

## Article

# Smuggled Hinduism—From Dōgen’s Viewpoint

Atsushi (Shōken) Hayakawa

Special Course of Buddhism, Tohoku Fukushi University, Sendai 981-8522, Japan;  
a-hayakawa@tfu-mail.tfu.ac.jp

**Abstract:** The central question of this paper is what kind of view Dōgen had about Mazu. At first glance, this may seem completely irrelevant to the theme of this issue. In fact, however, Dōgen’s view points to a subtle relationship between Buddhism and Hinduism in an interesting way. Dōgen seems to regard Mazu as an ambiguous figure, standing on the borderline between Buddhism and Hinduism. However, Dōgen’s intention was to save Mazu and keep him on the side of Buddhism. So how can Mazu be saved? To answer this question is to trace the fundamental boundary between Buddhism and Hinduism according to the outstanding Zen master. In this study we adopt the usual method of textual analysis. Our discussion proceeds in the following order. (The steps do not correspond exactly to the section breaks.) (1) First, the argument of a person called Senni is presented from Dōgen’s *Bendōwa*, where Dōgen severely criticizes him as a non-Buddhist heresy. At this step we will confirm that Senni is a Sāṅkhya theorist (hence, a Hinduist). (2) We take up a parallel to the above passage from Dōgen’s *Shōbōgenzō*, Chapter “*Sokushinzebutsu*”. It becomes clear that the true target of Dōgen’s criticism was Mazu, the great Chinese Chan master. (3) The above operation shows that Dōgen was trying to position Mazu as someone on the borderline between Hinduism and Buddhism. (4) We try to reconstruct from the text what in Senni angered Dōgen, or, in other words, from what he wanted to save Mazu. As a result, the borderline as seen by Dōgen will be visible to us. The main findings of this paper are as follows: (1) The mark that distinguishes Buddhism from Hinduism, according to Dōgen, is the presence of the never-ending Bodhi-mind. This is in fact what TSUNODA Tairyū suggested in his 1985 article. Dōgen implemented this idea as an endless loop of Bodhi-mind, which makes the goal unreachable. (2) The implicit object of Dōgen’s criticism is not the Japanese Tendai or the Darumashū, but Mazu, as HE Yansheng indicated in his 2000 book. The so-called Critical Buddhism movement began on the basis of a misunderstanding. The large amount of secondary literature that has resulted is also indirectly based on this error.



**Citation:** Hayakawa, Atsushi (Shōken). 2023. Smuggled Hinduism—From Dōgen’s Viewpoint. *Religions* 14: 41.

<https://doi.org/10.3390/rel14010041>

Academic Editors: Paul P.J.C.L. van der Velde and Arjan Sterken

Received: 19 November 2022

Revised: 21 December 2022

Accepted: 21 December 2022

Published: 27 December 2022



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

**Keywords:** Hinduism; Dōgen; Zen; Chan; Mazu

Dōgen (道元) is a Japanese Zen<sup>1</sup> master from the 13th century. In this paper<sup>2</sup>, we are going to talk about his observations about an Ātman theory. We attempt to reconstruct a comprehensible picture of his view by adjusting the focus of several previous studies and reconsidering the interrelationships between them. This reveals how he thought about the boundary between Buddhism and Hinduism.

## 1. The “Non-Buddhist Heresy” Senni

Below is a passage from his *Bendōwa* (弁道話), where he presents his idea in the form of a Q&A for a novice. (For the translation of Dōgen’s text I use the study of Hubert NEAR-MAN with some corrections. The original Japanese text from the Iwanami Bunko version is added in Notes Section.)

Question: There are some who say, “Do not grieve over birth and death, since there is an extremely quick method for freeing yourself from them, namely, by understanding the principle that it is the innate nature of one’s mind to be ever-abiding, to persist without change ... Thus, this body is but a temporary form, being born here and dying there, ever subject to change, whilst this mind is ever-abiding, so there is no reason to expect it to vary over past, present, and future. To

understand the matter in this way is what is meant by being free from birth and death. For the one who understands this principle, his future births and deaths will come to an end, so that when his body expires, he will enter the ocean of real existence. When he flows into this ocean of being, he will undoubtedly possess wonderful virtues, just as all the Buddhas have done... The person who does not yet understand this principle will be ever spun about through successive births and deaths ...” Such a statement as this truly corresponds to the Way of all the Buddhas and the great masters, don’t you think?<sup>3</sup>

Dōgen answers to this question as follows:

Answer: The view that you have just expressed is in no way one of Buddhism, but rather the non-Buddhist view of Senni. This erroneous view may be stated as follows: “In our bodies there is a soul-like intelligence. When this intelligence, or intellect, encounters conditions, it makes distinctions between good and bad as well as discriminating right from wrong. It is conscious of pain and itch, and suffering and pleasure. All such responses are within the capacity of this intelligence. However, when this body of ours perishes, this soul-like nature sloughs it off and is reborn somewhere else. As a result, even though it appears to perish in the here and now, it will have its rebirth in another place, never perishing, but always abiding unchanged.”. So this erroneous view goes.<sup>4</sup>

The name Senni (先尼 or 仙尼, Chin. *xian ni*) corresponds to Sanskrit *Śreṇika*, Pāli *Senaka* (Hosoda 1993, p. 63). Senni’s doctrine described here seems to be a Hinduistic one, which especially looks like one of Sāṅkhya’s. First, I briefly present the grounds for this assertion.

While the name of Senni appears in several Chinese Buddhist sūtras including the Prajñāpāramitāsūtras and the Samyuktāgama, it is presumed that Dōgen’s description above is mainly based on a passage from the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra, in which Senni presents his Ātman (or Puruṣa<sup>5</sup>) theory (Hosoda 1993, p. 63). This seems to be a nice starting point for us. Our questions in the preliminary query are: (A) Is the Senni in the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra depicted as a Hinduist? And (B) Did Dōgen identify him as a Hinduist? My observations are: (1) Senni claims Ātman’s omnipresence (我遍一切處) in the relevant passage<sup>6</sup>, which matches with the Sāṅkhya doctrine of Hinduism. We can even find almost the same statement “自性及我遍一切處” in the Gold-Seventy (Chn. *Jin-qui-shi-lun*, 金七十論), a Chinese translation of a commentary of the Sāṅkhyakārikā<sup>7</sup>. (2) Senni claims that every individual has its own Ātman, while Ātman is omnipresent. This somewhat curious idea is found in Sāṅkhyakārikā 18 and discussed by many commentaries<sup>8</sup>. (3) Senni in the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra uses the term “慢” (Chn. *man*) to mean *ahamkāra* (I-consciousness). This is a Sāṅkhya term.

From the points 1, 2 and 3 above, we can answer the above question A: Senni in the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra is depicted as a Sāṅkhya theorist, therefore a Hinduist. Then, we proceed to the question B: (4) The passage “Ātman is omnipresent” (我遍一切處) mentioned in my first observation above is reproduced as Dōgen’s statement “This Spiritual Intelligence permeates all living beings far and wide” (此靈知、ひろく周遍せり) in *Shōbōgenzō*, in a parallel passage of the above *Bendōwa* citation<sup>9</sup>. (5) Senni in the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra says “Gotama, it is like you cannot say ‘the resident is burnt when the house is burnt’ if the resident has escaped from the house when the house was burnt down by an accidental fire.”. This is reproduced in the sentence “It is like the resident escapes while his house is burnt down by an accidental fire” (たとへば人舎の失火にやくるに、舎主いでてさるがごとし) in *Shōbōgenzō*<sup>10</sup>. From the points 4 and 5, we can answer the question B: It is probable that Dōgen’s description of Senni’s doctrine is at least partly based on the Mahāyāna-Parinirvāṇasūtra, as has been claimed by some scholars. So, we have a good reason to presume that Dōgen identified Senni as a Hinduist.

Let us go back to the *Bendōwa* passage. According to Dōgen, the questioner is trying, unknowingly, to smuggle Hinduism into Buddhism. Indeed, Senni’s “soul-like intel-

ligence” seems incompatible with the no-self doctrine, which Buddhism has been claiming since a considerably early period. The negativity of Dōgen’s answer looks rather natural in this context. However, earlier research about this passage suggests that his gaze caught a certain problem which is deeper than the stereotypical self/no-self dispute. Below, I first set up the viewpoints “who is being criticized” and “what is being criticized” and observe how Dōgen’s eyes are working here.

## 2. Who Is Being Criticized?

It is HAZAMA Jikō (嵯慈弘) who first focused on the above passage in his 1942 article. Quite interestingly, he associates the questioner’s idea to the Original-enlightenment thought (天台本覚思想, jpn. *Tendai hongaku shisō*), which is, roughly speaking, a Japanese implementation of the Tathāgatagarbha thought<sup>11</sup>. Hazama cites the passage, which follows the text above.

Be that as it may, your learning this view and regarding it as the Buddha’s teaching is more foolish than clutching onto a roof tile or a pebble in the belief that it is gold or some precious jewel. The shameful of such befuddled ignorance and delusion beggars comparison. National Teacher Huizhong (慧忠) in Great Sung China has strongly warned us about such a view. Now, you equate the wondrous Dharma of all the Buddhas with the mistaken notion that your mind will abide whilst your physical features perish, and imagine that the very thing which gives rise to the cause of birth and death will free you from birth and death. Is it not being foolish? And how deeply pitiable! Be aware that this is the mistaken view of one who is outside the Way, and do not lend an ear to it.<sup>12</sup>

Here, Hazama takes notice of Dōgen’s curious excitement. Is it not too emotional for someone talking about the opinion of hundreds of years ago in a foreign country? Dōgen is completely losing his temper here. Hazama presumes that this criticism might actually not be directed at Senni, but at someone of his era, namely the people of Original-enlightenment thought which was quite popular at that time. In other words, he thought that Dōgen’s true enemy was not Hinduism itself.

Hazama, then, quotes the following passage among others, from *Gobukechimyaku* (五部血脈), a representative Original-enlightenment literature.

I consider with deep respect as follows. Birth and death are ingenious functions of the One Mind. Being and non-being are attributes of the original enlightenment. The reason is that the Mind is something that never comes or leaves, and that the soul is the principle which surrounds and pervades the whole universe. Therefore, you are not coming from anywhere when you are being born, and you are not leaving when you are dying. When the Mind, which never comes and nor leaves, does the work of being, it makes a human body with six sense organs appear. They call it birth. When the soul, which surrounds and pervades the whole universe, applies the attributes of non-being, it extinguishes the body which consists of five aggregates. They call it death... Life and death are one thing, and being and non-being are not different. If you think like this, the body of the Mind-Buddha will be revealed and you will get freedom at your birth and death<sup>13</sup>.

This text advocates the existence of the immortal soul, which is the subject of reincarnation. Indeed, it looks like Senni’s idea. Hazama’s claim might not be baseless.

Hazama’s article did not get much attention until HAKAMAYA Noriaki took up his argument in his 1986 paper to present his new image of Dōgen as a fighter against Original-enlightenment theory (Hakamaya 1986). His ideological movement, which was called Critical Buddhism (批判仏教, jpn. *hihan bukkyō*), gained considerable support from the people who had doubts about the current situation of the modern Japanese Buddhism, but lost its influence quickly after his former ally MATSUMOTO Shirō withdrew his claim<sup>14</sup>. How-

ever, apart from the politics of ideology, it seems me important to me to discuss to whom Dōgen's criticism is actually directed in this passage.

In fact, an excellent answer to this problem has already been given by HE Yansheng (何燕生), while it has not yet received the attention it deserves. It is widely known that there is a parallel to the above *Bendōwa* passage in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō* (正法眼藏). Hazama and Hakamaya both mentioned it, but have not paid enough attention to it. As He Yansheng correctly points out, this parallel passage is embedded as a whole in the discussion about the famous statement "Your very mind is Buddha" (即心是仏, chn. *ji xin shi fo*, jpn. *sokushinzebutsu*), which is very typical to the teaching of Mazu Daoyi (馬祖道一), the great Chinese Chan master. Therefore, it is basically a discussion about the Chinese Chan, rather than the Japanese Tendai (He 2000, pp. 262–67, especially p. 266). He Yansheng further compared Senni's claims cited by Dōgen with Chinese literature of the Hongzhou school (洪州宗) and the Heze school (荷澤宗), of which Mazu belongs to the former, and showed their striking coincidences (He 2000, pp. 267–74, especially p. 274).

He Yansheng carefully avoids assertions, but his argument has drawn Mazu to center stage. Dōgen himself is not referring to him by name either. At the beginning of *Shōbōgenzō*'s chapter "Sokushinzebutsu", he starts to talk about the man on the gloomy stage.

What the Buddhas and great masters, without exception, have traditionally maintained and entrusted to us is, simply, that this very mind of ours is Buddha. Even so, the statement "Your very mind is Buddha" (即心是仏, chn. *ji xin shi fo*, jpn. *sokushinzebutsu*) did not come from India, but was first heard in China. Many people who learn Buddhism have misunderstood what it is, and did not put another misunderstanding on the misunderstanding. Because they do not put another misunderstanding on the misunderstanding, they have wandered off onto non-Buddhist paths.<sup>15</sup>

It is not difficult to see that Dōgen considered Mazu to be a highly ambiguous figure. As he admits, Mazu's statement "Your very mind is Buddha" has a great heuristic potential. However, if you took it literally, you would not be a Buddhist anymore, but a Hinduist. So, you need to add a twist to put it back to a right direction. Here, in fact, he suggests that Mazu's teaching is in itself Hinduism.

### 3. What Is Being Criticized?

The second question is: What is wrong with the statement "Your very mind is Buddha?" To answer this question, I would like to present a passage from *Bendōwa* again. This is a continuation of the part already quoted.

You should understand that, in Buddhism, we have always spoken not only of body and mind as being inseparable, but also of the nature of something and the form it takes as not being two different things. As this teaching was likewise well known in both India and China, we dare not deviate from it. Even more, in Buddhist teaching that speaks of persistence, all things are said to have persistence without there ever being separated into categories of "body" and "mind". In teaching that talks about cessation, all things are said to be subject to cessation without differentiating whether they are of some particular nature or have some particular form. So why do you risk contradicting the correct principle by saying that the body ceases whilst the mind permanently abides? ...<sup>16</sup>

Think about it. the principle of the oneness of body and mind is something constantly being talked about in Buddhism. So, how does the mind, on its own, apart from the body, keep from arising and disappearing as this body of yours arises and perishes? Furthermore, were they inseparable at one time and not inseparable at another, then what the Buddha said would, naturally, be false and deceiving ...<sup>17</sup>

You must understand that the Buddhist teaching which asserts "The nature of Mind is the common feature of things" takes in the whole universe, without dividing it

into innate natures and their forms or ever referring to things as “coming into existence” or “perishing”. Nothing, up to and including realizing enlightenment and Nirvāṇa, is excluded from the innate nature of your mind. Each and every thing throughout the whole of the universe is simply “the One Mind” from which nothing whatsoever is excluded. All these teachings are equally teaching this One Mind.<sup>18</sup>

This rather long passage was once cited by MATSUMOTO Shirō to show a singular point in Dōgen’s thought (Matsumoto 2000, pp. 26–27). Indeed, it appears to contain a curious contradiction. As Matsumoto correctly indicates, “the Buddhist teaching which asserts ‘The nature of Mind is the common feature of things’” (心性大総相の法門) in the third paragraph (underlined) is based on a passage from *Awakening of Faith in the Mahāyāna* (大乘起信論 chn. *Dasheng Qixin Lun*, jpn. *Daijōkishinron*)<sup>19</sup>, which is, as is well known, a representative work of Tathāgatagarbha-theory. Obviously, Dōgen is watching the problem from the perspective of Tathāgatagarbha. However, on the other hand, the criticized Senni’s idea, too, is in fact quite the same as Tathāgatagarbha-theory. Then, it looks as if Dōgen is criticizing Tathāgatagarbha-theory by Tathāgatagarbha-theory.

Matsumoto proposes a radical solution. He assumes two types of Tathāgatagarbha-theory. One is called “Buddha-nature Immanence theory” (仏性内在論, jpn. *bushhō-naizairon*), according to which Buddha-nature is immanent in each person. The other is called “Buddha-nature Manifestation theory” (仏性顕在論, jpn. *bushhō-kenzairon*), according to which Buddha-nature wholly manifests in phenomenal things. Note that the former corresponds to what we usually call Tathāgatagarbha-theory, while the latter is a quite new concept, which has never been expressed within the Buddhist tradition as far as I know. Let us call Matsumoto’s two types “Immanence theory” and “Manifestation theory”, respectively, for brevity. If we apply Matsumoto’s typology, we can understand the above passage as a criticism from Dōgen’s Manifestation theory to Senni’s Immanence theory. Immanence theory distinguishes “soul-like intelligence” and body, of which the former is immanent to the latter. Manifestation theory does not distinguish soul and body and regards all of the world as one Mind.

While Matsumoto’s solution ensures the integrity of the text, his terminology sounds novel and somewhat awkward, which might be the reason why it is not readily accepted by everyone. However, in fact, we do have a pair of categories available within the traditional Buddhist terminology that present similar articulation to that of Matsumoto, namely “能攝藏” (chn. *neng zhe zang*, jpn. *nōshōzō*) and “所攝藏” (chn. *suo zhe zang*, jpn. *shōshōzō*)<sup>20</sup>. These concepts appear in the Chinese translation of Vasubandhu’s *Treatise on the Buddha Nature* (仏性論 chn. *Fo-xing-lun*, jpn. *bushhōron*)<sup>21</sup>, of which the Sanskrit text has not yet been found. For the ease of our discussion, I would like to use the word “subsumer-theory” for the former, and “subsumed-theory” for the latter. Subsumer-theory is the theory according to which a sentient being subsumes Buddha in him/herself, while Subsumed-theory is the theory according to which sentient beings are subsumed in Buddha<sup>22</sup>. Although this articulation resembles that of Matsumoto, they are not exactly the same. I prefer to use Vasubandhu’s terms, because they exist within the Buddhist tradition. It is, after all, not imaginable that Dōgen used Matsumoto’s coordinate system to construct his thought about Buddha-nature, while it seems highly probable to me that he knew Vasubandhu’s terms and used them implicitly.

Let us go back to Dōgen’s passages cited above. The questioner advocates Subsumer theory (Matsumoto’s Immanence theory). In other words, he believes that each person has “a soul-like intelligence”, which is equivalent to the immortal Buddha-nature, within him/herself. On the other hand, Dōgen advocates Subsumed theory. He thinks that we are all subsumed in the cosmic “One Mind”, which subsumes all. Dōgen criticized the people who took the statement “Your very mind is Buddha” as Subsumer theory.

#### 4. Why Did Dōgen Need to Deny Subsumer Theory

From the discussions above, the contour of Dōgen’s criticism has become clear enough. Now, we can go back to Hazama’s question: Why did he have to reject Subsumer theory so

fiercely? Subsumer theory, as represented by Senni, must have something which conflicts with his most important principle.

The reason I think is because your mind—not Buddha’s but *your* mind—would stand still within the scheme of Subsumer theory. This is suggested in the following passage, which follows the already cited part of the “Sokushinzebutsu” chapter.

Hearing talk of “your very mind”, those befuddled by doubts speculate that the intellectual, cognitive, and perceptual functions of sentient beings, even when they have no Bodhi-mind yet in themselves, are identical with Buddha. This is due to their never having encountered a genuine Teacher of Buddhism.<sup>23</sup>

The sort of non-Buddhist view I am referring to is that of Senni in the western part of India. The following is in accord with that viewpoint: . . . Although physical things come and go, and conditions arise and disappear, this Spiritual Intelligence forever exists, unchanging . . . It is also referred to as “the True Self”, “the Source of Enlightenment”, “One’s Original Nature”, and “One’s Fundamental Substance” . . . Such is the view of the non-Buddhist Senni.<sup>24</sup>

Here, Dōgen is digging up the root of Mazu’s ambiguity. As TSUNODA Tairyū correctly points out, the key is Bodhi-mind, your enthusiasm to follow the Buddhist way. In fact, Dōgen is suggesting that your mind is Buddha only when your mind is on the way (Tsunoda 1985, pp. 383–86). Once it has reached its goal and stands still, it is not a Buddha anymore. Therefore, if you say “Your very mind is Buddha” while your mind is not on the way, you are not a Buddhist, but a Hinduist, whatever your intentions are. In such a conceptual structure, the eternal mind in yourself as presupposed by Senni would hinder you to reach Dōgen’s paradoxical goal. His goal is never reaching a goal<sup>25</sup>.

Thus, the notion “our internal Buddha-nature”, which is presupposed by Subsumer theory, conflicts with Dōgen’s architecture. Actually, I do not even know whether Mazu himself was a Hinduist or a Buddhist. However, in any case, Dōgen tries to save him by placing his possibly Hindustic idea within the boundary of Buddhism. But how he did it? Let us listen to Tsunoda further. He associates the above paragraphs of *Shōbōgenzō* to the following sentences near the end of the chapter.

Thus, “Your very mind is Buddha” refers to the Buddhas called “Religious awakening”, “Practice”, “Enlightenment”, and “Nirvāṇa”. If you have not experience religious awakening, practice, enlightenment, or Nirvāṇa, you are not the one whose very mind is Buddha.<sup>26</sup>

The phrase “Religious awakening, Practice, Enlightenment, and Nirvāṇa” is Dōgen’s favorite. For him, these terms did not form a straight line starting from Religious awakening and ending with Nirvāṇa, but a circular process called the cycle of ceaseless practice (行持道環, *gyōjīdōkan*). After you have reached Nirvāṇa, you have to go back to Religious awakening. If you look for related passages in *Shōbōgenzō*, you will find the following, for example.

The Great Way of Buddhas and great masters invariably involves unsurpassed ceaseless practice. This practice rolls on in a cyclic manner without interruption. “Religious awakening”, “Practice”, “Enlightenment”, and “Nirvāṇa”. occur seamlessly. This is the cycle of ceaseless practice<sup>27</sup>.

On the contrary, if you understand that giving rise to Bodhi-mind is a one-time thing, after which one does not experience the rising of Bodhi-mind again, that one’s training and practice continues for an immeasurably long time, and that the fruits of awakening are a one-time event, you are not hearing the Buddha Dharma, you are not comprehending the Buddha Dharma, you are not encountering the Buddha Dharma.<sup>28</sup>

Thus, Dōgen reinterpreted Mazu’s “your mind” as the mind which has entered into an endless cycle, and prevented readers from becoming a Hinduist unknowingly.

## 5. A Story of Eternity

Interestingly, according to Dōgen the ceaseless practice of humans and that of Buddhas interact with each other.

As a result, owing to the ceaseless practice of all the Buddhas and great masters, our own ceaseless practice clearly manifests, and the Great Way of ours rolls on. And, owing to our ceaseless practice, the ceaseless practice of all the Buddhas clearly manifests, and the Great Way of the Buddhas pervades everywhere. The merits of this cycle are owing to our ceaseless practice<sup>29</sup>.

Therefore, Dōgen's endless loop has a cosmic character.

Due to this ceaseless practice, there is the sun, the moon, and the stars. Due to ceaseless practice, there is the great earth and the vast expanse of space. Due to ceaseless practice, there is body and mind as the internal and external effects of our past karma. Due to ceaseless practice, there are the four great elements and the five aggregations<sup>30</sup>.

As a result, the endless loop becomes something outside of empirical reality, outside of "now".

The word "now" does not refer to something that existed prior to ceaseless practice. What is called "now" is the manifestation of ceaseless practice<sup>31</sup>.

Following the above statements, Dōgen's infinite loop does not appear to exist within a single human life. On the contrary, life and death are within the infinite loop of "Religious awakening", "Practice", "Enlightenment", and "Nirvāṇa". This point might be important in considering Dōgen's thought. That is, he is not striving for his own salvation. It is an eternal loop without salvation, at least, of oneself.

Such a way of thinking perhaps reflects the thoughts of the Lotus Sūtra, which he loved<sup>32</sup>. In any case, his ideal was opposite to that of Senni and other typically Hinduistic thinkers. They are trying to escape from the endless reincarnation, while Dōgen was trying to get into it.

However, even though his ideal is noble, it will be a nightmare for the people who are not *Übermensch*. After all, it was something from which Gotama is said to have been trying to escape, is it not? Do you really want to live in an endless suffering? How is it different from the eternal hell?

Buddhism started from a common problem with Hinduism, "how to escape from eternal reincarnation". After one thousand and several hundred years of development, it came back to its starting point and declared from Dōgen's mouth, "Now, it is time to go to hell. Come with me". This is the essence of the opposition between Senni's Sāṅkhya doctrine and Dōgen's ideal. Mazu stands on the borderline. Dōgen is watching him, saying nothing about his real identity.

POSTSCRIPT: You might have had the feeling that you have missed something, after reading this article. Indeed, I have not discussed Subsumed theory in detail. I will deal with a subtype of Subsumed theory, which I call Sūtra-World theory (説法世界論 jpn. *sep-pōsekairon*), in my forthcoming book about the chapters "Bukkyō" (仏経) and "Mujōseppō" (無情説法) of *Shōbōgenzō* (in Japanese).

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The Japanese word "Zen" (禅) is equivalent of the Chinese "Chan" (禪).

<sup>2</sup> The present article is based on Hayakawa (2019, 2020).

- 3 どうていはく、あるがいはく、「生死をなげくことなかれ、生死を出離するにいとすみやかなるみちあり。いはゆる心性の常住なることわりをしるなり。(中略)身はこれかりのすがたなり、死此生彼さだまりなし。心はこれ常住なり、去来現在かはるべからず。かくのごとくしるを、生死をはなれたりとはいふなり。このむねをしるものは、従来の生死ながくたえて、この身をはるとき性海にいる。性海に朝宗するとき、諸仏如来のごとく妙徳まさにそなはる。(中略)いまだこのむねをしらざるものは、ひさしく生死にめぐるべし。」かくのごとくいふむね、これはまことに諸仏諸祖の道にかなへりや、いかむ。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 pp. 31–32, Nearman pp. 14–15).
- 4 しめしていはく、いまいふところの見、またく仏法にあらず。先尼外道が見なり。いはく、かの外道の見は、わが身、うちにひとつの靈知あり、かの知、すなはち縁にあふところに、よく好悪をわきまへ、是非をわきまふ。痛痒をしり、苦楽をしる、みなかの靈知のちからなり。しかあるに、かの靈性は、この身の滅するとき、もぬけてかしこにむまるゝゆゑに、こゝに滅すとみゆれども、かしこの生あれば、ながく滅せずして常住なりといふなり。かの外道が見、かくのごとし。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 pp. 32–33, Nearman p. 15).
- 5 The Puruṣa in Sāṅkhya terminology corresponds to what is commonly called the Ātman in Indian thought.
- 6 Taishō Tripitaka vol. 31, p. 594a (translated by 曇無讖 Tan Wu Chen) and p. 842a (translated by 慧嚴 Hui Yan).
- 7 Taishō Tripitaka vol. 54, p. 1247b.
- 8 I consulted Murakami (1978) p. 239ff.
- 9 *Shōbōgenzō*, Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 141. Nearman p. 47.
- 10 *Shōbōgenzō*, Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 141. Nearman p. 47.
- 11 It is difficult to give a clear definition to the Tatāgatarbha thought. Roughly speaking (again), it is a way of thinking that asserts the identity of Buddha and sentient beings in some sense. A popular form of this thought might be the statement “We all have Buddha in ourselves”. However, we will also mention a different type of formulation in this article.
- 12 しかあるを、この見をならうて仏法とせむ、瓦礫をにぎって金宝とおもはんよりもなほおろかなり。癡迷のはづべき、たとふるにもなし。大唐国の慧忠国師、ふかくいましめたり。いま、心常相滅の邪見を計して、諸仏の妙法にひとしめ、生死の本因をおこして、生死をはなれたりとおもはむ、おろかなるにあらずや。もともあはれむべし。たゞこれ外道の邪見なりとしれ、みゝにふるべからず。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 pp. 33–34, Nearman p. 15, Hazama (Hazama 1995) p. 7).
- 13 伏以生死二法者、一心妙用。有無之二道者、本覚真徳也。所以心者、無来無去之法、神者周遍法界理也。故生時無来、死時無去。無来無去之心施有用、心即現六根体、以之名生。周遍法界之神施空徳、神即亡五陰之身、指之曰死... 生死体一、空有不二。如是知見、如是観解、心体俱顕、生死自在。(Hazama 1995, pp. 8–9). N.B. The concepts “the One Mind” (一心), “the original enlightenment” (本覚) and “the soul” (神) seem to indicate one and the same thing. The word “空” seems to be used here to mean “non-being” or “nonexistence”, instead of the usual “emptiness”.
- 14 An interesting commentary in English on “critical Buddhism” is Stone (1999) pp. 79–82. Swanson (1993) is a nice survey of this movement. Hubbard and Swanson (1997) contains some excellent articles. I must apologize for not referring to all of the English secondary literature on this topic. However, in any case, neither Dōgen nor we deal with the question of Tendai Original-enlightenment thought itself. Mistakes made by Hazama and Hakamaya produced a lot of secondary literature.
- 15 仏々祖々、いまだまぬかれず保任しきたれるは即心は仏のみなり。しかあるを、西天には即心は仏なし、震旦にはじめてきけり。学者おほくあやまるによりて、将錯就錯せず。将錯就錯せざるゆゑに、おほく外道に零落す。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 140, Nearman p. 46).
- 16 しるべし、仏法にはもとより身心一如にして、性相不二なりと談ずる、西天東地おなじくしれるところ、あへてたがふべからず。いはむや常住を談ずる門には万法みな常住なり、身と心とをわくことなし。寂滅を談ずる門には諸法みな寂滅なり。性と相とをわくことなし。しかあるを、なんぞ身滅心常といはむ、正理にそむかざらむや。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 34, Nearman pp. 15–16).
- 17 嘗観すべし、身心一如のむねは、仏法のつねの談ずるところなり。しかあるに、なんぞ、この身の生滅せんとき、心ひとり身をはなれて、生滅せざらむ。もし、一如なるときあり、一如ならぬときあらば、仏説おのづから虚妄になりぬべし。又、生死はのぞくべき法ぞとおもへるは、仏法をいとふつみとなる。つゝしまざらむや。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 35, Nearman p. 16).
- 18 しるべし、仏法に心性大総相の法門といふは、一大法界をこめて、性相をわかず、生滅をいふことなし。菩提涅槃におよぶまで、心性にあらざるなし。一切諸法、万象森羅ともにたゞこれ一心にして、こめずかねざることなし。このもろもろの法門、みな平等一心なり。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 35, Nearman pp. 16–17).
- 19 “心真如者、即是一法界大総相法門体” (Taishō Tripitaka 32, p. 576a)
- 20 The terms “能摂義” (chn. *neng zhe yi*, jpn. *nōshōgi*) and “所摂義” (chn. *suo zhe yi*, jpn. *shōshōgi*) can also be used, which I actually prefer to use.
- 21 Taishō Tripitaka 31, 808a. See also Takasaki (1974) p. 22.
- 22 I could not find a good definition of these terms in *Treatise on the Buddha Nature*, but the following passages could be used as definition: “由此果能攝藏一切衆生故。説衆生爲如來藏”, (Because the result (i.e., being a Buddha) is able to subsume all the sentient beings, sentient beings are called *Tathāgatarbha*) and “三能攝爲藏者。謂果地一切過恒沙數功德。住如來應得性時。攝之已盡故... 故知本有” (Thirdly, about the subsumption (of Buddhahood) being called (*Tathāgata*)-*garbha*. It concerns the innu-

merable merits of the result (i.e., being a Buddha). When the Tathāgata was about to get the Buddhahood, he must have already subsumed all of them... so we know that he always had them.” (Taishō 31, p. 796a)

- 23 いはゆる即心の話をきゝて、痴人おもはくは、衆生の慮知念覚の未発菩提心なるを、すなはち仏とすとおもへり。これはかつて正師にあはざるによりてなり。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 140, Nearman p. 46).
- 24 外道のたぐひとなるといふは、西天竺国に外道あり、先尼となづく。かれが見処のいはくは、(中略)物は去来し境は生滅すれども、靈知はつねにありて不変なり。(中略)これを靈知といふ。また真我と称じ、覚元といひ、本性と称じ、本体と称ず。(中略)これすなはち先尼外道が見なり。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 141, Nearman pp. 46–47).
- 25 In fact, this is the reason why I do not want to adopt Matsumoto’s concept “Manifestation theory.” If the Buddha-nature manifests everywhere in the world, your mind should stand still where it is.
- 26 しかあればすなわち、即心是仏とは発心・修行・菩提・涅槃の諸仏なり。いまだ発心・修行・菩提・涅槃せざるは即心是仏にあらず。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 pp. 148–49, Nearman p. 51).
- 27 仏祖の大道、かならず無上の行持あり。道環して断絶せず、発心・修行・菩提・涅槃、しばらくの間隙あらず、行持道環なり。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 1 p. 297, Nearman p. 374).
- 28 しかあるに、発心は一発にしてさらに発心せず、修行は無量なり、証果は一証なりとのみきくは、仏法をきくにあらず、仏法をしるるにあらず、仏法にあふにあらず。(Iwanami Bunko version vol. 3, p. 332, Nearman p. 769).
- 29 このゆゑに、諸仏諸祖の行持によりてわれらが行持見成し、われらが大道通達するなり。われらが行持によりて諸仏の行持見成し、諸仏の大道通達するなり。われらが行持によりて、この道環の功德あり。
- 30 この行持によりて日月星辰あり、行持によりて大地虚空あり、行持によりて依正身心あり、行持によりて四大五蘊あり。
- 31 いまといふ道は、行持よりさきにあるにはあらず、行持現成するをいまといふ。
- 32 Dōgen cites quite a lot of passages from the Lotus Sūtra in *Shōbōgenzō*. He was a fanatic devotee of this scripture. One of the characteristics of the Lotus Sūtra is that the story unfolds over an extremely long period of time in units of eon (*kalpa*). The Buddha Śākyamuni has eternal life there, and leads people to liberation. No one is left behind. The path to Nirvāṇa is open to all. However, the journey will not be short. From an individual’s point of view, it may be many eons before the ultimate salvation is brought to you, a single Lotus Sūtra devotee. You may be reborn millions of times and suffer all the pain to save people.

## References

### Primary Sources

- Shōbōgenzō* 道元. 1990–1993. 『正法眼蔵』(水野弥穂子校注). 岩波文庫. 4 vols. [Dōgen. *Shōbōgenzō*. Edited and Annotated by Mizuno Yahoko. Iwanami Bunko]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Shōbōgenzō*. 2007. Translated by Rev. Hubert Nearman. Mt. Shasta: Shasta Abbey Press.

### Secondary Sources

- Hakamaya, Noriaki 袴谷憲昭. 1986. 「道元理解の決定的視点」. 『宗学研究』[“Dōgen Rikai no Ketteiteki shiten” (“A Definitive Perspective for understanding Dogen”) *Shūgaku Kenkyū*]. *Journal of Sōtō Studies* 28: 43–48.
- Hayakawa, Shōken (Atsushi) 早川祥賢. 2019. 「即心是仏・心常相滅・自己即仏」. 『東北福祉大学仏教文化研究所紀要』. [“*Sokushin-zebutsu, Shinjōsōmetsu, Jikosokubutsu*”, (“Your very mind is Buddha,” “The body perishes but the mind is immortal,” and “One’s self is Buddha”) *Tōhoku Fukushi Daigaku Bukkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo Kiyō*]. *Bulletin of Tōhoku Fukushi University Institute of Buddhist Culture* 1: 47–64.
- Hayakawa, Shōken (Atsushi) 早川祥賢. 2020. 「永遠の物語と一瞬のさとり—道元と臨濟」. 『印度学宗教学会論集』. [“Eien no Monogatari to Isshun no Satori—Dōgen to Rinzai” (“Story of Eternity and Momentary Enlightenment—Dōgen and Linji”)]. *Indogaku-Shūkyōgakkai Ronshū (Ronshū)* 47: 15–44.
- Hazama, Jikō 裕慈弘. 1995. 「鎌倉時代に於ける心常相滅論に関する研究」. 『道元思想大系』. 同朋舎出版. [“Kamakura-jidai ni okeru Shinjōsōmetsuron ni kansuru Kenkyū” (“A Study on the ‘the body perishes but the mind is immortal’ Theory in the Kamakura Era”) *Dōgen-Shisō Taikai*. Dōhōsha-Shuppan]. *Dōgen-Shisō Taikai* 14: 3–24. First published in 1942 『大正大学々報』 p. 34.
- He, Yansheng 何燕生. 2000. 『道元と中国禅思想』. 法蔵館. [Dōgen to Chūgoku-Zen Shisō (*Dōgen and Chinese Zen Thought*)]. Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- Hosoda, Noriaki 細田典明. 1993. 「『雑阿含経』の伝える先尼外道」. 『印度哲学仏教学』. [“Zōagonkyō no Tsutaeru Senni Gedō” (“The Heresy Senni according to the Samyuktāgama”) *Indo-Tetsugaku Bukkyōgaku*]. *Hokkaido Journal of Indological and Buddhist Studies* 8: 63–83.
- Hubbard, Jamie, and Paul L. Swanson. 1997. *Pruning the Bodhi Tree: The Storm Over Critical Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Matsumoto, Shirō 松本史朗. 2000. 『道元思想論』. 大蔵出版. [Dōgen-Shisō-Ron (*On Dōgen’s Thought*). Tokyo: Daizō-Shuppan].
- Murakami, Shinkan 村上真完. 1978. 『サーンクヤ哲学研究』. 春秋社. [Sānkuya Tetsugaku Kenkyū (*A Study on the Sāṅkhyā Philosophy*)]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Stone, Jacqueline I. 1999. *Original Enlightenment and the Transformation of Medieval Japanese Buddhism*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.
- Swanson, Paul L. 1993. “Zen Is Not Buddhism” Recent Japanese Critiques of Buddha-Nature. *NUMEN* 40: 115–49. [CrossRef]

- Takasaki, Jikidō 高崎直道. 1974. 『如来蔵思想の形成』. 春秋社. [*Nyoraijō-Shisō no Keisei (The Formation of the Tathāgatarbha Thought)*]. Tokyo: Shunjūsha.
- Tsunoda, Tairyū 角田泰隆. 1985. 「道元禅における心解釈考」. 『駒澤大学佛教学部論集』. ["Dōgen-Zen ni okeru Shin-kaishaku-kō" ("On the Interpretation of Mind in Dōgen's Zen")]. *Komazawa-Daigaku Bukkyō-Gakubu Ronshū*. *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 16: 381–91.

**Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.