct” (Stone 190).

³ While *sokushin jōbutsu* is a notion most often considered in relation to Shingon Buddhism, the founder of Tendai, Saichō, also used the term; in addition, by the time Dōgen arrived on Mt. Hiei, Tendai had incorporated much of Shingon.

Since Buddhist practice has traditionally included a strong moral component designed to gradually remove the defilements, by describing enlightenment as original and occurring in a single instant without eradicating the defilements, the importance of observing moral guidelines is unclear. Since all activities and delusions are considered, without transformation, to be enlightenment, antinomian behavior seems to be justified by *hongaku shisō*. If gambling, getting drunk, killing someone in a fight, and sleeping with a prostitute are enlightenment, why not engage in these activities? Indeed, there are historical documents indicating that some individuals did use *hongaku shisō* to justify their antinomian behavior (Stone 221). Even Stone, although much of her work can be read as an apology for medieval Tendai, does not deny that “original enlightenment thought can be morally ambiguous. On an individual level, it undoubtedly was misused to rationalize wrongdoing, at least upon occasion” (Stone 226). Thus, it is clear that the problem of licensed evil is closely associated with the teachings of *hongaku shisō*. Since Dōgen’s study of Tendai teachings on Mt. Hiei was during the time of the flourishing of *hongaku shisō*, he certainly became aware of the problem of licensed evil and its doctrinal roots.⁴

Ch’an/Zen: The Platform Sūtra and Beyond

When Dōgen left Mt. Hiei in 1217 he went to Onjō-ji, another Tendai temple, but stayed only very briefly before going to Kennin-ji, the temple founded by Eisai/Yōsai (1151-1215), who is credited as the founder of Rinzai Zen in Japan.⁵ At Kennin-ji, Dōgen became a disciple of Eisai’s successor Myōzen. However, although he left Mt. Hiei, Dōgen did not leave the problem of licensed evil: licensed evil is also present within Ch’an/Zen.

⁴ To be fair, it needs to be acknowledged that although *hongaku shisō* seems to deny the necessity of practice, there are also many passages within Tendai literature that affirm the necessity of practice within the conceptual framework of *hongaku shisō*. In this regard, Stone provides an extensive presentation of the Tendai argument for the necessity of practice (Stone 191-218). Stone also presents the Tendai response to licensed evil (Stone 218-221). Therefore, while Tendai thought can be interpreted as licensed evil, it has its own resources and responses to the problem. It is not the project of this thesis to analyze or critique the Tendai response to licensed evil. My focus is Dōgen.

⁵ According to Sōtō patriarch Menzan (1683-1769), Dōgen studied at Mt. Hiei for only three years (1212-1214); but Menzan’s history is probably marked by his attempt “to eliminate from his systematization of Sōtō doctrine all elements resonant of Tendai” (Stone 73). I have adopted the date of earlier sectarian histories, which state that Dōgen departed Mt. Hiei after five years (1212-1217), when he was eighteen (Stone 394).

Ch'an/Zen contains many teachings similar to those found in the Tendai tradition to be open to an antinomian interpretation. The history of Ch'an also abounds with antinomian monastic characters. Thus, Dōgen's studies at Kennin-ji would have made him well aware of the problem of licensed evil within the Ch'an/Zen tradition.

Much like the Tendai teaching of realizing inherent Buddhahood in a single moment, the Ch'an/Zen tradition presents realization as the 'sudden' awakening to the originally enlightened mind/nature. The *Platform Sūtra*, the central founding scripture of Ch'an/Zen, presents itself as the preaching of the sixth ancestor of Ch'an, Hui-neng (d. 713) who teaches "the Dharma of Sudden Enlightenment" (Yampolsky 133). It criticizes the gradualist approach and advocates sudden enlightenment: "The deluded recommend the gradual method; the enlightened practice the sudden teaching" (Yampolsky 137). In the *Platform Sūtra*, enlightenment is not presented as the result of gradual cultivation; rather, Hui-neng is recorded as saying: "At once, suddenly, you regain the original mind" (Yampolsky 141). The *Platform Sūtra* teaches that we are always already enlightened: "enlightenment (*bodhi*) and intuitive wisdom (*prajñā*) are from the outset possessed by men" (Yampolsky 135). As originally enlightened, or possessed of 'original mind,' enlightenment is described as awakening to 'original mind' or the synonymous 'original nature': "To understand the original mind of yourself is to see into your own original nature" (Yampolsky 137). Thus, the *Platform Sūtra* admonishes, "look into yourselves," "see into your own natures" and "grasp the original nature" (Yampolsky 128-130).⁶

Also much like Tendai *hongaku shisō*, enlightenment in Ch'an/Zen is described (especially in the Rinzai tradition that Dōgen studied at Kennin-ji) as insight into nonduality and a 'return' that re-affirms distinctions within nonduality. The Rinzai tradition is concerned with first awakening the

⁶ Another example of Ch'an 'original enlightenment' teachings can be found in the writings of Ch'an master Lin-chi (Jp. Rinzai) (d.866?), which Dōgen, as a student at that time in the Rinzai tradition, would most likely have studied at Kennin-ji. Lin-chi's commentary on the aphorism of Ch'an master Ma-tsu (709-788), "the ordinary mind is the Way," states to his disciples, "What are you looking for, worthies? These unsupported monks now in front of me, clear and distinct, listening to the Law, have never lacked anything" (Faure 1998, 46-7). Here, Lin-chi is pointing to the teaching of original enlightenment, telling his disciples that they are already enlightened, "clear and distinct," and "lacking nothing."

student to nonduality, the Fundamental, “the undifferentiated and the unconditional” (Hori 2003, 20). At this point, “subject and object are no longer separate and distinct” (Hori 2000, 289). But then it is necessary to “pry the monk out of the suffocating *satori* of the undifferentiated and the unconditioned, returning him to the everyday phenomenal world of self and things, of conventionality and discrimination” (Hori 2003, 21). For, “the Fundamental is not merely still and tranquil but also active and dynamic, not only empty and undifferentiated but also full of distinctions and differentiation” (Hori 2003, 21). Thus, much like in medieval Tendai, in Rinzai Zen the return to phenomenal distinctions is such that the conventional world is known as an expression of ultimate nondual reality.

In line with this affirmation of conventional reality as itself ultimate reality, Ch’an/Zen also contains specific teachings that re-describe enlightenment as compatible with the defilements. For example, in the *Platform Sūtra* Hui-neng states: “the very passions themselves are enlightenment (*bodhi*)... Do not depart from deceptions and errors; for they are themselves the nature of True Reality” (Yampolsky 148-9). As such, enlightenment does not require the eradication of various hindrances and defilements, but simply awakening to the ‘original nature’: “people of shallow capacity, if they hear the Sudden Doctrine, and ... place their trust ... in their own minds ... in regard to their own original natures; even these beings, filled with passions and troubles, will at once gain awakening” (Yampolsky 150). It is recorded by Tsung-mi (780-841) that some Ch’an monks were reading such passages and neglecting moral practice “on the authority of Hui-neng and the *Platform Sūtra*” (Faure 1998, 91).

This description of awakening as nondual with the passions and as not requiring the eradication of the passions is found not only in the *Platform Sutra* but also within other Ch’an/Zen texts and the lives of Ch’an adepts. For example, the *Liaoyuan ge* (Song of the Realization of the Origin), is recorded as stating, “Passions are awakening, the blue lotus grows in the mud and on manure” (Faure 1998, 47). The idea of the nonduality of passions and awakening has also been used throughout the history of Ch’an to justify the “Crazy Ch’an” antinomian figures (Faure 1998, 102-143). Some of these “Crazy Ch’an” masters are glorified in the classical Chinese biographies of

Buddhist monks. While “the vast majority of monks in the *Biographies* conform to an ascetic ideal” (Kieschnick 65), nevertheless, “one reads about Chinese monks who violate the monastic code with complete impunity: they drink, eat meat, play, fight, and use vulgar language” (Faure 1998, 101; see Kieschnick 51-66). The editors of the *Biographies* justify this antinomian behaviour by referring to the notion of “the fundamental nonduality of the phenomenal world” (Kieschnick 58). Thus, the attitude that denies the practice of eradicating the passions is present not only within medieval Tendai *hongaku shisō* but also within the Ch’an tradition.

The Ch’an/Zen tradition also contains teachings that deny the necessity of practice in general. In the *Platform Sūtra*, the very presentation of Hui-neng as an illiterate and uneducated seller of firewood who, without prior practice, was instantly awakened upon hearing a few sentences from the *Diamond Sūtra* (Yampolsky 125-7) seems to deny any correlation between practice and awakening. The question of the necessity of practice is directly addressed in the *Platform Sūtra* when Hui-neng and Chih-ch’eng discuss the traditional core of Buddhist practice: *silā*, *samādhi*, and *prajña* (precepts, meditation, and wisdom). In this discussion, Chih-ch’eng says “Not to commit evils is the precepts; to practice all the many good things is wisdom; to purify one’s own mind is meditation”⁷ (Yampolsky 164); but Hui-neng responds: “my view is different.... I don’t even set up precepts, meditation, and wisdom.... Self-awakening to self-nature, and sudden practice with sudden awakening – there is nothing gradual in them, so that nothing at all is set up” (Yampolsky 164-5). Here, the notion of sudden enlightenment is employed to deny the necessity of not only the practice of morality, but also the practice of meditation and wisdom.

In sum, not only medieval Tendai, but also the Ch’an/Zen tradition contains teachings and characters that are ‘morally ambiguous.’ The same question arises in Ch’an/Zen that arose in the context of Tendai *hongaku shisō*: If enlightenment is described as the sudden insight – irrespective of prior practice – into an ‘original mind’ that is not contrary to the delusions

⁷ Chi-ch’eng is alluding to the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas, attributed to Śākyamuni Buddha and preserved in the *Dhammapada* verse 183. In Chapter Four I will discuss Dōgen’s interpretation of this famous verse.

and passions, what is the use is engaging of moral discipline designed to eradicate the hindrances in a gradual approach to enlightenment? The problem of licensed evil remains in Ch'an/Zen; its teachings can be understood and used to legitimate antinomian behavior. Just as at Mt. Hiei, at Kennin-ji Dōgen would certainly have faced the problem of licensed evil.⁸

Ju-ching and Original Enlightenment Thought

Dōgen left Kennin-ji in 1223 to study in China. After visiting various teachers, he finally came to Ju-ching, with whom he studied Ch'an for two years, from 1225 to 1227. It is under Ju-ching that Dōgen is said to have “suddenly attained a Great Enlightenment” upon hearing Ju-ching describe practice as “dropping the body and mind” (*shinjin datsuraku*) (Kodera 61).

This period of Dōgen's life is recorded in his *Hōkyō-ki* (Record from the Pao-ch'ing Era), a text that reports some of his dialogues with Ju-ching, where Dōgen questions Ju-ching on various practical and doctrinal issues and receives responses. The theme of this text is “the centrality of ‘single minded intense sitting’ (*chih-kuan ta-tso*; Ja. *shikan taza*) in one's pursuit of enlightenment” as well as “the necessary elements of the meditation hall, and monastic rules and precepts to be observed” (Kodera 58). Thus, Ju-ching's teachings seem to have been eminently practical.

For the purposes of this thesis, the most important aspect of the *Hōkyō-ki* is that it reveals that Dōgen was considering the problem of licensed evil, and it also provides Ju-ching's response to licensed evil. In one passage, Dōgen questions Ju-ching's understanding that enlightenment is removing oneself from the desires and defilements, presenting that teaching as a lesser Hīnayāna teaching; and Ju-ching reaffirms the necessity to eradicate the hindrances, telling Dōgen not to reject the Hīnayāna:

Ju-ching said: ‘To study meditation under a master is to drop the body and mind; it is the singleminded intense sitting.... When practicing singleminded intense sitting, the five desires will depart and the five defilements will be removed.’

⁸ To be fair once again, before moving on it is necessary to mention that just as in Tendai *hongaku shisō*, the Ch'an/Zen tradition also contains teachings that assert the necessity of practice – including moral practice – within the model of original enlightenment thought (see, for example, Yampolski 135, 143-6, 154, 160-1). The purpose of this thesis is not to examine or critique the *Platform Sutra*'s or other Ch'an teachings that may serve as responses to licensed evil. Again, my focus is on Dōgen.

Dōgen asked: ‘If we depart from the five desires and remove the five defilements, [this teaching] would be the same as the discussion of the [non-Ch’an] scripturalists. Are we not then the practitioners of both Mahāyāna and Hināyana?’

Ju-ching replied: ‘The descendants of First Patriarch should not reject vehemently the teachings of Mahāyāna or Hināyana. If you turn away from the sacred teachings of *tathāgataes* [sic] as a student, how can you call yourself a descendant of the buddhas and patriarchs?’

(Kodera 124-5)

The dialogue continues as Dōgen presents the view that ‘The very passions themselves are awakening’ and Ju-ching again affirms the necessity to remove the passions:

[Dōgen] said: ‘The skeptics of today say that the three poisons are the Buddha Dharma, and that the five desires are the Way of the patriarchs....’

Ju-ching replied: ‘Unless you eliminate the three poisons and the five desires, you are identical to the heretics in the country of Bimbisāra and Ajātaśatru.⁹ If the descendants of the buddhas and patriarchs eliminate even a single defilement or desire, they will benefit greatly; this is the moment of direct encounter with the buddhas and patriarchs.’ (Kodera 125)

These passages clearly reveal Dōgen had studied the Tendai and Ch’an/Zen original enlightenment teachings that deny the necessity of removing the defilements, desires, or poisons. It also reveals that Ju-ching rejected those teachings and affirmed that defilements, desires, or poisons must be eradicated.

Indeed, Ju-ching is presented in the *Hōkyō-ki* as a teacher who thoroughly rejects original enlightenment thought. At one point Dōgen presented the idea that “all sentient beings, from the beginningless beginning, are the *tathāgatas*” to which Ju-ching replied,

Saying that sentient beings are originally buddhas is the same as believing the heterodoxy of spontaneous origination. We cannot condone those who compare “I” and “mine” with the buddhas and who take the unattained as the attained and the unexperienced as the experienced. (Kodera 119)¹⁰

⁹ At the time of Śākyamuni Buddha, Bimbisāra was a king who was suspected of trying to kill his son Ajātaśatru. When the plot was discovered, Ajātaśatru imprisoned and killed his father Bimbisāra (Kodera 181)

¹⁰ By calling the teaching of original enlightenment “the heterodoxy of spontaneous origination” (a teaching that rejects the fundamental Buddhist teaching of *pratītya samutpāda* [dependent origination] [Kodera 173]), Ju-ching is considering original enlightenment thought to be a substantialist heresy, positing ‘original enlightenment’ as an

I do not wish to address the value of this criticism; I simply wish to point out that this passage clearly demonstrates that Dōgen was familiar with original enlightenment thought that relativises the distinction between sentient beings and Buddhas, and that Ju-ching rejected it by affirming a strict duality between sentient beings and Buddhas. As Stone states, “the moral ambiguity of medieval Tendai texts should be seen not as a problem unique to nondual *hongaku* doctrine, but as embedded in larger intellectual concerns of the age” (Stone 227). In the *Hōkyō-ki*, Dōgen voiced these concerns and Ju-ching gave his unequivocal answer.

Daruma-shū: Antinomian Zen

Having received Dharma-transmission from Ju-ching, in 1227 Dōgen returned to Kennin-ji in Japan and began teaching. By 1230 he was sufficiently popular to warrant moving to the abandoned Anyō-in temple, and by 1233 he had outgrown An’yōin and he moved again to Kannon-dōri-in temple, which was later renamed Kōshō-hōrin-ji. Here, Dōgen gained many key disciples coming from important positions from within the Daruma-shū Zen sect, the first independent Zen sect in Japan. By Dōgen’s time the Daruma-shū had “achieved wide popularity” despite being repeatedly charged with antinomianism and banned by the court (Stone 79). When Dōgen encountered members of the Daruma-shū, he came face-to-face with an antinomian interpretation of Buddhist teachings.

The Daruma-shū was founded by Dainichi Nōnin (12th century).

According to a biographical notice in *Honchō Kōsōden*,

While young, he attended lecture sessions where he studied the sūtras and śāstras. By nature he was attracted to Zen and, polishing his talents, he meditated deeply, eventually attaining enlightenment. He founded Sambōji in Settsu, where he spread Zen widely. Monks and laymen of the Kinki regions flocked to him. He was attacked, however, because he had not studied under a teacher. (Faure 1987, 27)

essence inherent in everyone regardless of attainment or experience. This criticism of original enlightenment thought is shared by many contemporary scholars, especially within Critical Buddhism (see Hubbard/Swanson). In Dōgen’s own writings this heresy is addressed under the names ‘Senika heresy’ and ‘naturalist heresy’ (see especially “Busshō” [Buddha-nature] and “Soku Shin Ze Butsu” [Mind is itself Buddha]).

Seeking to legitimate his position, in 1189 Nōnin sent two disciples to China with gifts and a poem expressing his understanding, and was granted Dharma-transmission by Te-kuang, a disciple of Ta-hui in the Lin-chi/Rinzai Zen sect. “This is a form of Dharma transmission known as ‘conferring from afar’ (*yōfu*)” (Stone 79). Apparently this did not satisfy his critics: his legitimacy as heir to the Ch’an tradition was still questioned, and the Daruma-shū was also attacked on the grounds of “its denial of the necessity of keeping the precepts and the antinomian character of its doctrine” (Stone 79). The criticisms proved effective, and the sect was banned by the court in 1194. Nōnin died shortly thereafter.

Nōnin’s death did not mark the end of the Daruma-shū. “Nōnin’s Zen was kept alive outside the capital by his disciple Kakuan (d.u.),” who subsequently became the teacher of both Ejō (1198-1280) and Ekan (d.1251?) (Bielefeldt 1985, 45). But, Ejō met Dōgen in 1229 and joined his community in 1234, and then in 1241 Ekan joined Dōgen, along with his disciples Gikai (1219-1309), Giin (1217-1300), Gien (d.1314), among others. “These men were to become the nucleus of Dōgen’s new community,” and they were to be heirs in his lineage (Bielefeldt 1985, 45). The extent of the Daruma-shū influence on Dōgen’s life and teachings is not known. It has been argued that Dōgen’s move to Eihei-ji in Echizen in 1243 was “due in part to the fact that Daruma-shū had a strong following in that province” (Faure 1987, 30). Around the same time, Dōgen also began to frequently praise Ju-ching and to severely criticize the Lin-chi/Rinzai sect; but Dōgen’s criticism is selective; “it is only the Ta-hui faction that comes under attack; and of Ta-hui’s many disciples it is only Nōnin’s master, Te-kuang, that is explicitly singled out” (Bielefeldt 1985, 45). Thus, it is quite possible that Dōgen was trying to convince his new disciples to abandon their old allegiance and adopt a new lineage. However, the conversion to Dōgen’s Zen was not total: “Some of these converts never gave up their former allegiance to the Daruma-shū and inherited jointly both lineages” (Faure 1987, 26).¹¹

¹¹ It is also worth noting that, although “Japanese scholars usually consider the conversion of Nōnin’s disciples to Dōgen marked the end of the Daruma-shū,” the Daruma-shū actually “continued to exist independently at least until the final destruction of Sambōji during the Ōnin war, 1467-1477” (Faure 1987, 31).

As for the teachings of the Daruma-shū, they emphasized the original enlightenment notion of ‘seeing into one’s nature and becoming a Buddha’ (*kenshō jōbutsu*) and focused upon early Ch’an texts in which “discipline and practice retreat into the background” (Dumoulin 10). They relied upon texts which were, according to Faure, involved in “an attempt at reinterpreting the traditional Buddhist discipline and morality in a purely spiritual sense” (Faure 1987, 31). For example, it is thought that Nōnin studied and transmitted the *Ta-mo lun* (Treatise of Bodhidharma), which “stresses the uselessness of eliminating the passions that are fundamentally empty” (Faure 1987, 34, 44). This text purports to record a dialogue between Bodhidharma’s disciple Hui-k’o and another disciple,

Disciple: ‘Tell me how to cut off my passions.’

[Hui-k’o]: ‘Where are they, that you want to cut them off?’

Disciple: ‘I don’t know.’

[Hui-k’o]: ‘If you don’t know, it is because they are like space. What idea of space do you have, to speak of cutting it off?’

Disciple: ‘Is it not said in a sutra: cut all evil, cultivate all good, and you will become a Buddha?’¹²

[Hui-k’o]: ‘Those are false notions objectified by your mind.’

(Faure 1998, 90)

Hui-k’o also makes an appearance in the Daruma-shū text *Hōmon Taikō* (The Great Net of the Dharma Gate) where he is credited with asserting that the passions are not a hindrance to the manifestation of original enlightenment: “There are no practices [to follow], no cultivation [to engage in]. From the outset there are no mental defilements; from the beginning we are enlightened” (Heine 2006, 17). This statement is said to be the response given by Hui-k’o that Bodhidharma confirmed as the ‘marrow’ of his teaching, and for which Hui-k’o was chosen as the second patriarch (Faure 1987, 44). For Nōnin there is no practice and cultivation because enlightenment is already present: “There is nothing to gain and nothing to lose. With this the buddhas cannot gain *bodhi* nor can sentient beings lose it” (Faure 1987, 34). Thus, Nōnin’s Zen emphasized original enlightenment, deemphasized moral practice, and threw into question the necessity of eradicating the passions.

Perhaps the most important Daruma-shū text is the *Jōko shōgakuron* (Treatise on the Attainment of the Bodhisattva Awakening), which contains a

¹² Here is another reference to the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas.

section entitled *Jishin sokubutsu*, a phrase most often translated as ‘Mind is itself Buddha’ – “a formula used in the T’ang period to express the doctrine of the unity of all things. Through the identification of the self with the Buddha, all of reality is acknowledged as Buddha reality” (Dumoulin 11). Basing itself on this traditional dictum, *Jōko shōgakuron* “stresses repeatedly the identity between mind and Buddha, and between sentient beings and Buddha” (Faure 1987, 32). The maxim is presented as supporting a *hongaku* theory (Faure 1987, 32): it is associated with the notions “that there is in the beginning no darkening of the mind and that all living beings are originally enlightened” (Dumoulin 9). According to Dumoulin, the phrase *jishin sokubutsu* is given “a free interpretation injurious to the precepts and practice of Zen” (Dumoulin 70). Thus, Bodiford states that for the Daruma-shū, “If one believes in this inherent Buddha mind, then one is not only freed from all sin without having to observe the Buddhist precepts but also delivered from all torments to a life of continual pleasure. Observance of the precepts, Ch’an-style meditation, and formal rituals were all disparaged” (Bodiford 1993, 12).

On this point of affirming all reality as Buddha-reality in such a way as to deny the importance of moral practice, it is also worth mentioning an incident that happened towards the end of Dōgen’s life. In 1248 Dōgen expelled the Daruma-shū monk Genmyō (d.u.) (and his cohorts) from Eihei-ji. “According to the standard story, Dōgen went so far as to cut Genmyō’s seat out of the meditation platform in the monks’ hall to eliminate his contamination. No one had ever before seen Dōgen so enraged” (Bodiford 1993, 34). The exact nature of the offence is not known, but a dialogue between Ejō and Gikai one year after Dōgen’s death points to the probable context of the expulsion:

Gikai: My Dharma comrades of past years would say: ‘The Buddhist [expression], ‘All Evil Refrain From Doing, All Good Reverently Perform’ (*shoaku makusa shūzen bugyō*)¹³ actually means that within [true] Buddhism all evil ultimately has been refrained and all activities are Buddhism.... Therefore merely lifting an arm or moving a leg – whatever one does, whatever phenomena one produces – all embody [true] Buddhism.’ ...

¹³ Again, here is another reference to the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas.

Ejō: In our master's [i.e. Dōgen's] community there were some who spread such heterodox views. That is why he cut off all contact with them while he was still alive. Clearly the reason he expelled them was because they held these false doctrines. (Bodiford 1993, 34)

Thus, in the Daruma-shū, or at least among some adherents to the Daruma-shū, all acts are understood as expressions of original enlightenment, such that there is no need to do anything special like refraining from evil or doing good in order to attain enlightenment.

In sum, the Daruma-shū interpretation of original enlightenment teachings questioned the necessity of eradicating the passions, which led to a deemphasis on moral practice. The phrase *jishin sokubutsu* was used to affirm the world and self, as they are, as originally enlightened, and (at least sometimes) interpreted so as to render moral practice unnecessary. Thus, when Dōgen accepted disciples coming from the Daruma-shū, he came face-to-face with licensed evil.¹⁴

Dōgen's Continuity With Original Enlightenment Thought

Before presenting Dōgen's response to licensed evil (besides expelling antinomian monks), I wish to demonstrate that Dōgen's own teachings are similar to the original enlightenment thought found in Tendai and Ch'an, and are therefore open to an antinomian interpretation. It is perhaps surprising that Dōgen claimed to be transmitting Ju-ching's Ch'an: while Ju-ching rejected original enlightenment thought that could potentially be interpreted as licensed evil, Dōgen adopts much of it. Dōgen's teachings are very much in harmony with 'original enlightenment thought,' a phrase by which I now mean not only medieval Tendai *hongaku shisō* but also the stream of original enlightenment thought in the Ch'an tradition stemming from the *Platform Sūtra* and manifest in Daruma-shū. Without claiming that Dōgen adopted earlier original enlightenment thought uncritically, or that he

¹⁴ Again to be fair, it needs to be said that Nōnin's Zen was not completely without practice. They did engage in esoteric rites to "procure merit which in turn [would] bring worldly gain and ward off bad fortune" (Dumoulin 11). Dumoulin also notes that Nōnin did teach the Tendai form of Zen meditation (Dumoulin 12). Thus, Nōnin's de-emphasis upon practice did not mean a total rejection of practice. Moreover, according to Faure, "the followers of Nōnin do not seem to have led a dissolute life" (Faure 1987, 45). Nevertheless, Nōnin did not preach the need for moral practice, and nor did he transmit the precepts. A thorough understanding and comprehensive presentation of the Daruma-shū has yet to be accomplished in the English language.

added nothing of his own insight and thinking into his teachings, it is necessary to acknowledge an undeniable resemblance between aspects of Dōgen's thought and 'original enlightenment thought'. I will now demonstrate that Dōgen does teach that enlightenment is 'original', that the phenomenal world is no different from true reality, that awakening entails the insight into nonduality without the eradication of duality, and that the delusive passions are not unconditionally eliminated with enlightenment.

Dōgen's teachings harmonize with the original enlightenment notion that enlightenment is always already present. In *Bendōwa* (A Talk about Pursuing the Truth), Dōgen repeatedly refers to "original enlightenment" and he states: "This Dharma is abundantly present in (*sonawaru*) each human being" and that "livings beings are eternally functioning in this state" (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 2). He goes on to say, "we should remember that from the beginning we have never lacked the supreme state of bodhi" (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 10). Thus, it can be said that for Dōgen, enlightenment is, at least in some sense, 'original'.

Dōgen is also engaged in affirming the phenomenal world as ultimate reality. In "Busshō" (Buddha-nature) Dōgen asserts that everything and everyone is always already the ultimate reality of Buddha-nature. As in original enlightenment thought, for Dōgen Buddha-nature is not a potential that may one day become actual; rather Buddha-nature is already actual. Buddha-nature is not a seed that will one day sprout, branch, leaf, flower, and reach fruition; rather, "seed and flower and fruit" and "roots, stem, branches, twigs, and leaves are each equally the Buddha-nature" (Waddell/Abe 65). Everything is Buddha-nature: "*entire being* is the Buddha-nature" (Waddell/Abe 61); and everyone is Buddha-nature: "sentient beings are, as such, the *entire being* of the Buddha-nature" (Waddell/Abe 61). Thus, Dōgen states, "mountains, rivers, and the great earth are all the Buddha-nature Seeing mountains and rivers is seeing the Buddha-nature" (Waddell/Abe 67). Echoing Tendai, Ch'an, and Daruma-shū teachings, Dōgen is also involved in identifying ultimate reality with the conventional world.

Since everything and everyone is Buddha-nature, this conventional-ultimate reality is nondual. As Kim states, "The nondual oneness of all existence, sentient beings, and Buddha-nature is complete" (Kim 2004, 130).

In “Busshō” Dōgen states, “The entire world is completely free of all objective dust; right here and now there is no second person” (Waddell/Abe 62). Poetically commenting on this seamless reality, in “Ikka-no-myōju” (One Bright Pearl) Dōgen approves the teaching of Ch’an master Hsüan-sha Shih-pei (835-907): “the whole Universe in the ten directions is one bright pearl” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 40). For Dōgen, reality is nondual – it is ‘not two’.

However, although reality is ‘not two’ it is also ‘not one’. Again from “Busshō,” “*Entire being* is not an infinite number of miscellaneous fragments, nor is it like a single, undifferentiated steel rod” (Waddell/Abe 64). Dōgen’s notion of differentiation comes to the forefront in his discussion of *hōi* (Dharma-position).¹⁵ For Dōgen, reality is differentiated because dharmas (phenomena) are each in their own unique *hōi*. Using the example of firewood and ash, in *Genjōkōan* (Manifesting Absolute Reality) Dōgen writes, “firewood abides in its own Dharma-position,” and is “cut off” from ash, which also “resides in its own Dharma-position” (Kim 2004, 154); they are “independent” (Waddell/Abe 42). Commenting on this passage, Kim states that all dharmas “have their own Dharma-positions that are absolutely discrete and discontinuous” (Kim 2004, 155). In their Dharma-positions, every dharma is completely differentiated. Thus, for Dōgen, all dharmas are dual yet nondual, nondual yet dual – not two, not one. As he states in “Zenki” (Total Dynamism): “Though not identical, they are not different; though not different, they are not one; though not one, they are not many” (Kim 2004, 173).

Given that dharmas are neither identical nor different, enlightenment for Dōgen is not a dissolution into an all-consuming oneness, devoid of differentiation. In *Genjōkōan* Dōgen summarizes the path:

- [1] When all dharmas are the Buddha-dharma, there are delusion and enlightenment, practice, birth, death, buddhas, and sentient beings.
- [2] When the myriad dharmas all are without self, there is no delusion, no realization, no buddhas, no sentient beings, no birth, no death.
- [3] Since originally the Buddha way goes beyond abundance and scarcity, there are birth and death, delusion and enlightenment, sentient beings and buddhas. (Jaffe 101)

¹⁵ Dōgen seems to have borrowed the notion of Dharma-position from Tendai (Stone 201).

The first sentence expresses “the realm of provisional duality encompassing the concrete ups and downs of religious aspiration” (Heine 1981, 44). This is why the sentence mentions practice, and dichotomizes its terms: ‘delusion and enlightenment, practice, birth and death, Buddhas and sentient beings.’ The second sentence expresses the truth of emptiness, non-differentiation, or nonduality, which is “underlying the provisionally bifurcated dimensions, [and] which recognizes the relativity and non-substantiality of interdependent and contingent polarities” (Heine 1981, 45). As empty, there is ‘no delusion, no realization, no buddhas, no sentient beings, no birth, no death.’ The third sentence expresses the “paradoxical identity-in-difference,” or difference-in-identity, which is “both provisional and empty, and therefore neither provisional nor empty” (Heine 1981, 45). Because of this reaffirmation of difference within non-difference, Dōgen reaffirms ‘birth and death, delusion and enlightenment, sentient beings and buddhas.’ As in Tendai and Rinzai, in Dōgen’s great awakening, differentiation remains.

Since differentiation remains in enlightenment, “The dualistic world remains real, not dissolved” (Kim 2004, 64). Because dualities remain in enlightenment, Kim says that it is best to say that dualities are ‘realized’ in enlightenment:

The crucially important point to note is that in Dōgen, opposites or dualities were not obliterated or even blurred; they were not so much transcended as they were realized.... That is to say, nonduality did not primarily signify the transcendence of duality so much as it signified the realization of duality. (Kim 2004, 55, 105)

This ‘realization of duality’ is the realization that dualities are empty, that dualities do not inherently exist, and that therefore they are not in permanent opposition or fundamentally separate. Because birth and death, delusion and enlightenment, Buddhas and sentient beings are empty they are not mutually exclusive, and can therefore be said to be ‘not two, not one’.

In line with this presentation of enlightenment as inclusive of differentiation and dualities, Dōgen does not describe enlightenment as the end of delusion. In “Daigo” (Great Awakening) Dōgen writes, “Great awakening is not nondelusion” (Cook 1989, 120); or, translated differently, “You should not construe nondelusion as great enlightenment” (Kim 2007, 3). As Dōgen explains, ‘Great awakening is not nondelusion’ because “a

greatly enlightened person is nevertheless deluded” (Kim 2007, 2). The greatly enlightened is nevertheless deluded because the delusion of duality is not dissolved. And, in *Genjōkōan* Dōgen writes, “Those who have great realization about delusion are buddhas” (Jaffe 100). Commenting on this phrase, Yasutani Hakuun writes, “just because one becomes enlightened, that doesn’t mean anything changes. It’s the same as it’s always been” (Jaffe 25). Buddhas greatly realize dualities. In great awakening, delusion remains, one is simply enlightened, realizing the emptiness of delusion and enlightenment.

Similarly, although there is nothing in Dōgen as unequivocal as the phrase “the very passions themselves are enlightenment” in the *Platform Sūtra*, or the notion of *sokushin jōbutsu* in Tendai, Dōgen is nevertheless also involved in presenting an enlightenment that is not the end of the passions. In *Genjōkōan*, immediately after describing the realization of the path (as quoted above), Dōgen writes: “Yet, though it is like this, simply, flowers fall amid our longing and weeds spring up amid our antipathy” (Jaffe 101). This sentence displays not only attachment to the impermanent, but also the presence of passions in awakening. Since ‘weeds’ are a common metaphor for the delusive passions, the image of the weeds that continue to spring up refers to the recurring presence of the passions even within the greatly awakened (Heine 1981). Dōgen’s *Eihei Kōroku* (Extensive Record) also contains a passage where he teaches his disciples about “taking our weeds and sitting at the site of awakening,” implying “that we awaken in the context of our karmic consciousness” (Leighton/Okumura 2004, 407). As a final example, in one of his poems, Dōgen makes it clear that sadness, the result of attachment to this transient world, is not eliminated by enlightenment:

The unspoiled colors of a late summer night,
The wind howling through the lofty pines –
The feel of the autumn approaching;
The swaying bamboos keep resonating,
And the shedding of tears of dew at dawn;
Only those who exert themselves fully
Will attain the Way,
But even if you abandon all for the ancient path of meditation,
You can never forget the meaning of sadness.
(Heine 1997, 133-4)

From all this, it is clear that Dōgen did not consider enlightenment to be the simple eradication of emotion and the passions; rather, because it is the emptiness of delusion that is realized in great awakening, it is also the emptiness of emotion and the passions that is realized in great awakening. In great awakening the delusive passions are lived in emptiness, but that does not mean that they are eradicated.

Conclusion

Having briefly examined the basics of Dōgen's thought, it is apparent that Dōgen's teachings share many important aspects with original enlightenment teachings found in Tendai, Ch'an, and Daruma-shū. Since these earlier teachings have been found to be potentially antinomian, Dōgen's teachings seem to open the possibility of licensed evil. But, as his response to licensed evil in *Zuimonki* indicates, and as the remainder of this thesis will investigate, in spite of all the similarities with teachings that could be interpreted in an antinomian fashion, Dōgen's teachings do not amount to licensed evil.

Chapter Two

Practice and Enlightenment in Dōgen

Introduction

According to traditional Sōtō hagiography (as found in *Sansogyōgōki* and *Kenzeiki*), Dōgen experienced a ‘great doubt’ at Mt. Hiei as he sought to understand why practice is necessary if enlightenment is original:

Both exoteric and esoteric Buddhism teach the primal Buddha-nature and the original self-awakening of all sentient beings. If this is the case, why then in the Buddhas of all ages did the longing for awakening arise and they engage in ascetic practice? (Abe 1985b, 99)

Asking this question of senior teachers at Mt. Hiei, it is said that Dōgen could find none who could answer or explain it, and so he left and began to study Zen, first under Myōzen, and then in China. Traditional biographies relate that it is only in the moment of *shinjin datsuraku* (body-mind cast-off) as a disciple of Ju-ching that Dōgen resolved this ‘great doubt’ (Stone 72-3; Kim 2004, 22, 37; Abe 1985b, 99; Kodera 23-68).

Dōgen’s solution to his ‘great doubt’ is said to be contained in his teaching of the unity of practice and enlightenment (*shushō ittō*), also called the oneness of “original realization and wondrous practice” (*honshō myōshu*) – a notion which many Sōtō scholars have considered to be Dōgen’s central teaching (Stone 74-5).¹⁶ As these scholars have pointed out, “Dōgen held that because practice and enlightenment are inseparable, there can be no enlightenment apart from practice” (Stone 74). For Dōgen, it is not that ‘original enlightenment makes practice unnecessary’ but rather that ‘original enlightenment makes practice necessary’ because original enlightenment and practice are identical.

As modern scholars have repeatedly demonstrated, there are many reasons to doubt the historical truth of the traditional Sōtō hagiography of Dōgen’s life, including the notion that Dōgen experienced a ‘great doubt’ that

¹⁶ It is beyond the scope of this thesis to consider how Dōgen’s teaching of the unity of practice and realization relates to apparently similar teachings found in Tendai (Stone 216) and Ch’an/Zen (Yampolski 135).

prompted him to leave Mt. Hiei (Stone 73). However, the traditional account does serve to highlight the way in which Dōgen’s teaching of *shushō ittō* serves as a response to licensed evil. The ‘great doubt’ is normally thought of as questioning the need to engage in meditation practice, and so his teaching of *shushō ittō* is thought of as a solution justifying the need to engage in meditation. But I wish to emphasize the way in which the ‘great doubt’ is also a moral problem because it also throws into question the necessity of engaging in more obviously moral practices: If enlightenment is original, possessed by everyone, why do we need to engage in a moral discipline?¹⁷ By looking at the ‘great doubt’ in this way, the teaching of *shushō ittō* can then be understood as a response to the problem of licensed evil. Whether Dōgen experienced it or not, the question posed in the ‘great doubt’ is the question of licensed evil, and the teaching of *shushō ittō* is a response to licensed evil.

When Ejō asked Dōgen the question of licensed evil in the *Zuimonki* Dōgen responded by referring to his teaching of the oneness of practice and enlightenment, and by describing practice as wholehearted non-seeking. This chapter elucidates Dōgen’s teaching of *shushō ittō* in order to explain that it serves as a response to licensed evil because for Dōgen the oneness of practice and enlightenment means that there is no enlightenment outside of practice, thereby justifying the need to engage in moral practice. I begin by arguing that Dōgen presents enlightenment as *jijuyū zanmai* and *shinjin datsuraku*, the embodied realization of nonduality, emptiness, and dependent origination. With this background I then argue that for Dōgen practice is enlightenment because practice is *shinjin datsuraku*, which is itself wholehearted effort without seeking. I end this chapter by arguing that enlightenment is ‘original’ in Dōgen’s thought because practice is ‘original’: Dōgen’s adoption of the language of original enlightenment is mediated through an understanding of the oneness of practice and enlightenment, thereby necessitating our own personal practice to realize original enlightenment.

¹⁷ Kim also recognizes Dōgen’s ‘great doubt’ as, in part, a moral question (Kim 2004, 22-3).

Jijuyū Zanmai

Bendōwa is Dōgen's first major piece of writing in Japanese, written in 1231 at Anyo-in temple. It begins with these words:

All buddha tathāgatas, who directly transmit inconceivable dharma and actualize supreme, perfect enlightenment, have a wondrous way, unsurpassed and unconditioned. (Tanahashi 1985, 143)

This wondrous dharma, which has been transmitted only from buddha to buddha without deviation, has as its criterion *jijuyū zanmai*. (Okumura/Leighton 19)

Jijuyū zanmai (自受用三昧) is commonly translated as the “samadhi of self-fulfilling activity” (Kim 2004, 55), or the “samadhi of self-fulfillment” or “self-enjoyment” (Okumura/Leighton 43). This translation accords with the way *jijuyū zanmai* has historically been used in Buddhism, where it is contrasted with *tajuyū zanmai*, the “samadhi of other-fulfilling activity” (Kim 2004, 55). In this historical context, *jijuyū zanmai* refers to that samadhi in which the self (*ji*) experiences the joy of awakening “without relating itself to other sentient beings” (Kim 2004, 55). *Tajuyū zanmai*, on the other hand, “refers to the activity of aiding others (*ta*) to attain awakening so that they too can experience the joy of awakening” (Waddell/Abe 8).

The understanding of *jijuyū zanmai* as a samadhi in which the self does not relate to others seems appropriate because Dōgen describes *jijuyū zanmai* as a nondual samadhi: “it enacts the oneness of reality on the path of liberation” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 2). This oneness is described as ‘self-fulfilling’ because in *jijuyū zanmai* all things are the self. The ‘self’ in question here is not an individual particular ‘self’ that can be contrasted with an ‘other’ – it is the universe experienced as the self. In “Yuibutsu Yobutsu” (Buddhas, Together With Buddhas) Dōgen says, “What the Buddha means by the self is precisely the entire universe (*jindaichi*)” (Cook 1985, 139). For Dōgen, in *jijuyū zanmai* the self is ‘precisely the entire universe’. Thus, the contemporary commentator Uchiyama states that in *jijuyū zanmai*, “no matter where we look we see nothing but our self” (Okumura/Leighton 78), and Kim describes this samadhi as “a total freedom of self-realization without any dualism or antithesis” (Kim 2004, 55). *Jijuyū zanmai* is a nondual samadhi because there is no dualism between self and other: the whole world is the self; the self is the whole world.

And yet Dōgen also states that *jijuyū zanmai* “is not within the boundary of one or many” (Okumura/Leighton 19). Dōgen is known for his inventive readings of Chinese characters, which often highlight “multiple meanings and functions ... by meticulously exploring the possible significations of a given character” in a way that often “goes beyond the narrow confines of traditional diction and usage” (Kim 2007, 68).¹⁸ This, I believe, is how Dōgen deals with *jijuyū zanmai*. Whereas ‘traditional diction and usage’ would limit *jijuyū zanmai* to the purely nondual ‘samadhi of self-fulfillment,’ Dōgen is concerned with an inventive reading, which understands this samadhi as ‘not within the boundary of one or many.’ A literal translation of *jijuyū zanmai* is the “samadhi of self (*ji*, 自) receiving or accepting (*ju*, 受) its function (*yū*, 用)” (Okumura/Leighton 43), or the “samadhi of receiving (*ju*) and using (*yū*) the self (*ji*)” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 1). This translation accords with Dōgen’s *Genjōkōan*, which describes enlightenment as “The myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self” (Jaffe 102). These phrases indicate the presence of a particular, differentiated self, and hence of duality within enlightenment. At the same time, since the particular self in *jijuyū zanmai* is a self receiving itself from the world, the self is not separate, independent, and dualistically opposed to the other. Rather, as the myriad dharmas advance and confirm the self, the self is arising dependent upon the other, and it is therefore together with the other, or in a nondual relation with the other. In *jijuyū zanmai* the self realizes its own dependent nature – a ‘self’ not as an isolated subject, but as a dharma within the nondual network of co-dependent origination (*pratītya-samutpāda*), a teaching which explains the dependent arising of all dharmas. In sum, and in harmony with Dōgen’s descriptions of enlightenment discussed in the previous chapter, *jijuyū zanmai* is not simply awakening to nonduality without differentiation, difference or otherness; in *jijuyū zanmai* the differentiated and dualistic self and other are in a nondual relationship. *Jijuyū zanmai* is the samadhi of ‘not two, not one.’

¹⁸ For an examination of the various methods Dōgen employs to reconstruct and reinterpret kōan language, see Hee-Jin Kim 1985b.

Shinjin Datsuraku

As previously mentioned, in his *Hōkyō-ki* Dōgen’s great awakening is said to have occurred upon hearing Ju-ching express practice as “dropping the body and mind” (*shinjin datsuraku*) (Kodera 61). Later, Dōgen “entered Ju-ching’s quarters and burned incense, reporting, ‘I have come because body-mind is cast-off.’ Since Dōgen’s great awakening is described as *shinjin datsuraku*, it follows that *jijuyū zanmai* – as the samadhi of great awakening – needs to be understood as *shinjin datsuraku*. *Jijuyū zanmai* and *shinjin datsuraku* are two ways Dōgen speaks of enlightenment.

In *Genjōkōan* Dōgen states: “To study the Buddha-way is to study the self; to study the self is to forget the self; to forget the self is to be verified by myriad dharmas; and to be verified by myriad dharmas is to drop off the body-mind of the self as well as the body-mind of the other” (Kim 1985a, 51). In this formulation, it seems likely that ‘to be verified by myriad dharmas’ is another way of stating the samadhi of receiving and using the self, or ‘the myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self.’ Thus, *jijuyū zanmai* is described as *shinjin datsuraku* and self-forgetting.

Dōgen’s phrases ‘to forget the self’ and *shinjin datsuraku* aptly express the common Buddhist notion that enlightenment is realizing no-self (*anātman*). Since Buddhism considers clinging to a sense of a separate or independently existent, fixated, enduring, essential self (*ātman*) to be delusion, to forget the self can be considered to realizing no-self (*anātman*). Likewise, since in Buddhism the self is described as a composite of body and mind aggregates, the term *shinjin* (body-mind) can readily be understood as referring to the self, such that to *datsuraku* (drop-off or cast-off) body-mind is to abandon clinging to the false sense of self and therefore to realize no-self.

Furthermore, Dōgen’s statement that enlightenment is ‘to drop off the body-mind of the self as well as the body-mind of the other’ aptly expresses the common Mahāyāna notion that enlightenment is realizing emptiness (*śūnyatā*). The teaching of emptiness is often thought of as an extension of the teaching of *anātman* in order to include all dharmas; in emptiness, all dharmas are without an essential self. By saying that the body-mind of self

and other are dropped off in enlightenment, Dōgen is saying that enlightenment is realizing emptiness.

Finally, Dōgen’s teaching that ‘to be verified by myriad dharmas is to drop off the body-mind of the self’ expresses the notion that *shinjin datsuraku* is realizing co-dependent origination (*praītitya-samutpāda*), which (ever since Nāgārjuna) is considered in the Mahāyāna to be a way of explaining the activity of emptiness. In the Mahāyāna, it is said that all dharmas are empty because they arise dependently within the network of co-dependent origination; and Dōgen expresses this notion by saying that in self-forgetting a ‘self’ is nevertheless simultaneously verified by, or received from, or arises dependent upon, all things. The giving up of the dualistic view of independent subjects and objects is the realization that subject and object arise together.

In sum, Dōgen’s *Genjōkōan* indicates that in *shinjin datsuraku* the false sense of an independent self (*ātman*) is dropped-off, allowing the realization of emptiness and co-dependent origination. Just as *jijuyū zanmai* is the self itself realizing its own dependent nature, so too is *shinjin datsuraku* the self realizing itself as a dharma within the nondual network of co-dependent origination. *Jijuyū zanmai* is *shinjin datsuraku* – the subjective realization of nonduality, emptiness, and dependent origination.

Embodied Enlightenment

Referring to enlightenment as a samadhi (*zanmai*) in *Bendōwa* may lead to the sense that enlightenment happens only to the mind; and this emphasis on the mind may lead to thinking (as happens in licensed evil) that it is not necessary to physically practice to realize the Buddha-way. But, Dōgen’s notion of *shinjin datsuraku* implicates the body as well, and thus mitigates against overly intellectual interpretation of enlightenment by emphasizing the importance of embodiment, or embodied enlightenment. As Dōgen states in the *Zuimonki*, “The Way is surely attained with the body” (Kim 2004, 101).¹⁹ The importance of embodying enlightenment is emphasized in “Shinjin-Gakudo” (Learning the Truth with Body and Mind).

¹⁹ On this point it is also interesting to note that (at least until World War II) it was common in Rinzai Zen to speak of enlightenment as *taitoku* (body-attainment) (Hori 2000, 295).

In this fascicle, Dōgen makes the point that both mind and body must learn the truth. He states: “there are two ways to learn the Buddha’s truth: to learn it with the mind, and to learn it with the body” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 247).

To learn the truth with the mind is to learn that mind and all existence are nondual. In “Shinjin Gakudo” Dōgen writes: “mountains, rivers, and the Earth, and the sun, moon, and stars, are the mind.... Because this is so, what is seen by the mind of oneness (*isshin*) is uniform” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 249-50). This is the ‘samadhi of self-fulfillment’ wherein all existence is the self: the mind is co-extensive with the universe: the mind is the mind of the universe. And yet, of course, there is differentiation within nonduality: “Mountains may be of many kinds.... Rivers also may be of many kinds” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 249). Dōgen further emphasizes uniqueness by saying that “fences, walls, tiles, and pebbles are the mind” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 250).

For Dōgen, learning the truth with the mind is not sufficient because the truth must also be learned with the body: enlightenment is not a disembodied mental state; the truth is actively embodied. Thus, there is also “learning the truth with the body, learning the truth with a mass of red flesh” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 253). In this learning, nonduality is an embodied truth: it is learnt that “the whole Universe in the ten directions is just the real human body. Living-and-dying, going-and-coming, are the real human body” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 253). Here, the body is also considered co-extensive with the universe: the body is the body of universe. And yet again Dōgen reminds us that this is not dissolution of particularities: “[We should be] clearly seeing and ascertaining that *the human body*, although it is restricted by self and others, is *the whole of the ten directions*” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 254). Although the human body is differentiated – ‘restricted by self and others’ – it is nevertheless the whole universe. “It is not a place without directions or boundaries: it is *the real human body*. You and I now are people of *the real human body* which is *the whole Universe in ten directions*. We learn the truth without overlooking such things” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 255). For Dōgen, the truth of nonduality is embodied without dissolving the boundaries of our unique body.

For Dōgen, this learning the truth with the body and mind occurs in *shinjin datsuraku*. After listing the various kinds of minds, Dōgen says, “There is learning the truth through casting aside these kinds of minds” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 248). Maraldo prefers to translate “casting aside” as “discarding or letting go” (Maraldo 115). Dōgen also says that we learn the truth with the body as “we continue, moment by moment, to give up the body” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 255). Thus aligning with the presentation of *shinjin datsuraku* in *Genjōkōan*, in “Shinjin-Gakudo” to learn the truth is to drop off body-mind.

Since the truth learned in *shinjin datsuraku* is that the body-mind is co-extensive with the universe while remaining a unique body-mind, *shinjin datsuraku* can be understood as dropping off the dualistic mind and body of an imagined isolated subject and, without erasing differentiation, becoming or being the mind and body of the universe. Thus, Kim describes *shinjin datsuraku* as “a nondualistic vision of the self and world” which nevertheless does not eliminate the duality of self and world: “The body-mind totality was at last free from dualistic shackles and was free for duality.... The inexorable duality of the self and the world – with all the ensuing implications, paradoxes, and conflicts – was not dissolved, but seen in the light of emptiness and thusness” (Kim 2004, 37, 104, 105). The self, complete with its delusions and desires, does not disappear in *shinjin datsuraku*. Rather, enlightenment is the realization that duality, delusion, and desire are empty. Nothing is eradicated in *shinjin datsuraku*, but everything is realized as non-substantial. Since *jijuyū zanmai* is *shinjin datsuraku*, *jijuyū zanmai* is the body and mind realizing emptiness.

Practice and Verification : *Shinjin Datsuraku*

Having established that for Dōgen enlightenment must be understood as embodied-enlightenment, it is possible to now turn to his most famous statement, found in *Bendōwa*: “In buddha-dharma, practice (*shu*) and enlightenment (*shō*) are one and the same” (仏法には、修証是一等なり) (Okumura/Leighton 30). In order to make sense of Dōgen’s statement it is necessary to know that *shō* (証) literally means “to prove,” “to bear witness

to,” “to verify” (Kim 2007, 21).²⁰ Unlike the proponent of licensed evil, when Dōgen speaks of enlightenment (*shō*) he “always presupposes *the process of verification* in which enlightenment entails practice, and vice versa” (emphasis in original, Kim 2007, 22). When Dōgen says that practice (*shu*, 修) and enlightenment (*shō*) are identical, he is saying that there is no progression from practice to verification, because practicing is itself verifying the truth of the buddha-dharma. Thus, Bielefeldt provides a better translation of Dōgen’s famous statement: “In the *buddha-dharma*, practice (*shu*) and verification (*shō*) are the same” (Bielefeldt, 1988, 137).

Moreover, in order to make sense of this statement it is also necessary to understand that for Dōgen practice (*shu*) is *shinjin datsuraku*: in saying *shu* and *shō* are “one and the same” Dōgen is saying that dropping body-mind verifies the truth of the Buddha-dharma. As mentioned previously, *shinjin datsuraku* is the abandonment of self-clinging, which is dropping off the body-mind of an imagined isolated subject and (without erasing differentiation) becoming the mind and body of all existence in *jijuyū zanmai*. What I have yet to say is that Dōgen defines ‘practice’ as precisely the abandonment of self-clinging. It is by describing ‘practice’ as *shinjin datsuraku* that Dōgen is able to say that practice and enlightenment are one and the same.

The *Zuimonki* repeatedly asserts that practice is the abandonment of self-clinging, often expressed as casting aside the attachment to ego or self. For example, “To learn the practice and maintain the Way is to abandon ego-attachment” (Okumura 27), and “The basic point to understand in the study of the Way is that you must cast aside your deep-rooted attachments” (Masunaga 103). This text analyzes non-attachment to self in terms of casting aside body and mind. Dōgen states: “You must give up the world you have

²⁰ Besides *shō*, there are two other Chinese characters – *go* and *kaku* – which are often also translated into English as ‘enlightenment’ (and into Japanese as *satori*). “Very briefly, *go* is often used with *mei* as in *meigo* (‘delusion and enlightenment’), thereby stressing emancipation from delusions through insight into the true nature of reality” (Kim 2007, 21). The other term, *kaku* “connotes the awakening of the mind from its spiritual slumber and therein an awakening to an hitherto unknown reality/truth; in this sense it is sometimes paired with dream (*mu*)” (Kim 2007, 21). Throughout his writings, although Dōgen does use the terms *go* and *kaku*, “his most favored term is undoubtedly *shō*” (Kim 2007, 22). As in the famous phrase in *Bendōwa*, “*shō* is typically coupled with *shu* (‘practice’) as in *shushō* (‘practice and enlightenment’)” (Kim 2007, 22).

known, your family, your body, and your mind” (Masunaga 25). Indeed, one of the main themes of the *Zuimonki* is the importance of living in poverty, not clinging to food and clothing, and he criticizes those who “concern themselves with their own bodies and avoid anything that brings pain. They are reluctant to undertake any Buddhist training.... Such people have yet to cast aside their bodies” (Masunaga 25). Dōgen also repeatedly advocates non-attachment towards the mind, expressed as the relinquishment of personal views: “Students of the Way, the reason you do not attain enlightenment is because you hold onto your old views” (Okumura 144). Thus, “The primary point you should attend to is detaching yourself from personal views” (Okumura 136). Dōgen criticizes “those who undergo hard training without regard for their own bodies, yet withhold their minds from Buddhism. They reject any aspect of Buddhism that does not match their preconceptions. Such people have yet to cast aside their minds” (Masunaga 25). In sum, Dōgen’s practice is the casting off of body and mind – it is to renounce self-clinging. Thus, Dōgen admonishes, “Students of the Way, let go of body and mind and enter completely into the buddha-dharma” (Okumura 110).

By describing practice as casting aside body and mind, abandoning attachment to body and mind, or renouncing the self, Dōgen is able to say that practice (*shu*) is verification (*shō*): in casting off self-clinging the truth of the buddha-dharma is verified. Within the practice of dropping body-mind there is becoming the body-mind of the universe in the samadhi of receiving and using the self (*jiyū zanmai*), which is itself awakening to, and verification of, nonduality, emptiness, and co-dependent origination. Indeed, in *Genjōkōan*, when Dōgen says that “to forget the self is to be verified by myriad dharmas, and to be verified by myriad dharmas is to drop off the body-mind of the self,” the term translated as ‘verified’ is *shō*. Here, Dōgen is saying that in abandoning self-clinging there is receiving and using the self, and this receiving and using the self is what verifies the truth of the Buddhist teachings. Thus Dōgen says *shu* is *shō*.

In the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dōgen said that practice must be engaged without seeking to satisfy our own inclinations. It is now possible to see that he insisted on non-seeking because seeking is manifesting

of self-clinging. To avoid the physical hardship of practice is to seek to satisfy the ego's demands for comfort; it is to refuse to cast aside the body. To cling to personal views is to seek to satisfy the ego's demand that it not be challenged; it is to refuse to cast aside the mind. But, to abandon ego-attachment in *shinjin datsuraku* is to cease seeking to satisfy the ego; it is non-seeking. Practice-verification is non-seeking.

Practice and Verification: Wholehearted Effort

In the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dōgen also tells Ejō to practice “wholeheartedly.” For Dōgen ‘practice’ is defined not only as ‘*shinjin datsuraku*’ but also as ‘wholehearted effort,’ indicating that *shinjin datsuraku* is not simply passively non-seeking but also sincere effort. In *Bendōwa* Dōgen describes his Zen as *kufu-bendō*, which can be translated as “negotiation of the Way with concentrated effort” (Waddell/Abe 8), or “effort in pursuing the truth” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 2). For Dōgen this effort defines practice, so throughout the *Shōbōgenzō* Dōgen repeatedly refers to *zazen* as *kufu-bendō* (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 2), and Okumura/Leighton translate *kufu-bendō* as “the wholehearted practice of the Way” (Okumura/Leighton 19). Thus, when Dōgen states *shu* is *shō* he is saying not only that *shinjin datsuraku* verifies the truth of the Buddhist teachings but also that wholehearted practice is itself enlightenment.

In “Dōtoku” (Expressing the Truth) Dōgen claims that *kufu-bendō* is itself *dōtoku* (expressing the truth): “where there is the Buddhist patriarchs’ pursuit of the ultimate there is the Buddhist patriarchs’ expression of the truth.... this intention to arrive is itself the real manifestation” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 269-270). Similarly, in *Bendōwa* Dōgen states, “a beginner’s wholehearted practice of the Way is exactly the totality of original enlightenment” (Okumura/Leighton 30). Leaving aside for the moment the notion that enlightenment is ‘original,’ it is clear that for Dōgen enlightenment must not be considered a distant goal to be eventually attained: the buddha-dharma is completely present when effort is put forth in the first moment of practice.

By validating the wholehearted practice of a beginner as the totality of enlightenment, Dōgen is positing Buddhahood as the path of practice

itself, not as a rarified state accessible to only a select few. Thus, in “Bukkyō” (The Buddha’s Teaching) Dōgen transforms the traditional Buddhist notion of *tō-higan* (“reaching the other shore”) into *higan-tō* (“the other shore’s arrival”) in order to indicate that nirvana is not “a future event attainable only at the end of countless kalpas of spiritual efforts” but rather the other shore is “the event of realization here and now” (Kim 1985a, 63). Similarly, in “Kattō” (Entwining Vines) Dōgen provides a novel interpretation of the kōan of Bodhidharma’s transmission to Hui-k’o after testing of his four disciples by asking them to each express their understanding. According to the usual reading, each disciple’s expression surpassed the previous disciple’s expression: the first disciple attained Bodhidharma’s “skin;” the second disciple Bodhidharma’s “flesh;” the third disciple the “bones;” and finally Hui-k’o expressed perfect understanding, the “marrow” of Bodhidharma, which is why Hui-k’o was chosen as Bodhidharma’s successor. But, Dōgen’s understanding of the kōan denies that the expressions should be seen as progressive degrees of understanding; rather, they are all expressions of enlightenment: “The patriarch’s body-mind is such that the skin, flesh, bones, and marrow are all equally the patriarch himself: the marrow is not the deepest, the skin is not the shallowest” (Kim 1985b, 75). Here, Dōgen is saying that it is the nature of Buddhahood / enlightenment (Bodhidharma’s body-mind) that all instances of practice (skin, flesh, bones, marrow) express Buddhahood / enlightenment. Enlightenment is not reserved for Hui-k’o; enlightenment is expressed at all points of practice.

Similarly, in “Sesshin-sessho” (Expounding Mind and Expounding Nature) Dōgen writes,

The Buddha-way, at the time of the first establishment of the will, is the Buddha-way; and at the time of realization of the right state of truth, is the Buddha-way. The beginning, the middle, and the end are each the Buddha-way.... Nevertheless, extremely stupid people think that when we are learning the Buddha-way we have not arrived at the Buddha-way; they think that it is the Buddha-way only in the time beyond realization of the effect. They are like this because they do not know that the whole way is expounding of the way, they do not know that the whole way is practice of the way, they do not know that the whole way is [realization] of the way. (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 55)

The Buddha-way is Bodhidharma's body-mind, Buddhahood and enlightenment; as contemporary commentator Okumura states, the Buddha-way is both "the way leading to enlightenment" and "the buddha's enlightenment itself" (Okumura 40). Thus, "the Buddha Way is the way we should walk in our daily activities in the direction of the Buddha, while each of the activities is nothing other than a manifestation of the Buddha's enlightenment. This is the meaning of Dōgen's expression *shushō ichinyō* (practice and enlightenment are one)" (Okumura 40). For Dōgen, practice and enlightenment are one because each moment of practice is within the way of buddha's enlightenment. As Bielefeldt states, for Dōgen, "Buddhahood is nothing but the cultivation of the path itself.... On these grounds, then, Dōgen can revalidate the effort of the spiritual life" (Bielefeldt 1988, 143-5).

Nevertheless, although the practice of the beginner is the totality of enlightenment, it is still necessary to differentiate between the beginner and the adept. In "Sesshin-sessho":

From the time we establish the bodhi-mind and direct ourselves towards training in the way of Buddha, we sincerely practice difficult practices; and at that time, though we keep practicing, in a hundred efforts we never hit the target once. Nevertheless, *sometimes following good counselors and sometimes following the sutras*, we gradually become able to hit the target. One hit of the target now is by virtue of hundreds of misses in the past; it is one maturation of a hundred misses. Listening to the teachings, training in the truth, and attaining [enlightenment] are all like this. (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 55)

In accord with the principle of "neither different nor identical," Dōgen teaches that while the beginning and end of the Buddha-way are all equally the expression of enlightenment, the beginning and end are different: in the beginning we miss the target; and in the end we hit it. "It is like someone walking one thousand miles: the first step is one in a thousand miles and the thousandth step is one in a thousand miles. Though the first step and the thousandth step are different, the thousand miles are the same" (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 55). Just as Bodhidharma's "body-mind is such that the skin, flesh, bones, and marrow are all equally the patriarch" so that all his disciples equally express enlightenment, nevertheless Bodhidharma chose

Hui-k'o as his successor because he was different from the rest – he had reached the end of the Buddha-way and hit the target!

It is now possible to return to the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil where Dōgen says “practice and study themselves are inherently the Buddhadharmā” and he instructs Ejō to practice wholeheartedly but without seeking. It is now clear that for Dōgen practice is enlightenment because wholehearted non-seeking is itself enlightenment-verification of the Buddhadharmā. The practice-verification of *shinjin datsruaku* is the wholehearted abandonment or relinquishment of ego-attachment.

Before moving on, it is worth mentioning that the term *datsuraku* aptly portrays this dual meaning of effort and relinquishment. As Heine explains, *datsuraku* is a compound with both active and passive aspects, implying both effort and ease: *datsu* means “to remove, escape, extract,” and *raku* means “to fall, scatter, fade” (Heine 1986, 55). *Datsu* is “the more outwardly active term, though it refers to the distinctive occasion of the withdrawal from, omission or termination of activity: it is the act of ending activity” (Heine 1986, 55). On the other hand, *raku* “implies a passive occurrence that ‘happens to’ someone or something, as in the scattering of leaves by the breeze of the fading of light at dusk” (Heine 1986, 55). Thus, as Heine states: *datsuraku* is “the meeting point of purposefulness and effortlessness” (Heine 1986, 57). The purposefulness of *datsu* aptly portrays practice as singleminded, resolute, determined, decisive, dedicated, wholehearted effort; and the effortlessness of *raku* aptly portrays practice as the relinquishment of ego through non-seeking.²¹ The practice of Buddha-way is nonduality of effort and ease, verifying the Buddha-way.

Original Enlightenment and Original Practice

At this point, it may appear as though Dōgen has simply rejected the notion of ‘original enlightenment’ in favor of ‘acquired enlightenment.’ But Dōgen’s response to licensed evil in the *Zuimonki* is not to deny that

²¹ Since there is no perfect translation of *datsuraku* into English that can contain these nuances, translators of Dōgen are forced to emphasize either effortlessness or effort. Cook, for instance, translates *datsuraku* as “drop off,” thereby emphasizing effortlessness (Cook 1989, 66), whereas Heine prefers “cast off,” as do Waddell/Abe, thereby emphasizing effort (Heine 1986, 56; Waddell/Abe 41).

enlightenment is original, and I have already mentioned Dōgen’s statement, “the practice of a beginner is entirely that of original enlightenment.” For Dōgen, enlightenment is indeed original; and yet, while the proponent of licensed evil would wish to understand the notion of original enlightenment as denying the need to practice, for Dōgen original enlightenment affirms the need to practice because original enlightenment is, as he says in *Bendōwa*, “original practice” (Waddell/Abe 14). Dōgen only affirms original enlightenment in the context of the oneness of practice and enlightenment: for Dōgen, enlightenment is original because practice is original. We need to practice because practice is original practice-enlightenment.

In his discussion of *jijuyū zanmai* in *Bendōwa* Dōgen employs language reminiscent of original enlightenment thought. He states, “this dharma is abundantly inherent in (*sonawaru*) each human being” (Okumura/Leighton 19), and that “livings beings are eternally functioning in this state” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 2). Moreover, he goes on to say, “we should remember that from the beginning we have never lacked the supreme state of bodhi, and we will receive and use it forever” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 10). Dōgen also describes *jijuyū zanmai* as the “original source” of Buddha-tathāgatas, prompting Waddell/Abe to describe the “original source” as “The fundamental ground from which Buddha-tathāgatas appear... the spiritual realm of the *jijuyū* samadhi” (Waddell/Abe 11). For Dōgen, *jijuyū zanmai* is the original source of enlightenment; it is (or seems to be) everyone’s originally enlightened nature.

And yet, unlike the teachings of licensed evil, in *Bendōwa* Dōgen states that ‘original enlightenment’ is not apart from practice (*shu*) but immediately present within practice (*shu*):

The view that practice and enlightenment are not one is a non-Buddhist view. In the Buddha-dharma they are one. Inasmuch as practice is based on enlightenment (*shōjō no shu*), the practice of a beginner is entirely that of original enlightenment. Therefore, in giving instruction for practice, a Zen teacher should advise his or her disciples not to seek enlightenment apart from practice, for practice itself is original enlightenment. Because it is already enlightenment of practice, there is no end to enlightenment; because it is already practice of enlightenment, there is no beginning to practice. (Kim 2007, 23)

This is Dōgen’s version of the teaching of original enlightenment. The totality of original enlightenment is described as present in the first moment of practice because practice is itself original enlightenment. Practice and original enlightenment occur simultaneously.

In this passage Dōgen teaches his disciples that there can be no enlightenment outside of practice: “[Do] not to seek enlightenment apart from practice, for practice itself is original enlightenment” (Kim 2007, 23). This can be understood as meaning that without *shinjin datsuraku* there is no verification of the buddha-dharma: there can be no verification of the nondual, empty, and co-dependently arisen nature of reality without the practice of dropping off body-mind in the samadhi of receiving and using the self. It is imperative to practice because practice verifies the true nature of reality. In this sense, it is possible to say that verification depends upon practice.

In addition, Dōgen also says “practice is based on enlightenment” (*shōjō no shu*). This phrase indicates that ‘practice’ cannot be considered to be an independent ‘cause’ leading to the ‘effect’ of enlightenment or verification; rather, ‘practice’ is ‘based upon’ or ‘depends upon’ original enlightenment. Just as enlightenment/verification depends upon practice, so too does practice depend upon original enlightenment/verification.

Moreover, to say that (1) practice and enlightenment are one and the same, and that (2) that enlightenment is original, is to say that (3) practice must also be ‘original.’ Indeed, in this passage Dōgen speaks of ‘original practice’ when he writes, ‘because it is already practice of enlightenment, there is no beginning to practice,’ and later he explicitly calls practice “original practice” (Waddell/Abe 14). For Dōgen, enlightenment and practice are both original.

To understand in what way practice and enlightenment are ‘original’ it is helpful to turn to an earlier section in *Bendōwa* where Dōgen uses the example of zazen-practice to explain in what way practice-enlightenment is original. In this section, Dōgen teaches that all things originally sit zazen and engage in practice-enlightenment. It begins by first describing zazen as the way to practice enlightenment: “For disporting oneself freely in this samadhi [*jijuyū zanmai*], practicing zazen in an upright posture is the true gate”

(Okumura/Leighton 19). Dōgen then goes on to say that when an individual engages in the enlightened practice of *zazen-jijuyū-zanmai* all existence engages in the enlightened practice of *zazen-jijuyū zanmai*:

When even for a short period you sit properly in samadhi, imprinting the Buddha-seal in your three activities of deed, word, and thought, then each and every thing throughout the dharma world is the Buddha-seal, and all space without exception is enlightenment....
(Waddell/Abe 11)

At that time, all things together awaken to supreme enlightenment and utilize buddha-body, immediately go beyond the culmination of awakening, and sit upright under the kingly bodhi tree. At the same time, they turn the incomparable, great dharma wheel and begin expressing (*kaien*) ultimate and unfabricated profound prajña.
(Okumura/Leighton 22)

In this vision, *zazen* is not only the activity of a human sitting; *zazen* is practiced by all things, and all things are enlightened, or are enlightenment itself. This passage indicates that for Dōgen the enlightenment of all beings and things is the *zazen*-practice of all beings and things: when everyone and everything is engaged in ‘sitting upright under the kingly bodhi tree’ they are supremely enlightened. The enlightenment of all beings and things is their *zazen*-practice.

Moreover, in this passage the notions present in ‘original enlightenment thought’ that all beings are enlightened and that the nature of the entire phenomenal world is itself enlightenment are presented by Dōgen as dependent upon the practice of the individual. Unlike the proponent of licensed evil who understands the teaching of ‘original enlightenment of all things’ as meaning that enlightenment does not depend upon the individual practitioner, for Dōgen it is when ‘you sit properly in samadhi’ that ‘all space without exception is enlightenment.’

At the same time, in the passage that follows, Dōgen makes it clear that it is equally appropriate to say that the individual’s practice-enlightenment depends upon the practice-enlightenment of all existence:

These balanced and right states of realization also work the other way, following paths of intimate and mystical cooperations, so that this person who sits in *Zazen* steadfastly gets free of body and mind, cuts away miscellaneous impure views and thoughts from the past, and thus experiences and understands the natural and pure Buddha-Dharma.... At this time everything in the Universe in the ten

directions – soil, earth, grass, and trees; fences, walls, tiles, and pebbles – performs the Buddha’s work. The people that receive the benefit thus produced by wind and water are all mystically helped by the fine and unthinkable influence of the Buddha, and they exhibit the immediate state of realization. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 5)

Dōgen then provides a synthesis of these seemingly contradictory perspectives by indicating that zazen-enlightenment is a reciprocal relationship of giving and receiving occurring between self and other:

Grasses and trees, fences and walls demonstrate and exalt it [zazen-enlightenment] for the sake of living beings, both ordinary and sage; and in turn, living beings, both ordinary and sage, express and unfold it for the sake of grasses and trees, fences and walls.
(Okumura/Leighton 23)

Thus, in Dōgen’s view, the relationship between the practice-enlightenment of the individual and the practice-enlightenment of all things is mutual. For Dōgen, the practice-enlightenment of self-and-other is simultaneous:

“Simultaneously, all living beings of the dharma world in the ten directions and six realms become clear and pure in body and mind [and] realize the great emancipation” (Okumura/Leighton 22).

Dōgen describes this shared practice of simultaneous receiving and giving as the endless activity of original enlightenment:

Those receiving and employing this fire and water all turn round and round the Buddha-making activity of original enlightenment....
(Waddell/Abe 12)

The realm of self-awakening and awakening others is fundamentally endowed with the quality of enlightenment with nothing lacking, and allows the standard of enlightenment to be actualized ceaselessly.
(Okumura/Leighton 22-3)

Thus, for the individual to ‘sit properly in samadhi’ is the activity of original enlightenment; and for grasses and trees, fences and walls to ‘sit upright under the kingly bodhi tree’ is the activity of original enlightenment.

Since this giving and receiving of enlightenment is the practice of zazen, ‘original enlightenment’ can equally be called ‘original practice.’ Dōgen says, “when just one person does zazen even one time, [she or] he becomes, imperceptibly, one with each and all the myriad things and permeates completely all time.... [They are] performing the eternal and ceaseless work of guiding beings to enlightenment” (Waddell/Abe 13). The

person sitting zazen is engaged in a boundless, beginningless and endless practice. Moreover, this practice is not just the activity of a human being; rather, it is the original practice of all things:

It is, for each and every thing, one and the same undifferentiated practice, one and the same undifferentiated realization... [This practice] is not limited to the side of the practitioner alone. Each and every thing is, in its original aspect, endowed (*sonawaru*) with original practice – it cannot be measured or comprehended.
(Waddell/Abe 13-4)

For Dōgen, all existence is originally enlightened because it is the original practice of each and every thing to ‘sit upright under the kingly bodhi tree.’ Enlightenment is “abundantly inherent in (*sonawaru*) each human being” because we are “endowed (*sonawaru*) with original practice”. Thus, Dōgen’s adoption of the notion of original enlightenment is mediated through an understanding of the oneness of practice and enlightenment such that original enlightenment is original practice, necessitating our own personal practice.²²

Original *Shinjin Datsuraku* and Original Effort

Since (as previously discussed) ‘practice’ is *shinjin daturaku* and *kufu-bendō*, by saying that all existence is originally engaged in practice, Dōgen is also saying that all things are always already dropping body-mind and making effort in pursuit of truth. This bizarre notion becomes intelligible if dharmas are understood not as substantial ‘things’ but as the activity of emptiness. In Zen, dharmas are never static or stable; they are empty in the continuous activity of ‘becoming’. Since *shinjin datsuraku* is precisely this ‘becoming’ – this self-forgetting in the activity of emptiness – it is possible to say that all dharmas are always dropping off the self, or originally casting off body-mind.

Moreover, Dōgen understands this activity of ‘becoming’ as the exertion or effort of dharmas. In “Uji” (Time-Being) Dōgen describes

²² In “Gyōji” (Continuous Practice) Dōgen also teaches the oneness of practice and enlightenment, and describes ‘continuous practice’ in ways that greatly resemble ‘original practice’ as described in *Bendōwa* (see Tanahashi 1999, 114-6). The conclusion of *Genjōkōan* also contains a kōan (of priest Pao-ch’e of Mt. Ma-ku fanning himself even though the nature of wind is eternal and omnipresent) which expresses the notion that original enlightenment is original practice, requiring our own practice (see Cook 1989, 69). An examination of these writings would only repeat points I have already made in this discussion of *Bendōwa*.

dharmas as vigorously active in their dharma-positions: all things “now arrayed throughout the world are each dharma-stages (*hōi*) dwelling in their suchness and moving endlessly up and down” (Waddell/Abe 52). Later he speaks of the “sharp, vital quick (*kappatsupatchi*) of dharmas dwelling in their dharma-positions” (Waddell/Abe 53). Using a boat as an example of a dharma, in “Zenki” Dōgen writes of “the dynamic function of the boat” and “the boat’s vigorous exertion” (Kim 2004, 172). “Zenki” also elucidates the saying of Yüan-wu K’o-ch’in (1063-1135): “Life is the realization of total dynamism (*zenki*); death is the realization of total dynamism (*zenki*)” (Kim 2004, 172). For Dōgen, dharmas are always already exerting themselves within the great empty ‘becoming’ activity of total dynamism, and can therefore be described as engaging in wholehearted practice.

When speaking of a singular dharma, total dynamism (*zenki*) is *ippō gūjin*, which Kim translates as “the total exertion of a single thing” (Kim 2004, 66). For Dōgen, each dharma – a boat, firewood, or ash – is totally exerting itself within its dharma-position. *Ippō gūjin* can also be translated as “the total exhaustion of a single thing” because *jin* can be translated as “exhausted, completely used up” (Hori, personal communication, July 4, 2007). Thus, as dharmas totally exert themselves in the activity of total dynamism they are completely exhausting themselves of themselves, dropping off body-mind and leaving no trace.

Realizing Original Enlightenment

With an understanding of how original enlightenment is original practice requiring our own effort and practice, it makes sense that Dōgen would say, in *Bendōwa*, “This Dharma [*jijuyū zanmai*] is amply present in every person, but without practice, it is not manifested; without realization, it cannot be attained” (此の法人人の分上にゆたかなりと雖も未修には不顯 不証無得) (Waddell/Abe 8). For Dōgen, *shu* (修) and *shō* (証) are necessary to manifest (顯) and attain (得) original *jijuyū zanmai*.

In this passage Dōgen is saying that without practicing *jijuyū zanmai* there is no manifestation of *jijuyū zanmai*. The term Waddell/Abe translate here as ‘manifested’ (顯) is translated by Okumura/Leighton as “actualized”

(Okumura/Leighton 19), and it could also be translated as “displayed” (Hori, personal communication, Aug 15, 2007). Whatever the translation, because it is the body that ‘manifests,’ ‘makes actual,’ or ‘displays,’ Dōgen is indicating that practice is the physical embodiment of *jijuyū zanmai*. He is saying that without the practice of *shinjin datsuraku* there is no embodiment-manifestation of the samadhi of receiving and using the self; without dropping off body-mind there is no embodiment-manifestation of co-dependent origination; without giving up the body there is no embodiment-manifestation of nonduality.

Moreover, in this passage Dōgen is also saying that *shō* is the ‘attainment’ of original *jijuyū zanmai*. The term Waddell/Abe translate as ‘attained’ (得) could also be translated as ‘gained’ (Okumura, personal communication, May 8, 2007). Unlike ‘manifested’ or ‘actualized’ which emphasize embodiment, 得 seems to emphasize the point that in verification a mental understanding of the truth occurs; in verifying that the self arises in dependence upon the other by dropping body-mind, there is mental insight into the nondual and co-dependent origination of self-and-other.

Thus (in line with the teachings in “Shinjin-Gakudo”), in *Bendōwa* Dōgen says that in practice and verification there is both embodiment of truth and gaining of a mental understanding of truth. And, since practice is necessary for verification, embodying-manifesting the truth is necessary for mental-attainment. While it might be tempting to posit a difference between embodying truth through ‘manifestation’ and gaining a mental understanding of truth through ‘attainment,’ this is not the case: since practice *is itself* verification, manifestation *is itself* attainment. The embodiment of *jijuyū zanmai* is the verification-attainment of *jijuyū zanmai*. In Dōgen’s buddha-dharma practice, manifestation, verification, and attainment are one and the same.

The English word ‘realization’ may be a helpful a term to indicate the oneness of manifestation, verification, and attainment. The word ‘realization’ can be used to express ‘manifestation’ because one usage of ‘realization’ is ‘making real;’ it can also be used to express ‘attainment’ because another meaning or facet of ‘realization’ is ‘mental understanding;’ and, finally, it

can be used to express ‘verification’ because ‘realization’ can also mean insight into what has always been true.²³

Becoming a Buddha

In “Busshō” Dōgen writes: “The truth of Buddha-nature is such that Buddha-nature is embodied not before but after becoming a buddha (*jōbutsu*). Buddha-nature and becoming a buddha always occur simultaneously” (Kim 2004, 140). This key passage summarizes many of the points made in this chapter. Here, Dōgen is stating that Buddha-nature (original enlightenment) is not to be understood as “innately given, subsistent, or metaphysically preeminent” (Kim 1985a, 90); rather, practice (becoming a buddha) is necessary to realize original enlightenment: “Buddha-nature is embodied not before but after becoming a Buddha.” For Dōgen, enlightenment depends upon practice. Nevertheless, practice cannot be considered to be a cause leading to the effect of enlightenment; rather practice and enlightenment are one: “Buddha-nature and becoming a buddha are simultaneous.”

Moreover, since practice is wholehearted effort in pursuit of truth (*kufu-bendō*), practice can be considered the wholehearted effort to ‘become a Buddha’. By saying “Buddha-nature is embodied not before but after becoming a buddha” Dōgen’s phrase can also be understood as saying that original enlightenment depends upon our effort in practice. Thus, Kim comments on this passage by stating, “Only when we strive to become Buddhas is Buddha-nature embodied in and through our efforts” (Kim 2004, 68). Nevertheless, since “Buddha-nature and becoming a buddha occur simultaneously,” the wholehearted practice of the way (becoming a buddha) is itself the realization of the Way (Buddha-nature).

And, finally, recalling that for Dōgen all things are Buddha-nature it makes sense that Dōgen describes Buddha-nature as always already the dynamic activity of ‘becoming.’ In “Busshō” Dōgen says, “*Buddha-nature is*

²³ The usefulness of the term ‘realization’ was brought to my attention by Hori 2000, 304-7, who came to an appreciation of the term by reading Nishitani 5-6. Hori and Nishitani mention the first two meanings of ‘realize’ – i.e. making real and mental understanding. I am suggesting that it is also helpful to consider a third meaning of ‘realization’ – namely, as verification. In verification there is insight into a truth that has always been true but which we are only now realizing.

emptiness” and, “all sentient beings are emptiness-Buddha-nature” (Waddell/Abe 72, 74), indicating that Buddha-nature is not an essence but the activity of ‘becoming.’ Since all existence is originally enlightened, so all existence can be said to be ‘becoming a Buddha.’ Buddha-nature (original enlightenment) is becoming a buddha (original practice).

Conclusion

The proponent of licensed evil says that enlightenment is present *regardless* of practice (that “merely lifting an arm or moving a leg is true Buddhism”), and that therefore practice is not necessary. But Dōgen teaches that enlightenment is present *because* of practice, and that therefore practice is necessary. For Dōgen, there is no enlightenment outside of practice because practice is necessary to manifest-verify-attain enlightenment. Indeed, practice and enlightenment are one and the same: practice-enlightenment is *shinjin datsuraku* and *jijuyū zanmai* – the realization of nonduality, no-self, emptiness, and co-dependent origination in wholehearted non-seeking.

Dōgen does call this enlightenment ‘original’ and he considers it to be already present, but he does so because he considers all existence to be ‘originally’ practicing, wholeheartedly dropping body-mind. For Dōgen, all things are endowed with original enlightenment because all things are endowed with original practice; all things are Buddha-nature because all things are making efforts to become a buddha. The proponent of licensed evil may wish to interpret this teaching as meaning that since we are always already practicing, we do not need to engage in any specific discipline to realize the Buddha-Way. But for Dōgen the original practice of all things is dependent upon the practice of the individual: it is when the individual practices zazen that all existence practices zazen and realizes the Buddha-Way. Dōgen asserts this dependence at the same time as he asserts the reverse position that the practice of the individual depends upon the original practice of all things. For Dōgen, original practice-enlightenment is co-dependently arisen.²⁴

²⁴ In “Gyōji” Dōgen extends this principle to include the practice-enlightenment of the buddhas and ancestors:

The proponent of licensed evil may also say that since enlightenment is not the elimination of the defilements, there is no need to engage in practice. But Dōgen teaches that although enlightenment is not the elimination of the defilements, there is always a need to engage in practice. For Dōgen, enlightenment is not the eradication of the defilements, but it is the realization that the defilements are empty. Although the delusions and desires are not eradicated in *shinjin datsuraku*, they are nevertheless realized as empty; and in order to realize emptiness it is necessary to engage in the practice of casting aside ego-attachment. Students of the Way must always renounce self-clinging and allow the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self in order to manifest-verify-attain the Buddha-Way. Since this renunciation is precisely practice, students of the Way must always practice in the midst of defilement – never leaving defilements but realizing the emptiness of defilements. In these ways, Dōgen maintains *both* the nondual original enlightenment standpoint *and* asserts the need to practice.

In the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dogen said that ‘practice’ included zazen, the monastic life, and refraining from evil actions. In order to further illustrate how practice is enlightenment, the remainder of this thesis will turn from a general discussion of ‘practice’ towards Dōgen’s more specific teachings on zazen, monastic life, and precept-practice. In so doing, it will become even more clear that these particular activities are justified as practice-manifestation-verification-attainment because they are activities of wholehearted non-seeking.

by the continuous practice (*gyōji*) of all buddhas and ancestors, your practice is actualized and your great road opens up. By your continuous practice, the continuous practice of all buddhas is actualized and the great road of all buddhas opens up... your continuous practice of this day is a seed of all buddhas and the practice of all buddhas. All buddhas are actualized and sustained by your continuous practice. By not sustaining your continuous practice, you would be excluding buddhas, not nurturing buddhas, excluding continuous practice, not being born and dying simultaneously with all buddhas, and not studying and practicing with all buddhas” (Tanahashi 1999, 114-5).

Chapter Three

Zazen

Introduction

In the *Fukanzazengi* (Universal Promotion of the Principle of Zazen)²⁵ Dōgen states, “[Zazen] is the practice-realization of totally culminated enlightenment.... You must know that when you are doing zazen, right there the authentic Dharma is manifesting itself” (Waddell/Abe 4). For Dōgen, zazen is immediately and nondually itself practice-manifestation-verification-attainment.

Were I to ask Dōgen, “How should I live my life? And why should I live that way?” he would probably tell me, “Just sit because it is the practice-realization of totally culminated enlightenment.” In the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dōgen says: “Zazen is the practice of the Buddha. Zazen is the ultimate practice,” and he emphasizes wholeheartedly engaging in zazen without seeking. This chapter explores in more detail why it is that the activity of zazen is considered by Dōgen to be practice-realization. What is it about zazen that makes it so special so as to be ‘the practice-realization of totally culminated enlightenment’? Why is the activity of zazen privileged as manifestation-verification-attainment? Why did Dōgen choose zazen as the most important practice, above all other practices? In answering these questions I will also develop a model for understanding why Dōgen considers monastic life and precept-practice to be the realization of the Way.

Undefined Zazen

The *Fukanzazengi* begins by presenting the basic teachings of original enlightenment thought and the basic problem of licensed evil:

²⁵ The *Fukanzazengi* is thought to be Dōgen’s first piece of writing composed in 1227 upon his return from China. But there are two known existent versions of the *Fukanzazengi*, neither of which were written in 1227. Nevertheless, there is compelling evidence that there was a draft written in 1227 (Bielefeldt 1988, 15-34). There are also significant differences between the two existent versions, which can lead to the conclusion that Dōgen’s ideas about zazen changed throughout the course of his teaching career (Bielefeldt 1988, 109-170). The *Fukanzazengi* presented and discussed in this thesis is the so-called popular version, the *Kōroku* text, composed sometime between 1242-46 (Bielefeldt 1988, 35-42).

The Way is originally perfect and all-pervading. How could it be contingent upon practice and realization? The Dharma-vehicle is utterly free and untrammled. What need is there for our concentrated effort? Indeed, the Whole Body is far beyond the world's dust. Who could believe in a means to brush it clean? It is never apart from right where you are. What use is there going off here and there to practice? (Waddell/Abe 2).

Here, Dōgen is posing the question of licensed evil, wondering why practice is necessary if enlightenment is original.

Dōgen responds immediately to this question by saying: “And yet, if there is the slightest discrepancy, the Way is as distant as heaven from earth. If the least like or dislike arises, the mind is lost in confusion” (Waddell/Abe 3). As in his response to licensed evil found in the *Zuimonki*, here in the *Fukanzazengi* Dōgen does not reject the notion that enlightenment is original; rather, just as the *Zuimonki* identifies seeking as the problem, in the *Fukanzazengi* Dōgen identifies craving and aversion as the reason we do not realize original enlightenment. His response is to quote from the *Hsin-shin ming* (Verses on the Faith Mind) attributed to Seng-ts’an, the third Ch’an patriarch. This poem begins:

The Great Way is not difficult
For those not attached to preferences.
When neither love nor hate arises,
All is clear and undisguised.
Separate by the smallest amount, however,
And you are as far from it as heaven is from earth.
If you wish to know the truth,
Then hold no opinions for or against anything.
To set up what you like against what you dislike
Is the disease of the mind.
When the fundamental nature of things is not recognized
The mind's essential peace is disturbed to no avail.
The Way is perfect, as vast space is perfect,
Where nothing is lacking and nothing is in excess.
Indeed, it is due to our grasping and rejecting
That we do not know the true nature of things. (Clark 7)

By referring to this poem in his response to licensed evil, Dōgen is proposing (or restating the fundamental teaching of Buddhism) that it is due to craving and aversion that we fail to manifest-verify-attain the true nature of things. We fail to realize nonduality, selflessness, emptiness, and co-dependent

origination because of our love and hate, like and dislike, grasping and rejection, which is to say our seeking and attachments.

Given that our seeking and attachments are identified as the cause of confusion, it is not surprising that Dōgen describes *jijuyū zanmai* as lacking such defilements. The opening passage of *Bendōwa*, rather than explicitly mention craving and aversion, implies their absence by describing *zazen-jijuyū zanmai* as *mui*, “free from human agency” (Waddell/Abe 8), or “without intention” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 1). He repeats this point throughout *Bendōwa*, later describing *jijuyū zanmai* as “quietness, without intentional activity” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 6). For Dōgen, the “person sitting in *zazen*” is “in the stillness of *samadhi* beyond human agency or artifice” (Waddell/Abe 13). All these descriptions present *zazen-jijuyū zanmai* as a state without self-assertion or intention, craving or aversion.

This presentation of *jijuyū zanmai* as lacking in self-assertion accords with Dōgen’s summary of the difference between delusion and enlightenment presented in *Genjōkōan*: “Carrying the self forward to confirm the myriad dharmas is delusion. The myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self is realization” (Jaffe 102). Here, delusion is presented as the action of a self seeking, grasping, or imposing the self upon the myriad dharmas. But, in enlightenment the self allows the myriad dharmas to advance of themselves and confirm the self’s existence. In enlightenment the self is not asserting itself: it is lacking intention; it has cast aside self-serving craving and aversion. As *mui*, *zazen-jijuyū zanmai* is ‘the myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self.’

In dropping off of craving and aversion in *zazen-jijuyū zanmai* nonduality is realized. ‘Carrying the self forward to confirm the myriad dharmas’ is the usual dualistic consciousness: the subject is considering itself to be separate and independent such that it must move out of itself towards an external object. On the other hand, ‘The myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self’ is (as I discussed in relation to *jijuyū zanmai*) a nondual consciousness that has given up the dualistic view of independent subjects and objects. For Dōgen, the Buddha-Way is realized in non-seeking, in allowing the dharmas to advance and confirm the self.

Defiled Zazen

At this point it may seem as though Dōgen's zazen and enlightenment is a return to an original blank consciousness, utterly devoid of craving and aversion, discrimination and thinking, attachments and passions. But Dōgen criticized those who advocated "returning to the source, back to the origin" (*gengen hempon*) (Kim 2007, 87). The "quietist" view of zazen and enlightenment does not accord with Dōgen's teaching of the recurring presence of the defilements within the greatly awakened, and so it cannot be Dōgen's zazen. Whereas the proponent of licensed evil interprets the presence of the defilements within enlightenment as meaning there is no need to practice, for Dōgen the recurring presence of the defilements within enlightenment means that we must adopt an attitude of casting off defilements in the midst of defilements. We must drop off craving and aversion, discrimination and thinking, attachments and passions in the midst of craving and aversion, discrimination and thinking, attachments and passions. For Dōgen, there is no end to defilements, and they are only a problem when they are attached to and acted upon to assert the self, rather than cast off in sitting still.

As previously discussed, enlightenment is not apart from delusion, and nonduality is not apart from duality, and so self-effacing non-seeking should not be understood as apart from self-assertion and seeking. In *Gakudō-yōjinshū* (Guidelines for Studying the Way) Dōgen writes: "The Dharma turns the self: the self turns the Dharma. When the self readily turns the Dharma, the self is strong and the Dharma is weak. When, on the other hand, the Dharma turns the self, the Dharma is strong and the self is weak. The Buddha Dharma originally includes both of these" (Waddell/Abe 40). To translate this passage into the language of *Genjōkōan*, the strong-self is the self advancing to confirm the dharmas, and the weak-self is the myriad dharmas advancing to confirm the self. By saying, 'The Buddha Dharma originally includes both of these' Dōgen is indicating that great awakening is *both* the myriad dharmas advancing and confirming the self *and* the self advancing and confirming the dharmas. In this way, enlightenment is realized in the midst of delusion, nonduality is realized in the midst of duality, and self-effacing non-seeking is realized in the midst of self-assertion and

seeking. However, while the proponent of licensed evil may take note of the presence of self-assertion within realization as an opportunity to deny the need to practice casting aside the self, for Dōgen the affirmation of self-assertion is only one side of the equation: to merely assert the self is to fail to allow the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self by casting off the self. Although self-assertion is not eradicated or eliminated, it is nevertheless renounced. Dōgen's Way is to cast off self-assertion in the midst of self-assertion; it is to be unattached in the midst of attachment.

Just as great awakening is casting off self assertion in the midst of self-assertion (rather than the elimination of self-assertion), so too is great awakening renouncing passions in the midst of passions (rather than the elimination of passions). In "Gyōji" Dōgen states,

Even the Buddhas and ancestors are not without tender feelings and affections (*on'ai*) but they have thrown them away. The Buddhas and ancestors, too, are not lacking various bonds, yet they have renounced them. Even though you hold them dear, the direct and indirect conditions of self and other are not to be clung to.... If you must care for tender feelings, treat them with compassion; to treat them with compassion means to resolutely relinquish them. (Kim 2004, 20).

Here again Dōgen is teaching that even the great awakening of the Buddhas and ancestors is not cutting off all bonds, but rather an attitude of renunciation, of non-seeking in relation to the various defilements. This is how enlightenment can be with the passions: although they continue to arise, they are always renounced – not attached to or acted upon, but cast off in sitting still. Thus, Dōgen's teaching accords with the second of the four Great Vows of the Zen Bodhisattva: "However inexhaustible the passions are, I vow to extinguish them" (Kim 2004, 204).

Dōgen's teachings also emphasize the idea that zazen is not about stopping and eliminating all discrimination and thought. It is true that Dōgen does often write negatively of discrimination and thinking (Kim 2007, 83). But, in "Zazenshin" (Needle of Zazen) Dōgen vehemently criticizes those who present zazen as "'stopping thoughts, absorbed in quietude' (*sokuryo gyōjaku*)" (Kim 2007, 87); and in "Tashintsu" (The Power to Know Others' Minds) he rejects the practice of "cutting off considerations and forgetting

objects” (*zetsuryo bōen*)” (Bielefeldt 1988, 136).²⁶ The *Fukanzazengi* does give instructions which seem to advocate stopping thoughts:

For the practice of Zen (*sanzen*), a quiet room is suitable. Eat and drink moderately. Cast aside all involvements, and cease all affairs. Do not think good, do not think bad. Do not administer pros and cons. Cease all the movements of the conscious mind, the gauging of all thoughts and views (*nen sō kan*). (Waddell/Abe 3)

But, concerning these words, Bielefeldt writes:

we should probably not understand this passage as teaching a technique of meditation in which the mind is brought to a halt. We are dealing here with the preparation for *zazen*; given its context, the passage should probably be viewed as a Zen comment on the true meaning of suspending worldly affairs. (Bielefeldt 1988, 118)

Thus, Dōgen is here advocating the relinquishment of both the outer world of involvements and affairs and the inner world of thoughts and views. He is, in effect, admonishing his disciples to adopt an attitude of non-seeking or non-attachment: cast off what you personally consider to be good and bad, advantageous or injurious; cast off all that you hold to be true, your likes and dislikes, your self-serving seeking and avoiding. Thus, Dōgen is advocating an attitude of non-seeking, non-attachment, or renunciation.

In *Bendōwa* Dōgen identifies chasing thoughts as a reason we do not realize original enlightenment:

we should remember that from the beginning we have never lacked the supreme state of bodhi, and we will receive it and use it forever. At the same time, because we cannot perceive it directly, we are prone to beget random intellectual ideas, and because we chase after these as if they were real things, we vainly pass by the great state of truth. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 10).

Here, ideas and thoughts themselves are not presented as the problem; rather it is our attachment to (‘chasing after’) ideas and thoughts which is the problem. Similarly, in the *Fukanzazengi* Dōgen instructs his disciples to

cease from practice based on intellectual understanding, pursuing words and following after speech, and learn the backward step (*taiho*) that turns your light inward to illuminate your self. Body and mind will drop away of themselves and your original face (*honrai menmoku*) will manifest itself. (Waddell/Abe 3)

²⁶ For more examples of Dōgen’s rejection of “quietism,” see Bielefeldt 1988, 136.

Here again the problem is our attachment to thoughts, our “pursuing” and “following” ideas. But, by renouncing them in the “backward step” attachments drop away in *shinjin datsuraku*, and original enlightenment is realized.²⁷

In “Zazenshin” Dogen states that discriminative thinking occurs within zazen even while zazen is without seeking or avoiding. As such, there is the realization of nonduality in the context of discriminative thinking. In this fascicle Dōgen praises, quotes, and comments upon the *Zazenshin* of Ch’an Master Cheng-chüeh (1091-1157), a poem which summarizes the important points of Cheng-chüeh’s view of zazen:

Pivotal essence of every buddha,
Essential pivot of every patriarch.
Not touching things, yet sensing,
Not opposing circumstances, yet being illuminated....
The sensing is naturally subtle:
There has been no discriminating thought....
The sensing, without any duality, is singular....
The illumination, without any grasping, is complete....
(Nishijima/Cross 1996, 101)

This poem is usually read as advocating the elimination of discriminating thought, which distinguishes between likes and dislikes. In this view, it is by eliminating discriminating thought that there is not seeking (‘not touching things’), not avoiding (‘not opposing circumstances’), and not craving (‘without any grasping’), which allows for the realization of nonduality (‘sensing, without any duality’).

But in Dōgen’s reading the phrase ‘There has been no discriminating thought’ (*sō mufunbetsu*) becomes ‘It is ever already discriminative thinking’ (*isō funbetsu*), indicating the presence of discriminative thinking within realization (Kim 2007, 84). Thus, Dōgen comments, “*Every buddha*, in the state of already having discrimination, has already been realized” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 103). Dōgen makes this change without criticizing the notions that zazen is ‘not touching things’ and ‘not opposing circumstances’. He also does not refute that zazen is without grasping and that it is the realization of nonduality. But, unlike the usual reading of Cheng-chüeh’s poem, Dōgen does not conflate discriminative thinking with craving

²⁷ For a more detailed explanation of this passage, see Bielefeldt 1988, 125.

and avoiding, or place it in opposition to the realization of nonduality. For Dōgen, it is possible to be engaged in discriminative thinking without craving or avoiding, without asserting the self's likes and dislikes. Granted, "The activities of discrimination may be self-centered, discriminative, and restrictive" (and this is why Dōgen often writes negatively of discriminative thinking) but if "discriminative activities" are "freed of substantialist, ego-centric obsessions" it is enlightened thinking (Kim 2007, 84). Since discriminative thinking without self-assertion is the realization of nonduality, zazen is not 'stopping thoughts, absorbed in quietude' (*sokuryo gyōjaku*). Zazen is casting aside intentional activity, but it is not the absence of thinking. Thoughts continue to arise and they must continue to be cast off.

In sum, for Dōgen, there is no end to defilements, to self-assertion, delusive passions, discriminations and thoughts. But, unlike the proponent of licensed evil, for Dōgen the presence of these all-too-human characteristics is only a problem when they are attached to and acted upon to assert the self, instead of being renounced in sitting still.

Do Not Seek to Become a Buddha

In the last chapter I examined how practice is realization because it is the effort to become a buddha. It is also true that Dōgen says that in zazen we must not seek to become a buddha. For Dōgen, the imperative to cast off preference and aversion must be extended to include not only mundane pursuits, but also to include seeking to become a buddha or aversion to not being buddha. In *Zuimonki* Dōgen says that if people "practice trying to improve themselves, they have not become free from their ego. [The] desire to attain buddhahood [is a] selfish desire for fame and profit" (Okumura 193). In *Genjōkōan*, Dōgen says, "The moment you begin seeking the Dharma, you move far from its environs" (Waddell/Abe 41); and in *Eihei Kōroku* he says, "If you practice Zen by designing a buddha, Buddha becomes increasingly estranged" (Leighton/Okumura 2004, 305). Thus, in the *Fukanzazengi*, Dōgen states, "Have no designs on becoming a Buddha" (Waddell/Abe 3), and in *Bendōhō* (The Model for Engaging the Way) he writes, "do not be concerned with your own actualization"

(Leighton/Okumura 1996, 63).²⁸ Similarly, in “Zazenshin” Dōgen says, “there is the truth that zazen does not expect to become a Buddha. The principle is evident that to become a Buddha is irrelevant to zazen” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 95). Thus, Dōgen’s zazen is not concerned with becoming a Buddha; it has renounced not only “mundane” craving and aversion but also “sacred” craving and aversion.

Dōgen emphasizes the importance of not seeking to become a buddha in his commentaries on the kōan of Nan-yüeh’s ‘polishing a tile to make a mirror.’ Kim summarizes the story:

Ma-tsu Tao-i (709-788) was practicing meditation everyday. The teacher Nan-yüeh Huai-jang (677-744) happened to see him and asked: ‘What is your aim in practicing zazen?’ ‘My aim is to become a Buddha,’ he answered. Then the teacher picked up a tile and began to polish it on a stone in front of the hermitage where Ma-tsu had been meditating. Bewildered by this strange act, Ma-tsu asked: ‘What is Teacher doing?’ ‘I am polishing this tile to make a mirror.’ ‘How can you make a mirror by polishing a tile?’ The teacher’s reply was: ‘Likewise, how can you become a Buddha by practicing zazen?’ (Kim 2004, 67)

While it is possible to interpret this kōan as a call to abandon the practice of zazen, for Dōgen the kōan functions as a warning against seeking to become a Buddha (*fuzu-sabutsu*) through the practice of zazen. In the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dōgen mentions and interprets this kōan: “When Nan-yüeh made his remark about not trying to polish a piece of tile to make a mirror, he was warning his disciple Ma-tsu against striving to become a Buddha by practicing zazen. He was not trying to proscribe zazen itself” (Masunaga 43). For Dōgen, the problem is not zazen but seeking to become a buddha.

In not seeking to become a Buddha, zazen is the practice of buddha. In “Zazenshin” Dōgen writes, “the practice of a Buddha ... does not seek to make a Buddha” (Bielefeldt 140). Zazen is sitting buddha because it is without seeking or avoiding buddhahood: “Who, in the non-abiding Dharma, could have preference or aversion for not being buddha or preference or

²⁸ In *Zuimonki* Dōgen is recorded as saying, “Once you have entered the Buddha-Way, you should practice various activities just for the sake of the buddha-dharma. Do not think of gaining something in return. [Please] be free from the expectation of gaining a reward” (Okumura 39).

aversion for being buddha? Because it has dropped off [preference and aversion even] before the moment of preference and aversion, [sitting buddha] is sitting buddha” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 97). In the *Zuimonki* commentary on this kōan Dōgen states, “Sitting itself is the practice of the buddha. Sitting itself is non-doing (*fui*, 不為)” (Okumura 101). Masunaga translates *fui* as “the ultimate practice” (Masunaga 43), and Shoyu translates it as “absolute doing” (Shoyu 64). For Dōgen, zazen is Buddha-activity, which is ultimate or absolute activity. Moreover, given what Dōgen says of zazen in *Fukanzazengi* and “Zazenshin” it is likely that the notion in *Zuimonki* that zazen is *fui* also means that zazen is “non-doing” in the sense that it is activity without preference or aversion. This non-doing activity is activity without ‘the gauging of all thoughts and views’; it is the ‘practice of the buddha’ – the buddha-activity of manifesting-verifying-attaining the buddha-dharma. Thus, zazen is practice-manifestation-verification-attainment of buddha precisely because it is casting off all craving and aversion, even craving to be buddha and aversion to not being buddha.²⁹ Zazen is complete non-seeking, which realizes the Buddha-Way.

Undefined Practice-Realization

Dōgen ends “Zazengi” by describing zazen as “undefined practice-realization” (Waddell/Abe 110). For Dōgen, sitting performed without seeking some result is practice-realization because it is not defiled by the dualities between means-and-ends or subject-and-object. In describing practice and realization as ‘undefined’ (*fuzenna no*), Dōgen is referring to one of his favorite kōan, a dialogue between the Sixth Ancestor Hui-neng and Nan-yüeh. Okumura/Leighton summarize the kōan:

²⁹ In *Fukanzazengi* Dōgen ends his zazen instruction with these words: “Think of not thinking. How do you think not-thinking. Nonthinking. This in itself is the essential art of zazen” (Waddell/Abe 4). “Zazengi” instructions end with almost exactly the same words, which are a reference to a dialogue between Yüeh-shan (745-828) and a monk. There has been great debate as to the correct interpretation of this kōan both inside and outside of Dōgen studies, and to my mind Kim has provided the best interpretation (Kim 2007, 79-98). Nevertheless, within Dōgen’s commentary on this kōan in “Zazenshin” he states quite simply: “The point, in manifest form, is that there is acting buddha which does not expect to become buddha” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 93). Whatever else this kōan may mean, for Dōgen it means (in part) that zazen is acting buddha because it does not seek to become a buddha.

The Sixth Ancestor asked, ‘What is it that thus comes?’ After eight years [Nan-yüeh] was able to answer, ‘Any explanation misses it.’ The Sixth Ancestor asked, ‘If so, is there practice and enlightenment (*shu* and *shō*)?’ [Nan-yüeh] responded, ‘It is not that there is no practice and enlightenment, but only that they cannot be defiled.’ The Sixth Ancestor agreed, saying, ‘It is just this nondefilement that all buddha ancestors maintain.’ (Okumura/Leighton 49)

Since *shu* is *shō*, the nondefilement of practice and enlightenment is readily understood as not being defiled by the duality of practice and enlightenment. The nonduality of practice and enlightenment indicates the nonduality of ‘means’ and ‘ends’ in Dōgen’s thought. In the *Fukanzazengi* Dōgen states, “The zazen I speak of is not learning meditation” (Waddell/Abe 4), and elsewhere he states that zazen is not “‘meditation of awaiting enlightenment’ (*taigo-zen*) or ‘step-by-step meditation’ (*shūzen*)” or “‘practice prior to enlightenment’ (*shōzen no shu*)” (Kim 2004, 64). All of these meditations conceive and distinguish meditation and enlightenment in a dualistic means-ends relationship. Unlike these sorts of meditation, Dōgen’s zazen is immediately and nondually itself realization, undefiled by the duality of means-and-ends.

To be undefiled by the duality of means-and-ends is to be undefiled by the duality of subject-and-object. To be in a means-ends relationship is to be in a subject-object relationship because to engage in practice as ‘a means to attain an end’ is to dualistically posit that there is a subject practicing in order to achieve the object of that practice – i.e. enlightenment, buddhahood. When practicing with ‘the intention to become a buddha,’ buddha is imagined as an object that the subject can attain by means of practice. But, since sentient beings are already enlightened or originally Buddha, enlightenment-buddha should not be sought outside. By engaging in non-seeking practice, buddha is not objectified and the subject realizes original Buddhahood. In ceasing to objectify buddha by conceiving buddha as an end, practice itself is buddha.

It is in “Busshō” that Dōgen emphasizes that buddha should not be objectified. In this fascicle Dōgen comments upon a statement from the *Nirvana Sūtra*, *Issai shujō kotogotoku busshō ari* “All sentient beings without exception have the Buddha-nature.” This statement can easily be understood

as positing ‘Buddha-nature’ as an object within sentient beings. In this situation, Buddha-nature is made into an object (albeit an internal object), and practice becomes the activity of a subject seeking to become a buddha. Thus, the *Nirvana Sūtra* constructs Buddha-nature as the purpose or end of practice, such that practice is understood as the means to attain Buddha-nature. In this reading there is a duality between means and ends, between practice and realization.

To avoid this interpretation, Dōgen engages in a typically playful reconstruction of language and meaning to transform the phrase into the non-sentence *Issai shujō shitsuu busshō* “All sentient being, total existence, Buddha-nature”. In the original, *kotogotoku* is an adverb modifying the verb *ari*, thus meaning “without exception have.” But Dōgen reads this as the compound *shitsuu*, meaning “all existence.” In this way, Dōgen’s reading is not a sentence with a subject and a verb. It is best not to say that “all existence *is* Buddha-nature” because that would contain an implicit dualism between “all existence” and “Buddha-nature.” Similarly, it is also best not to say that “sentient beings *are* Buddha-nature” because that would also imply that there are two things linked together. In Dōgen’s reading, all dualities collapse into the non-sentence “All sentient being, total existence, Buddha-nature” (Hori, personal communication, June 2005). By reading the *Nirvana Sūtra* in this way, Dōgen is emphasizing the point that Buddha-nature should not be objectified. We should not even say that we *are* originally Buddha; rather, ‘All sentient being, Buddha-nature.’ By de-objectifying Buddha-nature, there is no duality between subject-and-object, means-and-ends, or practice-and-realization.

In sum, to engage in sitting without ‘the intention to become a buddha’ Buddha-nature is not objectified and sitting is not considered to be the means to attain Buddhahood; rather, (slipping into dualistic language because of the demand for coherent sentences,) the means *is* the end, the subject *is* the object, and practice *is itself* buddha in the oneness of practice and realization.

Wholehearted Effort

Although Dōgen teaches that students should not strive to become a buddha, he also teaches that effort is essential in order for practice-and-realization to be undefiled by the dualities of means-ends and subject-object. In *Bendōwa* Dōgen states, “We must know that, in order not to allow defilement of enlightenment inseparable from practice, the buddha ancestors vigilantly teach us not to slacken practice” (Okumura/Leighton 30). In the context of zazen, *Fukanzazengi* states, “If you concentrate your effort single-mindedly, you are thereby negotiating the Way with your practice-realization undefiled” (Waddell/Abe 5). For Dōgen, zazen is practice-realization not only because it is *mui*, casting aside craving and aversion; zazen is practice-realization because it is also sitting with effort.

In the last chapter I examined Dōgen’s teaching of *shushō ittō* and argued that practice is enlightenment because practice is wholehearted effort in pursuit of truth (*kufu-bendō*). So, it comes as no surprise that in “Zazenshin” Dōgen says that, “zazen is always ‘striving to make a buddha,’ and that zazen is invariably that ‘striving’ which is itself ‘making a buddha’” (Kim 2007, 28). Kim notes that the word he translates as striving, *zu*, “has a wide range of meanings: (1) ‘to intend,’ ‘to desire,’ ‘to seek,’ ‘to expect,’ ‘to look for,’ and (2) ‘to plan,’ ‘to design,’ ‘to organize,’ ‘to project,’ ‘to picture’” (Kim 2007, 29). Thus, as Bielefeldt states, “Dōgen prefers to stress what might almost be called the intentionality of enlightenment and to interpret Buddhahood as the ongoing commitment to make a Buddha” (Bielefeldt 1988, 145). For Dōgen, the effort of zazen is itself enlightenment.

This effort of sitting is practice-realization because it is the realization of nonduality. In *Bendōwa* Dōgen writes, “The wholehearted practice of the Way (*kufu bendō*) that I am talking about allows all things to exist in enlightenment and enables us to live out oneness (*ichinyo*) in the path of emancipation” (Okumura/Leighton 19). In *Genjōkōan* Dōgen makes it clear that effort enacts nonduality because it allows no division between subject-and-object. Here he writes, “Mustering our bodies and minds (*shinjin o koshite*) we see things, and mustering our bodies and minds we hear sounds, thereby we understand them intimately (*shitashiku*). However, it is not like a reflection dwelling in a mirror, nor is it like the moon and the water” (Kim

2004, 105). Within the context of ‘mustering’ there is intimate nondual realization. As Kim comments, “The Way [is] ‘intimately understood’ ... by the mustering of our body-mind. Humans and the Way [are] no longer in a dualistic relationship like that of the moon and the water, or the mirror and the reflection, or the knower and the known” (Kim 2004, 105). Similarly, in his commentary on Cheng-chüeh’s *Zazenshin*, Dōgen again emphasizes effort. To make his point Dōgen comments upon the line from Cheng-chüeh’s “The sensing, without any duality, is singular.” This “sensing” is nondual perception, without any duality between knower and known, sener and sensed. This sensing “is totally vigorous.... To use even one mere instant of the present *sensing* is to garner the mountains and rivers of the whole Universe and, exerting total effort, to *sense* them” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 103). It is necessary to be ‘exerting total effort’ in order for there to be intimate ‘sensing’: “Unless our own *sensing* is in the state of direct familiarity with mountains and rivers, there cannot be a single instance of sensing or half an instance of understanding” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 103). By exerting total effort in zazen there is intimate nondual sensing.

Before moving on it is necessary to also say that (of course) differentiation remains within nondual sensing. In “Gabyō” (A Painted Rice Cake) the notion of exerting total effort in ‘sensing’ is expressed as “The total experience of a single thing” (*ippōtsū*), which

does not deprive a thing of its own unique particularity. It places a thing neither against others nor against none.... A single total experience is a single thing in its totality. The total experience of a single thing is one with that of all things. (Kim 2004, 66).

Exerting total effort in the total experience of a single thing is the realization of nonduality, but it does not dissolve the uniqueness of particular things.

Why Choose Zazen?

In spite of all the above, I have still not explained why zazen – out of all practices – is special. Granted, zazen is wholehearted non-seeking, and is therefore the realization of the Buddha-Way, but why does Dōgen choose zazen as the most important practice? Dōgen is asked about his selection of

zazen in *Bendōwa*, question two: “Why is this [zazen] alone the true gate [to buddha-dharma]” (Okumura/Leighton 1997, 24)? Here is Dōgen’s response:

Great Teacher Shakyamuni correctly transmitted the wondrous method for attaining the Way, and the tathagatas of the three times (past, present, and future) also all attain the Way through zazen. For this reason, [zazen] has been conveyed from one person to another as the true gate. Not only that, but all the ancestors of India and China attained the Way through zazen. Therefore I am now showing the true gate to human and celestial beings. (Okumura/Leighton 1977, 24)

Thus, although we may not find it intellectually satisfying, Dōgen advocates zazen alone by turning towards historical evidence: he justifies his choice of zazen because it is the path of all buddhas and ancestors. Earlier in *Bendōwa* Dōgen also states that, “the many patriarchs and the many buddhas, who dwelt in and maintained the Buddha-Dharma, all relied on the practice of sitting erect in the samadhi of receiving and using the self, and esteemed [this practice] as the right way to disclose the state of realization”

(Nishijima/Cross 1994, 4). The *Fukanzazengi* also cites Buddhist history, specifically the legends the Buddha’s “six years of upright sitting” and Bodhidharma’s “nine years of wall sitting,” to justify sitting practice (Waddell/Abe 3). Moreover, discussing the transmission of the “Buddha-mind seal ... in India and China” Dōgen says, “It is simply a matter of devotion to sitting, total commitment to immovable sitting. Although it is said that there are as many minds as there are people, all of them must negotiate the way solely in zazen” (Waddell/Abe 5). As Bielefeldt notes, “in fact, throughout his writings, Dōgen returns again and again to these historical grounds for his selection of *zazen*” (Bielefeldt 1988, 168). Thus, Bielefeldt concludes that Dōgen’s privileging of zazen above all other practices rests “on historical demonstration.... In the end the selection of *zazen* as the one true practice is an act of faith in a particular vision of sacred history” (Bielefeldt 1988, 168).³⁰

³⁰ The actual historical accuracy of Dōgen’s sacred history is, in a sense, irrelevant. I am just presenting how Dōgen justifies zazen practice, not questioning the validity of his historical claims. Dōgen’s emphasis upon zazen is understandable: he was a Ch’an/Zen monk, and these sorts of Buddhists practice a lot of zazen. Ju-ching emphasized zazen, and so does his student. It is also worth mentioning that Dōgen’s exclusive focus on a single practice was the style of the so-called reformers of the Kamakura period (see Stone 231-2)

In spite of Bielefeldt's conclusion and Dōgen's tendency to turn towards historical evidence to demonstrate the validity of his emphasis upon zazen, I find myself still wondering why zazen might be special. I find a clue in Dōgen's response to *Bendōwa's* question six: "Among the four different postures (walking, standing, sitting, lying down), why does Buddhism encourage entering realization through meditation only in sitting" (Okumura/Leighton 29)? Here is Dōgen's response:

It is not possible to thoroughly comprehend the path by which the buddhas from the past, one after another, have been practicing and entering realization. If you seek a reason, you must know that it is only because [sitting] is what has been used by Buddhist practitioners, and beyond this you do not need to search. However, the Ancestor [Nagarjuna] praises it, saying 'Zazen itself is the dharma gate of ease and delight (nirvana).' So couldn't we infer that it is because [sitting] is the most stable and peaceful of the four postures? Moreover, this is not the path of one or two buddhas, but all buddhas and ancestors follow this path. (Okumura/Leighton 29)

Here, Dōgen is again emphasizing Buddhist history, but he also cites Nagarjuna as stating, "Sitting in Zazen is the peaceful and joyful gate of Dharma" (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 12). This leads Dōgen to ponder: "So couldn't we infer that it is because [sitting] is the most stable and peaceful of the four postures" (Okumura/Leighton 29)? To me, the notion that zazen is the most stable and peaceful posture provides a clue as to why zazen might be preferred above all other practices. In this chapter I presented zazen as practice-realization because it is casting aside craving or aversion. It seems to me that indulging in craving and aversion is less likely to occur when in a stable and peaceful posture. The zazen posture itself is conducive to renunciation of craving and aversion. By just sitting still, without physically reacting to thoughts and passions, the habits of like and dislike are forgotten, the self is forgotten, and the myriad dharmas can advance and confirm the self in the realization of emptiness, nonduality, and co-dependent origination.³¹

³¹ Because Dōgen himself does not explicitly discuss them, a more complete investigation of the many possible benefits of the zazen-posture itself is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Conclusion

Dōgen's own *Zazenshin* describes zazen as “without design yet it makes effort” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 106). It is “without any stain or defilement” (Bielefeldt 1988, 204), and without “divergence” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 106). Dōgen's zazen is neither seeking nor avoiding mundane reality, nor is it having designs on becoming a buddha, even while it is striving to make a buddha.³² It is the realization of nonduality because it is casting aside self-assertion and thereby allowing the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self. Moreover, by not objectifying buddha, zazen is practice-realization undefiled by the dualisms of means-and-ends or subject-and-object. However, although it is not self-assertion through seeking or avoiding, zazen is nevertheless vigorous activity. It is the total effort of zazen which makes sitting practice-realization because it is in total exertion that there is intimate knowing undefiled by the duality of subject-and-object.

When Dōgen responds to Ejō's question of licensed evil in the *Zuimonki* he emphasizes the importance of wholehearted zazen without seeking. Dōgen's zazen can be understood as a response to licensed evil because zazen is not living a life according to personal inclination. Zazen is renouncing self-assertion, and so it is practice-realization. Without casting off craving and aversion in zazen there is no realization of original enlightenment. While this is true, it is equally true that the question of licensed evil is also about life “off-the-cushion.” Thus, in the *Zuimonki* response to licensed evil Dōgen also mentions the importance of living a monastic life and refraining from evil actions. With the understanding gained in this chapter concerning the reasons why zazen is practice-realization it is now possible to examine Dōgen's teachings on monastic life and precept-practice in order to determine why they too are practice-realization.

³² It is beyond my abilities to comprehend how practice can be striving to make a buddha without having designs on becoming a buddha. I must leave it to others more capable than myself to reconcile these aspects of Dōgen's teachings.

Chapter Four

Rituals and Precepts

Introduction

Dōgen's Zen is often considered to be the sect of "just sitting" (*shinkan-taza*). Indeed, given that he describes *zazen* as the way of realization, it is not surprising that Dōgen repeatedly advocates only practicing *zazen*. In the *Zuimonki*, for instance, Dōgen states, "The most important point in the study of the Way is *zazen*.... Therefore, students must concentrate on *zazen* alone and not bother about other things. The Way of the Buddhas and Patriarchs is *zazen* alone" (Masunaga 96-7). And again from *Bendōwa*: "After the initial meeting with a [good] counselor we never again need to burn incense, to do prostrations, to recite Buddha's name, to practice confession, or to read sutras. Just sit" (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 4).

However, despite the strong language, Dōgen's admonition to 'just sit' to the exclusion of all other practices is largely rhetorical. As mentioned, immediately subsequent to his own great awakening, Dōgen entered Ju-ching's room, burned incense and did prostrations. As a teacher, he advocated confession (Kim 2004, 215-6) and reading sutras (Kim 2004, 231-4). It is also worth noting that in his list of practices that should be abandoned, Dōgen does not include monastic ritual practice or practicing the precepts, the two aspects of Dōgen's practice that this chapter will examine.

When Ejō poses the question of licensed evil in the *Zuimonki* by interpreting original enlightenment thought as justifying a life lived according to personal inclinations, Dōgen responds by advocating living a monastic life and practicing the precepts; he says, "detach yourself from worldly affairs and evil actions." By saying that these practices are "inherently the Buddhadharma," Dōgen is justifying the need to engage in these practices by indicating that they are themselves practice-realization. Moreover, he also emphasizes the need to engage in these practices "off-the-cushion" without seeking: he advocates detachment from "worldly affairs and evil actions, even though they may attract you" and practicing "the austerities without any anticipation." Moreover, "Practice without even

seeking after the completion of the Way or the attainment of the result.” Dōgen’s response to licensed evil is to say that living the monastic life and practicing the precepts is living a life of complete non-seeking; it is “seeking nothing for yourself” and “accords with the principle of ‘not seeking the Buddhadharma on the outside.’”

In the last chapter I examined Dōgen’s teachings on zazen and discussed how zazen is practice-realization because it is the wholehearted casting off of self-assertion and realizing nonduality; in this chapter I examine Dōgen’s teachings on monastic life and precept-practice and discuss how for Dōgen these practices are designed to eliminate self-assertiveness such that wholehearted engagement with these practices is also undefiled practice-realization.

Transmitting Ritual

Compared to his emphasis upon zazen, Dōgen’s teachings on monastic ritual have often been considered a curious and relatively unimportant aspect of his teachings. However, Dōgen himself emphasized that his transmission of Ju-ching’s Ch’an entailed not only zazen but also the customs and standards of monastic practice (of which zazen can be considered one aspect).³³ As already mentioned, one of the primary concerns (besides zazen) found in Dōgen’s record of his time in China is “the necessary elements of the meditation hall, and monastic rules and precepts to be observed” (Kodera 58). And, when Dōgen returned from China, his monasteries “were the first in Japan to include a monks hall (*sōdō*) within which monks lived and meditated according to Chinese-style monastic regulations” (Bodiford 1993, 7).

At the beginning of *Bendōwa* – before launching into his discussion of zazen – Dōgen mentions the importance of the monastic rules in his transmission. Considering his return from China, Dōgen writes,

I decided to compile a record of the customs and standards that I experienced first-hand in the Zen monasteries of the great Kingdom of Sung.... I will leave this record to people ... so that they might know the right Dharma in the Buddha’s lineage. This may be my true mission. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 3)

³³ For an examination of zazen as a ritual practice see Leighton 2007.

Dōgen also returns to the importance of monastic regulations at the conclusion of *Bendōwa* when he states, “In addition, there are standards and conventions for monasteries and temples, but there is not enough time to teach them now, and they must not be [taught] in haste” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 22).

Many of Dōgen’s teachings on the proper standards and conventions are collected in the *Eihei Shingi*, which is dedicated to precise detailed instructions concerning proper ritual action around the monastery. For example, in the “Bendōhō” chapter of the *Eihei Shingi* Dōgen describes the daily routine activities for the monks, including, for instance, how to properly enter and move around the monks hall. There are also fascicles in the *Shōbōgenzō*, such as “Senjō” (Washing) and “Senmen” (Washing the Face), that prescribe monastic customs with meticulous exactitude. Martin Collcutt has calculated that nearly a third of the fascicles in the *Shōbōgenzō* “are devoted wholly or in part to the detailed regulation of such everyday monastic activities as meditation, prayer, study, sleep, dress, the preparation and taking of meals, and bathing and purification” (Collcutt 148).

Dōgen justifies his detailed regulations in the same way he legitimates *zazen*, by referring to Buddhist history. Dōgen justifies the specifics of daily rituals by saying that they are the ways the Buddhas and ancestors acted. For example, when Dōgen discusses cleaning the teeth by chewing a willow twig in “Senmen,” he justifies it by citing a scripture that records an instance when the Buddha cleaned his teeth by chewing a willow twig; Dōgen concludes: “Clearly, chewing the willow twig is a practice which buddhas, bodhisattvas, and the Buddha’s disciples unfailing retain” (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 148). “Senmen” also justifies washing the face because it is “the lifeblood of the Buddhist patriarchs” (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 143). He concludes “Senmen” by saying, “In sum, chewing the willow twig and washing the face are the right Dharma of eternal buddhas and people who are devoted to practicing the truth with the will to the truth should practice and experience them” (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 152). Indeed, Dōgen considered cleansing to be integral to the Ch’an he transmitted; in “Senmen” he taught,

In the Buddha-dharma the principles of cleansing with water are always prescribed. To wash the body, to wash the mind, to wash the feet, to wash the face, to wash the eyes, to wash the mouth, to wash after the two acts of urination and excretion, to wash the hands, to wash a bowl, to wash a robe, or to wash the head – all these acts comprise the right Dharma of the Buddhas and ancestors of the three periods. (Kim 2004, 182)

More generally, throughout the *Zuimonki* Dōgen equates ritual practice with “the actions of the Buddhas and Patriarchs” (Masunaga 37). Thus, Dōgen instructs his disciples, “you should practice the Way of the previous sages and emulate the conduct of the patriarchs.... just practice in the manner of your predecessors” (Masunaga 45). Dōgen justifies the specifics of daily activity by referring to the history of Buddhist practice. Dōgen ends one of his essays containing ritual instructions with these words: “The foregoing instructions are the body and mind of the Buddhas and ancestors: revere and follow them” (Kim 2004, 45).

Ritual as Non-Seeking

In addition to his historical justification for practicing monastic ritual, for Dōgen rituals must be followed because they are activities of non-seeking, and as such are practice-realization. To live “seeking nothing for yourself” is to live practice-realization. To help his disciples live without seeking Dōgen emphasized conformity to communal life and adherence to exact instructions prescribing the correct way to perform all daily activities at the monastery. By prioritizing the life of the community and insisting his disciples act according to the precise instructions concerning how to engage in all activities, Dōgen attempts to preclude the possibility of leading a life according to personal inclination. For Dōgen, the self should not be asserted in any activity. His monastic manuals reveal that he sought the complete ritualization of all activity. By prescribing the proper ways to perform all activities, he sought to remove any hint of personal inclination. Conforming to the minute details of this practice, even the practitioner’s subtle avenues used to express their particular individual self is blocked. In this way, the monastic life is the life of non-seeking, and is therefore practice-realization.

For Dōgen, it is imperative to harmonize ourselves with the community. In *Zuimonki* Dōgen is recorded as saying, “Students who have been moved to study the Way should merely follow the rest of the assembly in their conduct” (Masunaga 103). In “Bendōhō” he writes:

when the assembly is sitting, sit together with them; as the assembly lies down, lie down also. In activity and stillness at one with the community, throughout deaths and rebirths do not separate from the monastery. Standing out has no benefit; being different from others is not our conduct. (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 63)

He also states: “When you attentively follow the assembly according to this dharma, it is exactly the criterion for engaging the way” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 72-3). For Dōgen, the self is to give itself over completely to the monastic community. Following the ways of the community – unable to ‘stand out’ or ‘be different’ – a monastic is unable to assert themselves, or express their own preferences and aversions.

For Dōgen, following the ways of the community means, in part, following a teacher. The *Zuimonki* emphasizes following a teacher as a way to abandon personal preference. For example, “Even if they go against your own preferences, if they are your teacher’s words ... you must follow them completely. This is an essential point you should be careful about in learning the Way” (Okumura 183). Even more directly, the *Zuimonki* ends with these words: “True attainment of the Way is casting aside body and mind and following your teacher directly. If you maintain this attitude, you will be a true person of the Way. This is a primary secret” (Okumura 223).

Following the ways of the community also involves respecting elders. In the “Taitaiko Gogejarihō” (Dharma when Meeting Senior Instructors), Dōgen lists sixty-two rules of appropriate behavior for junior monks when meeting senior monks, including: “If you are admonished, bow politely and listen and accept it.... Always arouse a humble mind.... When a senior is not yet asleep, do not go to sleep first.... When a senior has not yet started eating, do not eat first.... When a senior has not yet sat down, do not seat yourself first (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 121-125).³⁴ By respecting and conforming oneself to the demands of elders, personal preferences are cast aside in

³⁴ Much to my dismay, because it reveals my lack of progress in the Way, rule #5 states: “Never laugh raucously without shame or embarrassment” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 121).

communal life. The specific details of ritual life are designed “to renounce the small self” (Kita/Nagaya 47). For example, “When the teacher takes a drink of tea, the students also drink; when the teacher takes a bite of cake, the students do likewise.... By this the student [is able to] carry out their practice faithfully and without permitting any personal mind to creep in” (Kita/Nagaya 54-5).³⁵ By demanding conformity to ritual forms of respecting elders, Dōgen’s monastic life is constructed so as to not permit the ‘personal mind to creep in.’

Of course, the monastic tries to find subtle ways to express themselves. By making noises getting down from the *tan* (meditation platform), or by brushing off the *tan* loudly, or by walking heavily, or by wearing clothes or brushing teeth in a particular way – in these and all kinds of minute ways, the individual tries to assert the self. Recognizing this tendency, Dōgen gave detailed instructions on all aspects of daily comportment. For example, in “Bendōhō” Dōgen describes how to leave the meditation hall: “Quietly take your pillow and place it in front of the cabinet, not making noise as you fold it. Be careful not to disturb the people on the neighboring tans.... Let yourself down lightly from the seat.... Do not make noise by brushing off your seat.... Do not slide your slippers noisily so as rudely to distract the assembly” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 66-71). And, in the “Senjō” fascicle of the *Shōbōgenzō*, Dōgen describes the proper ways of using the toilet and washing the anus and penis, of cutting finger nails and hair, and of washing the body in general (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 57-67). Apparently unsatisfied with lack of detail in “Senjō,” in the “Senmen” fascicle, Dōgen focuses entirely on describing the way to wash the face and brush the teeth (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 139-153). In this way, in the monastic context, there is absolutely no room for expressing personal preferences.

At times, Dōgen explicitly instructs his disciples to abandon the tendency towards self-expression, particularly in the form of making judgments, which is likely based on personal preferences or desires. For example, in his *Tenzokyōkun* (Instructions for the Chief Cook), Dōgen writes:

³⁵ Although this essay is a discussion of the ritual within a Rinzai monastery, the authors’ comments are equally applicable to Dōgen’s Zen.

“Do not comment on the quantity or make judgments about the quality of the ingredients...., just sincerely prepare them” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, 36). He teaches that it is necessary to be non-judgmental towards both ingredients and people: the *tenzo* must prepare food “without making judgments about the ingredients’ fineness or coarseness” and they “should not see the assembled monks as good or bad” (Leighton/Okumura 44-5). Without judgment, the *tenzo* has “no attachments” (Leighton/Okumura 37), and the tendency towards self-assertion is further diminished.³⁶

In sum, conforming to the way of the monastic community – without disturbing others, acting quietly, lightly, softly, without judgment – the personal inclinations of the individual practitioner are eroded and thereby life becomes the activity of non-seeking. Indeed, in “Senjō” Dōgen describes ritual washing as activity without intention: “It is not our own intentional effort; it is the natural expression of dignified behavior itself” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 65). Moreover, just as in zazen, the principle of non-seeking extends even into not-seeking enlightenment from ritual practice. In *Zuimonki* Dōgen advocates practicing ritual “with no (expectation of) profit; expect nothing, seek nothing, gain nothing.... Without having the slightest expectation, maintain the prescribed manner of conduct” (Okumura 125). For Dōgen, ritual should be enacted without seeking any gain – whether profane or sacred. As previously discussed in relation to zazen-practice, in this way of non-seeking the self is cast off in a samadhi of receiving and using the self, and there is practice-realization. By practicing “without even seeking after the completion of the Way or the attainment of the result,” Buddhahood is not posited as an object to be attained by means of practice, and so there is practice-realization undefiled by the duality of means-and-ends, subject-and-object. Living the monastic life without following personal inclination, without anticipation, is therefore practice-realization.

³⁶ As long-time Tenzo at Tassajara Zen Mountain Monastery in California, Jūsan Kainei Edward Brown writes of monastic practice: “One need not question whether the present moment’s activity is worth doing; it is simply the one requiring attention at the present. There is no time for worry, regrets, wishes, complaints, demands” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, xiii-xiv). He continues by writing that the structure of practice is such that “the sharp edges of personal preference and personal freedom to ‘act out’ [are] worn down” (Leighton/Okumura 1996, xvii). This loosening of personal desires and judgments is as Dōgen envisioned.

Purification as Realization

Of particular importance to Dōgen were rituals concerned with cleansing or purification, which is evident in the previously mentioned “Senjō” and “Senmen” fascicles. In addition, the fact that “Senmen” is the only fascicle to have been preached on three separate occasions also attests to the importance Dōgen placed on purification rituals. It is in the context of his discussion of purification rituals that it becomes particularly clear that Dōgen’s exact ritual instructions are intended to provide an opportunity for the self to be dropped off in all activity, allowing the undefiled practice-realization of nonduality.

Dōgen considers purification activities to be realization itself. Referring to the same kōan employed to justify the necessity of zazen, Dōgen opens his discussion of washing in “Senjō” with reference to the encounter between the Sixth ancestor Hui-neng and Nan-yüeh: “There is [*shu* and *shō*, practice-and-realization] that Buddhist patriarchs have guarded and maintained; it is called *not being tainted*” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 57). Here Dōgen is playing upon the double-meaning of ‘not being tainted’ or ‘undefiled.’ He is indicating (1) that the ancestors engage in purification practice, and (2) that this purification practice is not defiled by the duality of practice-and-realization. Thus, Dōgen is using this kōan to justify the need to purify the body by asserting that this purification practice is itself realization. Just as zazen and enlightenment are not to be defiled by being dualistically opposed as means and ends, so too are purification rituals and enlightenment not to be defiled: purification-practices are not the means to attain the end of enlightenment, rather, they are themselves enlightenment.

Dōgen also affirms the oneness of ritual practice and realization in his commentary on this kōan by playing upon another double meaning. He states, “Ritual conduct (*sahō*, 作法) is the cardinal principle (*shūshi*); the realization of the Way is ritual conduct (*sahō*, 作法)” (Kim 2004, 184). Nishijima/Cross translate this phrase slightly differently: “To enact the Dharma (*sahō*, 作法) is the point. To attain the state of truth is to enact the Dharma (*sahō*, 作法)” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 57-8). The term *sahō* (作法) is a compound of two characters; together they mean (as in Kim’s translation) ‘ceremonial form, ritual form, the proper way to do things.’ But, if the two

characters of *sahō* are read separately, *sahō* becomes *saku* (作) ‘to do, to make’ and *hō*, (法) method, means, law, Dharma.’ By reading *sahō* as *saku* and *hō*, Dōgen’s phrase can also be understood (as in Nishijima/Cross’ translation) as meaning ‘to enact the Dharma’ or ‘to do the Dharma.’³⁷ Given Dōgen’s propensity to explore multiple meanings, it is likely that Dōgen is playing on a double meaning in order to indicate that ritual practice (*sahō*, 作法) is itself the embodiment of the Dharma (*saku* 作 and *hō* 法). Once again, ritual practice is the manifestation of the Way, the attainment and verification of the truth.

As undefiled practice-realization, purification-practice is also described as the realization of nonduality. In “Senmen” Dōgen states, “When we bathe away dust and dirt and apply fragrant oil to the body, inside-and-outside will be totally clean. When inside-and-outside is totally clean, object-and-subject is pure and clean” (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 140). Later he states, “when we practice bathing, the body-mind within and without, the five viscera and six entrails, the duality of object and subject, and the inside, the outside, and the middle of the Dharma-world and space, are instantly pure and clean” (Nishijima/Cross 1997, 142). Since ‘pure and clean’ can be readily understood in this context as referring to not being defiled by a dualistic relationship, Dōgen is here claiming that in the practice of purification subject and object are not defiled by being in a dualistic relationship; rather, ritual purification is an activity of nonduality, undefiled by the duality of subject and object.

Dōgen places great emphasis upon cleansing or purification practices even though he affirms (what may be considered an) ‘original’ purity. In “Senjō” Dōgen writes, “Although body and mind are undefiled, there is the teaching of cleansing the body and mind” (Kim 2004, 184). Similarly, in “Senmen” Dōgen writes, “in spite of being not yet defiled, you bathe your body; although you are already supremely pure, you cleanse yourself” (Kim 2004, 185). Thus, in accordance with his teaching that zazen-practice is necessary even though enlightenment is original, so too does Dōgen affirm the need to engage in purification practices even though we are not defiled.

³⁷ This possible interpretation of *sahō* was pointed out to me by my supervisor, Victor Hori, in a personal communication on Dec 12, 2006.

For Dōgen, we need to engage in purification practices because they are ‘original practices’ realizing ‘original enlightenment’. Introducing the specific practices of washing, in “Senjō” he says: “At just the moment when we dignify body-and-mind with training, eternal original practice is completely and roundly realized. Thus the body-and-mind of training manifests itself in the original state” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 58). Thus, just as *Bendōwa* describes zazen as ‘original practice’ realizing ‘original enlightenment,’ in “Senjō” Dōgen describes purification rituals ‘original practice’ realizing ‘the original state.’³⁸

Why Emphasize Ritual?

It may seem strange that Dōgen’s response to licensed evil in *Zuimonki* mentions the importance of living a monastic life. The problem of licensed evil is that it is antinomian: it denies the necessity of moral practice; so, why does Dōgen speak about monastic ritual, which does not seem to be a particularly “moral” practice? Why does Dōgen not focus exclusively on the importance of precept-practice and the necessity to refrain from evil conduct and engage in virtuous action?

One way of answering this question is to say, quite simply, that Dōgen is replying to Ejō – a monk whose life as a disciple is centered on living in Dōgen’s community. Within Dōgen’s monastic community a reference to ritual is an appropriate response to licensed evil because within that context all activity is prescribed by the monastic regulations. Since all activity is determined by ritual prescriptions, there is no need to emphasize the precepts. When Dōgen’s disciples ‘left home’ and became monks they

³⁸ Gikai, the former Daruma-shū monk, seems to have been converted to Dōgen’s teaching that ritual is realization of original enlightenment. He is recorded as stating,

I now know that monastic ritual and deportment themselves are the true Buddhism. Even if apart from these, there is also the infinite Buddhism of the Buddhas and patriarchs, still it is all the very same Buddhism. I have attained true confidence in this profound principle that apart from the lifting an arm or moving a leg within one’s Buddhist deportment there can be no other reality. (Bodiford, 1993, 58)

For Gikai, the ritual practice of ‘lifting an arm or moving a leg within one’s Buddhist deportment’ is the expression of original enlightenment, the only reality. Contrary to the licensed evil interpretation where original enlightenment teachings are used to justify abstaining from monastic practice, for Gikai original enlightenment teachings are used to justify the need to engage in monastic practice. These teachings have also led Abe to paraphrase Dōgen’s “Busshō” by stating, “there is no ‘being pure’ apart from ‘becoming pure’” (Abe 1985a, 221).

stepped outside of the ethical system of society and entered monastic life where actions are prescribed by ritual imperatives, not by notions of good and evil or right and wrong. In examining Dōgen’s teachings, there are few instructions concerning the proper way to distinguish good and evil, but there are ritual instructions.

In the *Zuimonki*, Dōgen is recorded as repeatedly teaching his disciples not to concern themselves with distinguishing between right and wrong, good and evil, but to just follow the monastic regulations. For example, he states, “To enter the Buddha Way is to stop discriminating between good and evil and to cast aside the mind that says this is good and that is bad. You must forget thoughts about what is good for your own body or what suits your own mind” (Masunaga 37). Rather than acting in accordance with considerations of good and bad, Dōgen instructs his disciples to just follow the monastic rules. For example, he states, “act in accord with the Buddhist rules” (Masunaga 37). Dōgen repeatedly admonishes his disciples: “act only in accordance with Buddhism... follow wholeheartedly the regulations of Buddhism” (Masunaga 37, 46). Within the monastery ritual instructions are more important than moral considerations of right and wrong, or good and evil, so it is appropriate for Dōgen to reference monastic life in a response to licensed evil.³⁹

Precept-Practice

Although Dōgen does emphasize the need to live a monastic life, he does refer to the precepts in his response to licensed evil by mentioning the need to refrain from “evil actions”. The place of precept-practice in Dōgen’s thought is an especially important question for those who wish to consider the relevance of Dōgen’s response to licensed evil for those living outside the monastery walls, or for those who recognize that even within the monastery,

³⁹ I should also mention that in response to another question by Ejō recorded in the *Zuimonki*, Dōgen indicates that zazen is itself practicing the precepts (see Okumura 24). For an analysis of how zazen upholds each precept see Anderson 87. Moreover, Dōgen sought to imbue his ritual with a moral vision (see Kim 2004, 177-182). Dōgen’s emphasis upon non-seeking and non-attachment can also be seen as ‘moral’ or ‘ethical’ values (see Cook 1985, and Zelinski). In addition, Dōgen emphasized the bodhisattva-ideal, and it is quite possible to appreciate Dōgen’s rituals as expressions of compassion, goodness, and the wish to benefit others (see Mikkelsen 1997, 2002, 2006, Reikichi Kita and Kiichi Nagaya, and Ives).

ritual can never totally take the place of considerations of good and evil or right and wrong. For laypeople not deeply engaged in zazen or ritual practice, the role of precepts is especially relevant.⁴⁰ I will now turn to Dōgen’s teachings on the precepts in order to demonstrate that – just like zazen and ritual – Dōgen says that the practice of the precepts is itself the realization of nonduality characterized by effort without self-assertion.

Unlike Eisai, the founder of Rinzai Zen in Japan, Dōgen did not adopt and transmit the Hinayāna precepts, but only the Mahāyāna or bodhisattva precepts (Kim 2004, 181). In the “Jukai” (Receiving the Precepts) fascicle, Dōgen states: “we should receive the bodhisattva-precepts; this is the beginning of entering the Dharma” (Nishijima/Cross 1999, 228). He transmitted sixteen precepts, which were recited by both monks and laypeople each month (Bodiford 1993, 172). They are divided into three groups: the Three Devotions are refuge in Buddha, Dharma, and Sangha; the Three Pure Precepts are the restraint from evil, the cultivation of goodness, and the benefiting of living beings; and then there are the Ten Serious Prohibitions, such as not to kill, steal, lust, etc. After discussing the precepts, Dōgen concludes: “We should receive and keep them without fail” (Nishijima/Cross 1999, 231).⁴¹

I should mention that although Dōgen does say that the precepts should be received and followed, precept-practice is considered by Dōgen to be less important than both zazen and ritual practices. As mentioned, Dōgen’s teachings emphasized ritual practice; but he only rarely discusses the precepts. In the *Zuimonki* Dōgen does affirm the practice of the precepts as its own valid teaching – but a lesser teaching: “Although the precepts and

⁴⁰ The importance Dōgen places on leading a monastic life points to a significant issue in the study of Dōgen: his views on the laity. Dōgen has a reputation for being egalitarian, for insisting that his Zen was available for all – monks and lay people, men and women. But, Dōgen’s move from the outskirts of the city to the remote mountainous Eihei-ji in 1243 has been seen as a radical turning away from the laity to focus exclusively on monasticism. However, this view overlooks the fact that Dōgen had always privileged monastic life. For a discussion of this issue see Kim 2004, 42-49 and Heine 1997.

⁴¹ It should be noted that Dōgen’s precepts “differ significantly from what other schools in China and Japan, both Ch’an/Zen and non-Zen (Tendai, Pure Land, Nichiren), were performing. Various schools administered either additional or a different set of precepts, or dispensed with the behavioral codes altogether” (Heine 2006, 12). Heine argues that “it seems to be a highly dubious claim that Dōgen was instructed in the 16-article precepts by his Chinese mentor” (Heine 2006, 13). It is also unknown exactly when Dōgen began administering them, “although it was apparently in operation during the last years of the Eihei-ji period” (Heine 2006, 12).

eating regulations should be maintained, you must not make the mistake of establishing them as of primary importance and of basing your practice on them” (Masunaga 6). He does say that the precepts are “good,” however this “does not make them the most essential teaching” (Masunaga 6). Similarly, when someone asks in the *Bendōwa*, “Is it necessary for those who focus on this zazen to observe the precepts strictly?” Dōgen responds by privileging zazen over precept-practice: “The sacred practice of maintaining the precepts is indeed the guiding rule of the Zen gate and the traditional style of buddhas and ancestors, but even those who have not yet received precepts or who have broken the precepts still do not lack the possibility [to practice zazen]” (Okumura/Leighton 34). Undoubtedly, although the precepts are important for Dōgen, they are not as important as either ritual practice or zazen.

***Shoakumakusa* as Relative and Imperative**

Dōgen’s discussion of precept-practice is most directly addressed in “*Shoakumakusa*” (Not Doing Evil), a fascicle structured as a commentary upon the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas, a verse (repeatedly alluded to earlier and) that does not list the precepts individually, but is often said to be the core of the Buddhist precepts. This verse is attributed to Śākyamuni Buddha, preserved in the *Dhammapada*, and found in the *Nirvana Sūtra* (among other texts). In Japanese, the verse is,

Shoaku makusa
Shuzen bugyō
Jijō goi
Ze shō bukkyō

This verse can be translated as,

Not to commit any evil,
 To do every good,
 And to purify one’s mind,
 This is the teaching of all the Buddhas.
 (Kim 2004, 224)

Dōgen opens his commentary by saying that this verse is part of the correct transmission of the Buddhahdharma, and that it is the practice and realization of all Buddhas: “Being *the teaching of all the enlightened*, it is the *teaching, practice, and realization of a billion Buddhas*” (Cleary 85). It is immediately

apparent that, like zazen and ritual, Dōgen’s justification for the practice of morality rests, in part, upon the idea that all Buddhas and ancestors uphold the precepts.

Dōgen then states (the axiomatic position in Zen) that ‘evil’ and ‘good’ (and ‘indeterminate’) are lacking self-nature or empty: they are, Dōgen says, “*mushō*,” variously translated as “unborn” (Fox 36 and Kim 224), “uncreated” (Bodiford 2), or “unoriginated” (Cleary 85). As Cleary explains, “[*Mushō*] means that ‘evil’ does not come from itself, but exists only in contrast to ‘good’ and ‘indeterminate.’ Since one implies the others, the attribution of evil depends on the attribution of good and indeterminacy; there is no set point of origin in objective reality” (Cleary 129). Moral values are thus “without fixed existence” and cannot be considered “absolute” (Cleary 129). Kim adds, “Like any other phenomena, good and evil come and go as circumstances and conditions change in the impermanent scheme of things. [Therefore,] the ultimate nature of moral values is emptiness” (Kim 2004, 224).

And yet, although moral values are *mushō*, this does not deny the reality of the difference between good and evil or the need distinguish between good and evil. After asserting the absolute nature of moral values as *mushō*, Dōgen continues to say, “yet within these three natures there are a number of phenomena” (Cleary 85). Explaining his translation, Cleary states: “Yet even though there is no absolute good or evil because ‘evil’ is not evil of itself and ‘good’ is not good of itself, nevertheless in the relative world phenomena are good, evil, or indeterminate, in their particular context” (Cleary 129). Indeed, concerning evils or wrongs, Dōgen goes on to say,

there are similarities and differences between wrong in this world and wrong in other worlds. There are similarities and differences between former times and latter times. There are similarities and differences between wrong in the heavens above and wrong in the human world. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 99)

Even greater still is the divergence between the buddha path and the secular realm in terms of what is called evil. (Bodiford 2)

[And] the evil of the way, the good of the way, and the indeterminate of the way are far different. (Cleary 85)

And later, when discussing good, Dōgen briefly states, “the principle is the same that the recognition of good is different according to the world” (Cleary

89). For Dōgen, moral distinctions are relative but relevant: although relative to other ways of life, within the Buddha Way there is a definite morality with differences between evil, good, and indeterminate. As Dōgen says, for those interested in “learning anuttara samyak sambodhi [*supreme perfect enlightenment*] – hearing teachings, cultivating practices, and realizing results” – the way of Buddhist morality must be followed (Bodiford 2). Cleary comments, “the emptiness of good and evil ... does not mean that what is good and bad in terms of learning real enlightenment can be made up or manipulated on a whim. It is a question of actual effect, of learning, application, and experience” (Cleary 130). Although relative to other worlds, within the Buddhist monastic world the pursuit-practice of enlightenment necessitates a determinant morality.⁴² Whereas proponents of licensed evil recognize only the ultimate or absolute nature of moral values as *mushō* and conclude that there is no need to distinguish between good and evil actions, for Dōgen this fails to appreciate the equally true relative nature involving distinctions and differences. For Dōgen, relative truth is just as true and undeniable as absolute truth.

Since morality is relevant, Dōgen affirms the importance of practicing a specific morality. He affirms *shoakumakusa* as an injunction, demand, prescription, or imperative for those following the Buddha-Dharma: “At first [*shoakumakusa*] says, *don’t do any evil*. If it doesn’t say *don’t do any evil*, it is not the true teaching of Buddhas; it must be demonic suggestion. You should know that what says *don’t do any evil* is the true teaching of Buddhas” (Cleary 86). In the same way, all buddhas “encourage the deliberate practice of [good]” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 107). Indeed, the usual way to interpret and translate the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas is as a prescriptive or imperative to be followed, as in this translation: “Commit no evil, / Do every good; / Purify your own mind, / This is the teaching of the many buddhas” (Hori, 2003, 604).

⁴² The fascicle “Shoakumakusa” does not consider the content of moral values. But, the *Zuimonki* briefly summarizes Dōgen’s view of moral content by reaffirming the Buddhist phrase: “Things which bring about suffering are called evil; things which bring about joy are called good” (Okumura 154).

***Shoakumakusa* as Realization**

In what diverges most seriously from the view of licensed evil, for Dōgen the imperative to refrain from evil action is legitimated because it is an expression of enlightenment. The words “Do not commit any evil” are words originating in enlightenment itself:

when you hear and teach enlightenment, in its concrete expression, it is naturally heard as this [*shoakumakusa*]. This is so because it is the direct expression of supreme enlightenment itself. It is unmistakably the talk of enlightenment; accordingly, it speaks enlightenment. (Kim 2004, 225)

When enlightenment speaks it says ‘Commit no evil.’ As ‘the talk of enlightenment,’ “Commit no evil” is “the *verbal* self-expression” of enlightenment (Fox 36). Because it is expressing enlightenment in words, ‘Commit no evil’ is *the teaching of all the Buddhas*, and “has been in Buddhism from the eternal past to the eternal present” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 106).⁴³

When the teaching ‘Not to commit any evil’ is heard and put into practice, enlightenment is immediately realized – manifested, verified, and attained.

When it becomes the preaching of the supreme state of bodhi, and when we are changed by hearing it, we hope *not to commit wrongs*, we continue enacting *not to commit wrongs*, and wrongs go on not being committed; in this situation the power of practice is instantly realized. This realization is realized on the scale of the whole earth, the whole world, the whole of Time, the whole of Dharma. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 99)

For Dōgen the enactment or activity of ‘Not committing evils’ is itself the instantaneous realization of nonduality. Every moment of not doing an evil act is a Buddha-act. Thus, just as the teaching of ‘Not committing evils’ is “the *verbal* self-expression” of enlightenment, so too is the activity of ‘Not committing evils’ “the *active* self-expression” of enlightenment (Fox 36). For the person *not committing*, enlightenment “finds expression in him and even *as* him. He does not merely know truth, he *is* Truth and consequently does

⁴³ It may be worth mentioning that in *Zuimonki*, Dōgen asserts that enlightenment clarifies good and evil: “Once we have thoroughly realized that all things are the Buddhadharmā, then we know that evil is always evil and is far from the Way of the Buddha and the Patriarchs and that good is always good, and is linked with the Buddha Way” (Masunaga 56). Dōgen makes this assertion, but he does not explain why.

Truth, which is to say that he inevitably does no evil” (Fox 36). As Kim says, for Dōgen, “to commit evil was incompatible with enlightenment” because “‘Not to commit any evil’ was intrinsic to enlightenment and enlightenment was biased toward ‘not to commit any evil’” (Kim 2004, 225).⁴⁴

Furthermore, just as ‘not committing evils’ is the activity of enlightenment realizing nonduality, Dōgen describes ‘doing good’ as realization:

good doing inevitably includes the realization of the many kinds of right. The realization of *good doing* is the Universe itself.... At the place where we are already performing, as *good doing*, a single right among the many kinds of right, the entire Dharma, the Whole Body, the Real Land, and so on, are all enacted as *good doing*.
(Nishijima/Cross 1994, 105)

Just as in his discussions of zazen and ritual, when Dōgen discusses the moral practices of ‘Not committing evils’ and ‘Doing good’ he presents practice-and-realization undefiled by a means-ends relationship: practicing ‘not committing evils’ and ‘doing good’ is the immediate realization of nonduality. In this way, it is possible to interpret and translate the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas as descriptive of the activity of a Buddha: “No evil is committed, / All good is done; / The purity of one’s own mind, / Is the teaching of the many Buddhas” (Hori 2003, 604). This is what Kim calls “authentic” morality, which “should and can arise spontaneously from enlightenment” (Kim 2004, 228). Therefore, the Verse of the Precepts of the Seven Buddhas is both a prescriptive injunction or demand and also a descriptive expression of enlightenment. The Verse is true on both a conventional and ultimate level: as an injunction it is the conventional truth; as a description it is the ultimate truth.⁴⁵

***Shoakumakusa* as Wholehearted Non-Seeking**

After presenting ‘not committing evils’ as realization, Dōgen explains that ‘not committing evils’ is realization because it is a situation without self-assertion, expressed here as ‘not committing’:

⁴⁴ While this thesis agrees with Fox and Kim, I should mention that Dōgen’s discussion in the *Zuimonki* of the kōan of “Nansen cuts the cat in two” seems to contradict the view that Buddha-acts necessarily do no evil. In his discussion, Dōgen describes Nansen’s act, which clearly violates the precepts, as both “a crime” and “a Buddha act.” For a discussion of this passage in the *Zuimonki*, see Mikkelsen 1997.

⁴⁵ For a reading of the precepts as both conventional and ultimate truths see Aitken 1984.

the scale of this [realization] is the scale of *not committing*.

(Nishijima/Cross 1994, 99)

Precisely such a person, at precisely such a time, cannot do evil any more, even though being in places conducive to evil, facing situations conducive to evil, and being in the company of evil-doing companions. (Cleary 86)

The power of *not committing* is realized. (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 100)

This is the truth of [*ichinen ippō*]. (Bodiford 3)

Ichinen ippō is a Zen phrase variously translated as “taking up at one moment, and letting go at one moment” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 100), or “one picked up, one put down” (Cleary 86). As Cleary explains, *ichinen ippō* “means being able to use something purposefully without becoming obsessed by it or controlled by it” (Cleary 131). This is “non-contrivance” (Kim 2004, 228). Precisely such a person, at precisely such a time, is *not committing*: they are not doing anything with reference to personal attachment, craving or aversion, desire or hatred. It is activity without self-assertion; it is the activity of non-seeking. In this situation the person is “no longer being a slave to compulsion or coercion, whether internal or external” (Cleary 131).

Considering the phrase *shoakumakusa*, Nishijima/Cross note that the final syllable *sa* “means to make, to produce, or to commit – it includes the suggestion of intention” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 97). This implies that to ‘not do evil’ is to not be caught by self-asserting intentions. Nishijima/Cross conclude that, for Dōgen, “naturally, wrongdoing does not occur; i.e. without our intentional commitment, there is no wrong” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 97). Just as Dōgen affirms zazen and ritual as undefiled practice-realization because they are activities without self-seeking, so too does he present the moral practice of ‘not doing evils’ as instantaneous realization because it is activity without self-assertion. It is precisely because the activity of ‘not committing evil’ is an activity uncontrived by the self that it is an activity of enlightenment itself.

Along the same lines, ‘to do good’ is described by Dōgen as activity without self-assertion. Dōgen says that ‘Doing good’ “is not self, not known by self” (Cleary 90). Considering *shuzen bugyō* (To do every good) Nishijima/Cross note that *bugyō* “has a feeling of doing what is natural, as opposed to intentional commitment” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 98). Once again,

this implies that to ‘do good’ is also not to be involved in the self’s attachments or intentions, its personal cravings and aversions. Thus, in *Zuimonki* Dōgen is recorded as saying, “Simply do good without expectation of reward or fame, be truly gainless (*mushotoku*), and work for the sake of benefiting others. The primary point to bear in mind is to separate from your ego” (Okumura 113). And, the “Kannon” (Avalokiteśvara, the Bodhisattva of Compassion) fascicle teaches a message of non-intentional moral practice. In this fascicle Dōgen provides a commentary upon the kōan of Ugan Muju (782-841) and Shu-itsu (769-835) as they discuss Avalokiteśvara/Kannon. Ugan Muju asks “What does the Bodhisattva of Great Compassion do by using his limitlessly abundant hands and eyes?” and Shu-itsu responds: “He is like a person in the night reaching back with a hand to grope for a pillow” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 211-2). Dōgen considers this statement to be an unequalled expression of the truth of Kannon (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 212). Dōgen describes this ‘groping for a pillow’ in non-intentional terms: “Remember, what is now being discussed is neither grasping the pillow, nor pulling in the pillow, nor pushing away the pillow” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 214). Nevertheless, the ‘groping for the pillow’ does right without intending or knowing it is doing right: “they cannot be hands and eyes that would rob from a street-market. [At the same time] the virtue of hands and eyes should not be seeing, practicing, or preaching that recognizes ‘rightness’” (Nishijima/Cross 1996, 216). Thus, Dōgen teaches that non-intentional action is the compassionate action of Avalokiteśvara who does right without knowing it is right; it is ‘not the self’ or ‘known by the self.’

In *Zuimonki* Dōgen states: “things which do not arouse human desires are good” (Okumura 154), implying that ‘things which do arouse human desires are evil’. This makes sense because activities that perpetuate desires are not conducive towards fostering an attitude of non-seeking, while activities that erode desires do facilitate non-seeking. Following the precepts reduces avenues for self-expression, for asserting personal inclination, such that practicing the precepts is living a life of non-seeking, allowing the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self in the samadhi of receiving and using the self.

Finally, although precept-practice is not the activity of a self asserting itself, nevertheless it is imperative to practice with total effort. Dōgen stresses “applying one’s whole mind to practice” and “applying the whole body to practice” (Cleary 87), and he says, “When you practice by garnering your own body-and-mind ... the power of practicing with the four elements [i.e. all physical things] and the five aggregates [i.e. the whole body and mind] is realized at once” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 100). As in his discussions of zazen and ritual, realization occurs when there is total effort, application, or garnering in practice.

Dōgen ends “Shoakumakusa” with a kōan. “In the story, [the statesman] Kyo-i (d.846) asks, “*What is the Great Intention of the Buddha-Dharma?*” and [Zen Master] Dōrin (d.824) says, “*Not to commit wrongs. To practice the many kinds of right*” (Nishijima/Cross 1994, 106). “The statesman said, ‘If so, even a three-year-old child can say this.’ Dōrin said, “*A three-year-old child may be able to say it, but an eighty-year-old man cannot practice it*” (Cleary 91). Dōgen comments, “What he meant to say was that there is a speech a three-year-old child can say, and one should study this carefully; there is a path that an eighty-year-old man cannot practice, and one should work on it carefully” (Cleary 94). For Dōgen, the moral teaching of avoiding evil and practicing good should never be forgotten, and the path cannot be practiced because the path is not-practicing – it is non-striving. The path is the Way of non-doing with total effort.

Conclusion

Having examined Dōgen’s teachings on monastic life and precept-practice, it has become clear that he advocates these practices because they are activities of non-seeking. Since they are dropping off ego-attachments, self-serving intentions or self-assertions, they are activities of enlightenment. In order to aid his disciples realize the Buddha-way of non-doing, Dōgen provides both detailed ritual instructions and a precept-code, which leave practitioners with no room for personal inclination. These activities, as activities of non-seeking, are themselves realization, undefiled by the dualities of means-and-ends, or subject-and-object.

Unlike the proponent of licensed evil, for Dōgen not all action is the realization of the Dharma. To lead a life of virtue and vice as we please is to lead a life according to personal inclination, and as such is not the activity of non-seeking and the realization of the Way. Dōgen's response to licensed evil is to say that the activity of non-seeking is the realization of the dharma, and that therefore we should live a monastic life and follow the precepts. To summarize, Dōgen's justification and discussion of the practice of ritual and precepts parallels that of zazen: because they are all activities wholeheartedly engaging the Way without striving they are all practice-realization. By describing practice in this way, these teachings constitute a response to the question of licensed evil.

Conclusion

Birth-and-Death

Licensed evil is a recurring question in East-Asian Mahāyāna Buddhism. Versions of it are found in Japanese Pure Land traditions, and Dōgen encountered it in his studies of Tendai and Ch'an/Zen, as well as in his disciples coming from the Daruma-shū.

Perhaps the most important idea in the Mahāyāna is encapsulated in Nāgārjuna's famous verse, "There is nothing that distinguishes samsara from nirvana; there is nothing that distinguishes nirvana from samsara" (Gethin 239). With this teaching, the Mahāyāna denies any absolute dualistic distinction between samsara and nirvana, between this world of birth-and-death and liberation. From this perspective the all-too-human qualities of birth-and-death (its karma, delusions, confusions, passions, and defilements) can be understood as nondual with enlightenment. It becomes possible to teach, "The very passions themselves are awakening" and "Evil karma is precisely liberation." From here there can be the teaching, "the defilements themselves – without transformation – are liberation."

Once samsara is understood as already nirvana, and the defilements are understood as nondual with enlightenment, it is possible to teach that sentient beings are always already or originally enlightened, even in the midst of their defilements. Liberation can be understood not as the eradication or *transcendence* of defilements into nirvana; rather, liberation can be the *realization* of original nirvana within greed, hate, and delusion. Moreover, since nirvana is not the absence of defilements, realization need not be preceded by a long process of purification to remove the passions and evil karma in order to transcend samsara. Rather, realization can happen immediately, with desire, evil karma, and delusion.

From these teachings it even becomes possible to teach that a suffering sentient being is no different a buddha: the deluded mind is the buddha's mind. By completely collapsing the distinction between samsara and nirvana, this teaching can lead to a denial of the necessity of any practice: since the deluded mind is the awakened mind, and since practice is

traditionally considered to be the transformation of the deluded mind into the awakened mind, practice is useless. We are originally enlightened; enlightenment is nondual with defilement; and so practice is unnecessary. It is from this perspective that Ejō can ask Dōgen about the question of licensed evil: If enlightenment is already present, why do we have to engage in the practices of zazen, monastic ritual, and refraining from evil instead of simply following our personal inclinations?

“Shōji” (Birth and Death) is Dōgen’s shortest fascicle in the *Shōbōgenzō*; it is undated. In this fascicle Dōgen points to another implication of the Mahāyāna teaching that samsara is itself nirvana. He writes,

We understand that birth-and-death itself is nirvana: thus we neither loathe birth-and-death nor long for nirvana. Only then, for the first time, are we free in birth-and-death. (Kim 2004, 166)

Unlike the proponent of licensed evil, for Dogen it is precisely *because* samsara is nirvana that practice is necessary. The teaching that “birth-and-death itself is nirvana” means that we should “neither loathe birth-and-death nor long for nirvana.” It is precisely *because* samsara is nirvana that you should engage in the practice which renounces craving and aversion towards either samsara or nirvana. In this abandonment of craving and aversion, “Only then, for the first time, are we free in birth-and-death.” If we do not practice then we are leading a life according to personal inclinations, engaging in craving and aversion, and we would not be free in birth-and-death. But, in casting off craving and aversion, we are free in the midst of our world of birth-and-death – including its suffering, delusion, and defilements. For Dōgen, liberation is not the eradication or *transcendence* of defilements into nirvana, but the *realization* of nirvana within greed, hate, and delusion. This realization, however, requires that we take up the practice of neither loathing nor longing for samsara or nirvana.

Dōgen emphasizes the implications of the nonduality of samsara and nirvana with the closing words of “Shōji”:

Your present birth-and-death itself is the life of Buddha. If you attempt to reject it with aversion, you thereby lose the life of Buddha. If you abide in it, attaching to birth-and-death, you also lose the life of Buddha and are left with only its outward appearance. You attain

the mind of Buddha only when there is no hating of birth-and-death and no desiring nirvana. But do not try to measure it with your mind or explain it with words. When you let go of both your body and mind, forget them both, and throw yourself into the house of Buddha, and when functioning begins from the side of Buddha drawing you in to accord with it, then, with no need for any expenditure of either physical or mental effort, you are freed from birth-and-death and become Buddha. Then there can be no obstacle in anyone's mind. There is an extremely easy way to become Buddha. If you refrain from all evil, do not cling to birth-and-death; work in deep compassion for all sentient beings, respecting those over you and showing compassion for those below you, without any detesting or desiring, worrying or lamentation – that is Buddhahood. Do not search beyond it. (Waddell/Abe 106-7)

Again Dōgen indicates that it is precisely *because* samsara is nirvana that practice is necessary. The teaching that our “present birth-and-death itself is the life of Buddha” is a call to “let go of both your body and mind, forget them both, and throw yourself into the house of Buddha”. Because samsara is nirvana you should engage in the practice which lets go of clinging, rejection, attachment, hating, detesting, and desiring. For Dōgen, there is no need to search for nirvana beyond birth-and-death: simply give up detesting samsara or desiring nirvana, and then you realize that you are already enlightened, that your present birth-and-death is precisely “the life of Buddha.” In this way, letting go, forgetting, neither craving nor avoiding is itself Buddhahood. The teachings of original enlightenment do not make practice unnecessary; rather, the original nonduality of samsara and nirvana make practice necessary.

Dōgen's response to Ejō's question of licensed evil is to refer to his teaching of the oneness of practice and enlightenment (*shushō ittō*) by saying, “practice and study are themselves inherently the Buddhadharma.” It is by describing practice as *shinjin datsuraku* (abandoning attachment to body and mind, or casting aside body and mind) that Dōgen is able to say that practice (*shu*) is verification (*shō*). Casting off self-clinging is the realization of nonduality, emptiness, and co-dependent origination in *jijuyū zanmai* – and is therefore the verification of buddha-dharma. Whereas the proponent of licensed evil says that practice is unnecessary because enlightenment is present *regardless* of practice, Dōgen teaches that practice is necessary because enlightenment is present *within* practice. For Dōgen, there is no

enlightenment/verification outside of practice because practice is necessary to manifest-verify-attain enlightenment. Without the wholehearted non-seeking of *shinjin datsuraku* and *jijuyū zanmai* there is no self-forgetting as the myriad dharmas advance and confirm the self in realization of nonduality, no-self, emptiness, and co-dependent origination.

Nevertheless, Dōgen calls this enlightenment/verification ‘original,’ but he calls it such because he considers all existence to be ‘originally’ engaged in the wholehearted practice of dropping body-mind. Everything is endowed with original enlightenment because everything is endowed with original practice; everything is Buddha-nature because everything is making efforts to become a buddha. Thus, Dōgen adopts the language of original enlightenment but marries it with an understanding of the oneness of practice and enlightenment, making our own personal practice necessary.

Moreover, whereas the proponent of licensed evil also says that practice is not necessary because enlightenment is not the elimination of the defilements, Dōgen teaches that practice is always necessary even though enlightenment is not the elimination of the defilements. Although not the eradication of the defilements, in enlightenment the defilements are nonetheless realized as empty. *Shinjin datsuraku* is not the eradication of the passions, but it is the realization of the emptiness of the passions by casting off the passions. The renunciation of self-clinging must always be renewed in order to allow the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self in the realization of the Buddha-Way. With these teachings, Dōgen is able to maintain *both* the original enlightenment standpoint of the nonduality of defilements and enlightenment *and* assert the requirement to practice.

An examination of Dōgen’s teachings on zazen, monastic life, and precept-practice reveal that he advocates these practices because they are activities of wholehearted non-seeking. By telling his disciples to just sit, and to follow precise ritual instructions and a precept-code, Dōgen leaves his students with no room for personal inclination, self-seeking, or self-assertion. In this way, these activities, as activities of non-seeking, or dropping off ego-attachments, are themselves allowing the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm the self in undefiled realization. To lead a life of license evil (of virtue and vice as we please) is to live following personal inclinations, and is

therefore not the activity of non-seeking and the realization of the Way. Therefore Dōgen teaches the realization of the Way in zazen, ritual, and precepts.

At this point, finally, I can return to my questions that motivated the writing of this thesis: How should I live my life? And why should I live that way? Now, over two years later, with an understanding of Dōgen's response to licensed evil, I see that there is a problem with my questions: my questions assert a self. My questions are not *shinjin datsuraku*; they do not allow the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm my-self. For Dōgen, I should wholeheartedly do nothing, and thus drop off body-mind. I should engage in practice that not even an eighty-year-old man can practice, and do non-doing by throwing myself into the house of Buddha. To do non-doing I should do no evil, do good, follow the monastic regulations, and just sit. In this way, I abandon self-assertion, allow the myriad dharmas to advance and confirm my-self, and manifest-verify-attain the Buddhadharmā.

Bibliography

- Abe, Masao. (1985a) "The Idea of Purity in Mahayana Buddhism." *Zen and Western Thought*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 216-222.
- . (1985b) "The Oneness of Practice and Attainment: Implications for the Relation Between Means and Ends." *Dōgen studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985. 99-111.
- Aitken, Robert. (1984) *The Mind of Clover*. San Francisco: North Point Press.
- . (1994) *The Practice of Perfection: the Paramitas from a Zen Buddhist Perspective*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Anderson, Reb. (2001) *Being Upright: Zen Meditation and the Bodhisattva Precepts*. Berkeley: Rodmell Press.
- Bielefeldt, Carl. (1988) *Dōgen's Manuals of Zen Meditation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . (1985) "Recarving the Dragon: History and Dogma in the Study of Dōgen." *Dogen Studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 21-53.
- Bodiford, William. trans. "Shoakumakusa" *Soto Zen Text Project*
<http://www.stanford.edu/group/scbs/sztp3/>
- . (1993) *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Clark, Richard, trans. (2001) *Hsin-hsin Ming: Verses on the Faith-Mind by Seng-ts'an*. Buffalo: White Pine Press.
- Cleary, Thomas, trans. with commentary. (1993) *Rational Zen: The Mind of Dogen Zenji*. Boston: Shambhala.
- Collcutt, Martin. (1981) *Five Mountains: The Rinzai Monastic Institution in Medieval Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cook, Francis. (1985) "Dogen's View of Authentic Selfhood and its Socio-ethical Implications." *Dogen Studies*. Honolulu, Hawaii: University of Hawaii Press. 131-149.
- . trans. with commentary. (1978) *How to Raise an Ox: Zen Practice as Taught in Zen Master Dōgen's Shobogenzo, including ten newly translated essays*. Los Angeles: Center Publications.

- . trans. with commentary. (1989) *Sounds of Valley Streams: Enlightenment in Dōgen's Zen, Translation of Nine Essays from Shōbōgenzō*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dobbins, James. (1989) *Jōdō Shinshū*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Dumoulin, Heinrich. (1990) *Zen Buddhism: A History Volume 2 – Japan*. New York: Macmillan.
- Faure, Bernard. (1987) “The Daruma-shū, Dōgen, and Sōtō Zen.” *Monumenta Nipponica*. 4:21. 25-55.
- . (1998) *The Red Thread: Buddhist Approaches to Sexuality*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Fox, Douglas. (1971) “Zen and ethics: Dogen’s synthesis.” *Philosophy East and West*. 21: 33-41.
- Gethin, Rupert. (1998) *The Foundations of Buddhism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Peter. (1990) *An Introduction to Buddhism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, Peter. (2000) *An Introduction to Buddhist Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, Steven. (1997) “The Dogen Canon: Dogen's Pre-Shobogenzo Writings and the Question of Change in His Later Works.” *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*. 24: 39-85.
- . (1986) “Dōgen Casts Off "What": An Analysis of Shinjin Datsuraku.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*. 9: (1) 53-70.
- . (2006) “Dōgen and the Precepts, Revisited.” *Buddhist Studies from India to America*. ed. Damien Keown. New York: Routledge. 11-31.
- . (1981) “Multiple dimensions of impermanence in Dōgen's ‘Genjōkōan’.” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies*. 4: (2) 44-62.
- . (1999) *Shifting Shape, Shaping Text: Philosophy and Folklore in the Fox Kōan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- . (1997) *The Zen Poetry of Dōgen: Verses from the Mountain of Eternal Peace*. Boston, Mass: Charles E. Tuttle.

- Hori, Victor Sōgen. (2000) "Kōan and Kenshō." *The Kōan*. ed. Steven Heine and Dale S. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press. 280-315.
- . (2003) *Zen Sand: The Book of Capping Phrases for Kōan Practice*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Hubbard, Jamie and Paul Swanson, ed. (1997) *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Ives, Christopher. (1982) *Zen Awakening and Society*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Jaffe, Paul. trans, (1996) "Text of the Shōbōgenzō Genjōkōan." *Flowers Fall: A Commentary on Dōgen's Genjōkōan*. Boston: Shambhala / Random House. 101-107.
- Jōdō Shinshū Seiten*. (1991) Kyoto: Buddhist Churches of Canada.
- Kieschnick, John. (1997) *The Eminent Monk: Buddhist Ideals in Medieval Chinese Hagiography*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Kim, Hee-Jin. (2007) *Dōgen on Meditation and Thinking: A Reflection on his View of Zen*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . (2004) *Eihei Dōgen: Mystical Realist*. Boston: Wisdom.
- . (1978) "Existence/time as the way of ascesis: an analysis of the basic structure of Dōgen's thought." *Eastern Buddhist*. 1978. ns: 43-73.
- . trans. (1985a) *Flowers of Emptiness: Selections From Dōgen's Shobogenzo*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press.
- . (1985b) "The reason of words and letters: Dogen and koan language." *Dogen Studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 54-60.
- Kiyota, Minrou. (1978) *Shingon Buddhism: Theory and Practice*. Los Angeles: Buddhist Books International.
- Kodera, Takashi James, trans. with commentary. (1980) *Dōgen's Formative Years in China: An Historical Study and Annotated Translation of Hokyo-ki*. Boulder: Prajña Press.
- Leighton, Taigen Dan and Shohaku Okumura, trans. (2004) *Dōgen's Extensive Record: A Translation of the Eihei Kōroku*. Somerville: Wisdom Publications.
- . and Shohaku Okumura, trans. (1996) *Dōgen's Pure Standards for the Zen Community: A Translation of the Eihei Shingi*. Albany: State University of New York.

- . (2001) "Sacred Fools and Monastic Rules: Zen Rule-Bending and the Training for Pure Hearts." *Purity of Heart and Contemplation*. ed. Bruno Barnhart and Joseph Wong. New York: The Continuum International Publishing.
- . (forthcoming 2007) "Zazen as an Enactment Ritual." *Zen Rituals: Studies of Zen Theory in Practice*. ed. Steven Heine and Dale Wright. New York: Oxford.
- Loori, John Daido. (1996) *The Heart of Being*. Boston: Charles E. Tuttle Co., Inc.
- Loy, David. (2002) "The Lack of Ethics and the Ethics of Lack in Buddhism." *Crossing Boundaries: Essays on the Ethical Status of Mysticism*. ed. G. William Bernard and Jeffery J. Kripal. New York: Seven Bridges Press. 286-287.
- Maraldo, John. (1985) "The practice of body-mind." *Dogen studies*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. 112-130.
- Masunaga, Reihō, trans. (1971) *A Primer of Sōtō Zen: A Translation of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki*. Honolulu: East-West Center Press.
- Mikkelson, Douglas. (2002) "The Cardinal Virtues of the Bodhisattva in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki*." *Eastern Buddhist*. 53-78.
- . (2006) "Towards a Description of Dōgen's Moral Virtues." *Journal of Religious Ethics*. 34:2.
- . (1997) "Who is Arguing About the Cat? Moral Action and Enlightenment according to Dōgen." *Philosophy East and West*. 47(3): 383-397.
- Nagatomo, Shigenori. (1987) "An Analysis of Dōgen's 'casting off body and mind'." *International Philosophical Quarterly*. 27: 227-242.
- . (1992) *Attunement Through the Body*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nishijima, Gudo Wafu. (1998) "The Ethics of Action." *Buddhist-Christian Studies*. 18: 183-185.
- Nishijima, Gudo Wafu and Chodo Cross, trans. (1994) *Master Dōgen's Shobogenzo*. Vol 1. London: Windbell Publications.
- and Chodo Cross, trans. (1996) *Master Dōgen's Shobogenzo*. Vol 2. London: Windbell Publications.

- - - and Chodo Cross, trans. (1997) *Master Dōgen's Shobogenzo*. Vol 3. London: Windbell Publications.
- - - and Chodo Cross, trans. (1999) *Master Dōgen's Shobogenzo*. Vol 4. London: Windbell Publications.
- Nishitani, Keiji. (1982) *Religion and Nothingness*. trans. Jan Van Bragt. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Okumura, Shohaku, trans. (2004) *Shobogenzo-Zuimonki: Sayings of Eihei Dōgen Zenji Recorded by Koun Ejō*. Kyoto: Soto-shu Shumuchō.
- - - and Taigen Dan Leighton, trans. (1997) *The Wholehearted Way: A Translation of Eihei Dōgen's Bendōwa*. Boston: Tuttle Pub.
- Reikichi, Kita and Kiichi Nagaya. (1961) "How Altruism is Cultivated in Zen." *Anthology of Zen*. ed. William A. Briggs. New York: Grove Press, Inc. 45-69.
- Shaner, David. (1985) "The Bodymind Experience in Dogen's 'Shobogenzo: a Phenomenological Perspective.'" *Philosophy East and West*. 35: 17-38.
- Shoyu, Genkai, trans. (1965) *Rev. Koun Ejō's Shōbōgenzō Zuimonki*. No location or publisher listed.
- Stambaugh, Joan. (1999) *The Formless Self*. Albany: State University of New York.
- - - . (1990) *Impermanence Is Buddha-Nature: Dogen's Understanding of Temporality*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Stone, Jacqueline. (1999) *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Swearer, Donald. (2005) "History of Religions." *The Blackwell Companion to Religious Ethics*. ed. William Schweiker. Maldon: Blackwell Publishing. 138-146.
- Tamura, Yoshiro. (1984) "Critique of Original Awakening Thought in Shoshin and Dōgen." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*. 11: 243-266.
- Tanahashi, Kazuaki, trans. and ed. (1999) *Enlightenment Unfolds: The Essential Teaching of Zen Master Dōgen*. Boston, Mass.: Shambhala.
- - - . trans. and ed. (1985) *Moon in a Dewdrop: Writings of Zen Master Dogen*. San Francisco: North Point Press.

- Tisdale, Sallie. (2005) *Women of the Way: Discovering 2,500 Years of Buddhist Wisdom*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Victoria, Brian. (1997) *Zen at War*. New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill.
- Waddell, Norman, trans. (1977) *Hōkyōki*. *Eastern Buddhist*. 10 (2).
- - - and Masao Abe, trans. (2002) *The Heart of Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Yampolsky, Philip. (1967) *The Platform Sutra of the Sixth Patriarch*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yasutani, Hakuun. (1996) *Flowers Fall: A Commentary on Dōgen's Genjōkōan*. trans. Paul Jaffe. Boston: Shambhala / Random House.
- Zelinski, Daniel. (2003) "Dogen's Ceaseless Practice." *Action Dharma: New Studies in engaged Buddhism*. ed. Christopher Queen, Charles Prebish and Damien Keown. New York: RoutledgeCurzon. 50-62.