INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or “target” for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is “Missing Page(s)”. If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of “sectioning” the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.

5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.
THE BUDDHIST CONCEPT OF IGNORANCE:
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DŌGEN

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN PHILOSOPHY
MAY 1983

By
Suwanna Wongwaisayawan

Dissertation Committee:
Eliot Deutsch, Chairman
K.N. Upadhyaya
Roger T. Ames
Graham Parkes
Robert T. Bobilin
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have special appreciation for Drs. Eliot Deutsch (Chairman), K. N. Upadhyaya, Robert Bobilin, Roger Ames, and Graham Parkes whose careful readings of my dissertation were instrumental to its completion. I also feel thankful to Professor Kiyotaka Kimura of the University of Tokyo who offered generous help with key references in Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō. He read my chapter on Dōgen and gave helpful comments. The presence of Dr. T. P. Kasulis can be felt in this work for he first introduced me to Dōgen.

This dissertation was supported by a grant from the East-West Center. I feel grateful to Dr. David Wu of the Center's Culture Learning Institute who gave me constant encouragement throughout the dissertation writing period.

This acknowledgement cannot be complete without a mention of the unfailing love from my family and support from invaluable friends like Ms. Shanta Danaraj and Mr. Chaiwat Satha-Anand. They made this long journey a little more pleasant.
This work attempts to develop the point that ignorance is fundamentally understood in Buddhism not as a statement about the absence of a particular piece of knowledge, but as the articulation of a state of mind, a mode of experiencing.

Chapter I investigates some major Western traditions and argues that a commitment to metaphysical entities in one form or another acts as a deterrent to the consideration of ignorance as a central philosophical issue.

Chapter II deals with the issue of misperception in the West and makes a claim that in Buddhism this issue is most significantly articulated as ignorance. The point is made that the Buddhist concern is more general in outlook, pointing to the total disposition of man as opposed to his particular perceptual acts.

Chapter III elaborates the theme that the discussion of the subject is necessary to the discussion of philosophical ignorance. Different expressions of the subject made by Descartes, Kant and Husserl are used to highlight the Buddhist articulation of "non-ego" (anattā) as the subject.
Chapter IV argues that Early Buddhism expresses ignorance (avijjā) as a positive obstruction to wisdom, a condition which prevents man from realizing the true nature of existence. It is also claimed that in Mahāyāna Buddhism the sinitic articulation of mind (hsin) presents a move to understand the Buddhist enlightenment as ontological immediacy which is prior to thoughts' discriminative acts. Ignorance is thus associated with discrimination.

Chapter V argues that for Dōgen, ignorance (mumyō) is expressed as a "culture" which limits man's mode of experiencing. Dōgen's advocacy of zazen is interpreted as a practical attempt to depetrify human awareness. For Dōgen, ignorance is not to be conceptually rejected but ontologically authenticated.

Chapter VI concludes that "desire," "culture" and "language" are the basic contributive factors which articulate the mode of experience wherein ignorance is not apparent. The point is made that in Buddhism, ignorance is the condition for responsibility rather than an excuse from it. Ignorance and suffering are central to the Buddhist understanding of man.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

THE ISSUE OF IGNORANCE: ITS NON-SIGNIFICANCE IN THE WEST

SOME PRELIMINARY CLARIFICATIONS

I wish to state explicitly that my project is not a historical investigation of the development of the concept of ignorance (avijñā or munyā). What I attempt to pursue is rather a "cross-sectional analysis" of this dynamic concept as it is articulated within different Buddhist traditions. By "cross-sectional analysis" I mean a method of handling the concept of ignorance by focussing on discussions on this issue across Buddhist traditions without a claim to any strict historical continuity. Any claim to a strict continuity of concepts needs to explore the historical evidence involved. Such a project is difficult but not impossible for an investigation of this concept. However, a cross-sectional study is preferred here because it lends itself more to a construction of ideas and a philosophical presentation of the issue.

Before I begin the investigation of the Buddhist understanding of this concept I would like to bring to attention the fact that this concept has never received a vigorous philosophical scrutiny in Western philosophy. The kind of centrality this concept assumes in Buddhism is not
found in the West. This does not mean, however, that Western philosophers are unaware of this issue. To say the least, Socrates' whole philosophical career can be seen as a systematic attempt to bring his fellow Athenians to question and to doubt and consequently to reach the realization of their own ignorance. And yet, the magnitude of significance, the existential burden generated by ignorance has never been felt by the majority of great thinkers in the West.

One reason for the lack of significance of this concept in the West in general might be attributed to the fact that in the broadest sense Western philosophies are attempts to move to the realm of being. In this context ignorance is seen as an absence and therefore it does not carry great significance to discuss non-being or non-entity. However, this argument, in my opinion, is an oversimplification for, in fact, Western philosophies are rich and varied in their concerns. The designation of Western philosophical attempts as merely "moves towards being" might be severely inadequate. My approach is to consider Western philosophical systems as varied and different without any attempt to ascribe one single characterization to the various systems. What follows will be a brief study of some major trends in Western philosophies with an aim to delineate some fundamental themes and point out why ignorance is not very significant in those systems.¹ My attempted survey might be considered superficial by some criteria but I insist that
it is necessary for my investigation as a whole. This is because the non-significance of this issue in the West has to be addressed and explained to some extent. A more detailed analysis to fully answer this question can be carried on in further studies, if desirable.

In the course of our investigation of some major Western thinkers we will find that ignorance is taken to mean "absence or lack of knowledge." This definition of ignorance is generally prevalent in the thought of a philosopher like Plato. For Descartes, however, the concept of "error" meaning "a false judgment of the will when it makes knowledge claim beyond the limit of the understanding" is more significant. As for Hume, who places emphasis on the mentalistic analysis of perception, the issue of misperception is as significant. For Hume, misperception indicates a confused idea of the impression which is imprinted on the mind. However, all these comparable, though not similar, concerns in these Western thinkers do not involve a fundamental existential concern in the sense that they do not touch upon the total disposition of man. In this respect, it might be argued that Plato does ascribe great "existential significance" to ignorance especially in the Socratic dialogues. However, my contention is that the differences in the Socratic and the Buddhist concerns are more decisive than the similarities. This debatable point will be discussed as we proceed.
Another important characteristic of the Western understanding of ignorance is that it is viewed as diametrically opposed to knowledge. This dualistic framework is not prevalent in the Buddhist scheme. An alternative framework is to explain that ignorance and enlightenment are "polaristic" to each other. This polaristic model of explanation emphasizes that ignorance and enlightenment are not distinct but should be seen on the polar points of the same continuum. However, I do not think that this model of explanation is necessarily an improvement of the dualistic model. Neither is it very helpful to the Buddhist position. It might be illuminating for the Taoist explanation of the changing and the absolute aspects of the Tao. But when it comes to Buddhism, the relationship between ignorance and enlightenment should not be expressed in any binary conceptual framework, may it be dualistic or polaristic. This is because in Buddhism, the realization of ignorance is the authentication of enlightenment. This is held to be the case throughout the three major Buddhist traditions. In Early Buddhism, the Buddha after the enlightenment articulated the principle of dependent origination with ignorance as the first link. The Mahāyāna tradition as presented in the Awakening of Faith expresses the relationship between ignorance and enlightenment in the metaphor of water and waves which suggests neither a dualistic nor a polaristic image. Dōgen in Zen tradition states in "Genjōkōan"
fascicle that enlightenment is but the realization of illu-
sion and illusion is none other than to be deluded about
enlightenment. These different strands of discussions on
ignorance and enlightenment will be discussed in more
detail while we proceed.

In Plato's vision, philosophy is the continuous effort
of the intellect to realize that realm of being which is
imperishable and immutable. Only "what is" is considered
the proper object of "knowledge" by Plato. "What is always
becoming" belongs to the changing realm of sensation and
therefore is not the proper object of knowledge. For
Plato, the realm of becoming is relegated to a minor
status by virtue of its changing nature. This fundamental
distinction which Plato makes concerning the realm of being
as distinct from that of becoming carries a far-reaching
implication for the understanding of what philosophy itself
is.

In the light of Plato, Philosophy is an attempt to
ground the changing world in the unchanging world of Form.
The controversial issues arising from the distinction
between these two worlds in Plato which are exemplified
in the nature of the relationship between the Forms and
the individual objects, the problems about the number of
Forms discernable, etc., will not be touched upon here.
What concerns us here is the fact that for Plato, philoso-
phy searches for and commits itself to a particular
conceptual framework (the theory of Form in this case) which is constructed and articulated to explain the nature of the natural world. This kind of a search for explanatory principles means also a doctrinal commitment to a metaphysical entity which is constructed as the criterion for knowledge. Philosophy seen thus would seem to run on an opposite course to the issue of ignorance.

And yet, Plato does discuss ignorance. In the Platonic dialogues we find essentially two presentations of ignorance, namely, the Socratic ignorance and ignorance with "that which is not" as its "object." Let us investigate these two positions in some detail.

In Meno amid the discussion on virtue Meno makes a typical complaint against Socrates in the following.

Meno: Socrates, even before I met you they told me that in plain truth you are a perplexed man yourself and reduce others to perplexity. At this moment I feel you are exercising magic and witchcraft upon me and positively laying me under your spell until I am just a mass of helplessness. If I may be flippant, I think that not only in outward appearance but in other respects as well you are exactly like the flat sting ray that one meets in the sea.

.....

In response to this accusation, Socrates argues,

Socrates: As for myself, if the sting ray paralyzes others only through being paralyzed itself, then the comparison is just, but not otherwise. It isn't that, knowing the answer myself, I perplex other people. The truth is rather that I infect them also with the perplexity I feel myself. So, with virtue now, I don't know what it is.
The phrase "Socratic ignorance" points to two types of situation: one, a particular context like the one presented here in *Meno* wherein an interlocutor is examined out of his conviction or belief on particular issue; the other, a general proclamation of Socrates' ignorance. The latter situation is most explicitly stated in the *Apology* where after questioning a politician who is known to be a "wise" man Socrates concludes, "However, I reflected as I walked away, Well, I am certainly wiser than this man. It is only too likely that neither of us has any knowledge to boast of, but he thinks that he knows something which he does not know, whereas I am quite conscious of my ignorance. At any rate it seems that I am wiser than he is to this small extent, that I do not think that I know what I do not know."

A case can be made here that the Socratic ignorance involves an existential concern. The term "existential" here is used to mean the ontological state which involves one's total being once the conceptual construction has been demolished by intellectual questionings. This state of being is brought forth after an abandonment of wrong opinions or unexamined presuppositions is achieved. It is often designated a kind of "perplexity" or "paralysis" wherein neither an affirmation nor a negation of a particular position can be asserted. It is stated that this perplexity is a necessary requirement for philosophical
knowledge. This aspect of the Socratic ignorance is generally applicable to Socrates' interlocutors. As for Socrates himself, he claims that he is different from other Athenians only in respect to his realization of this ignorance. In both cases, it is very important to point out that ignorance here is not something given but it invariably involves an achieved realization. Ignorance has to be found out, laid bare and recognized.

At this point some comparable similarities between the Socratic and the Zen Buddhist understandings of ignorance might be detected. That is to say, both emphasize the ontological paralysis wherein all beliefs are suspended as necessary condition for the arising of wisdom. The method used in both systems involve dialectic interactions between the two parties. However, it is my contention that the differences are more decisive than the similarities. This is not to negate the feasibility of comparing the two systems by bringing out its points of compatibilities, but it is clear that the sole emphasis on similar points can be decisively misleading.

First of all, it must be made clear that the points of similarity is a matter of structure but not of content. It is true that both systems emphasize the total and radical breakthrough from the realm of false opinions to a qualitatively different state of being. However, this does not mean that the two attempts are totally similar.
It is important to point out that the Buddhist "existential concern" is characterized by the feeling of dukkha, that is, a sense of the fundamental suffering nature of existence. It is hardly the case that Socrates would concern himself with the issue of suffering which is decisively characteristic of the Buddhist sense of the "existential."

Secondly, the Buddhist understanding of ignorance is closely related to the delusion of the belief in a self as an independently existing ego. The issue of non-self (anattā) is at once the fact of man's existence and the highest expression of Buddhist personhood. In Buddhism, the realization of one's ignorance is a cessation of the delusion of the ego. In my opinion, it is hardly the case that Socrates was attempting to establish non-ego as the ideal expression of being human. Socrates admits his ignorance of the definitions of moral virtues, but I do not think that the Socratic ignorance points to an attachment to the existence of a delusory ego. The sense of the "existential" in Buddhism cannot be divorced from the characterization of existence as anattā. In my view, the Buddhist expression of anattā is alien to the Socratic articulation of ignorance. Therefore, I think that the difference in content between the two systems needs to be brought out.

As for Plato, it is best to investigate his understanding of ignorance by making a distinction between the
explicit and the prevalent in his treatments of this issue. The reason I have to make this distinction is because Plato is not totally consistent on this issue. What I call "the explicit" is Plato's specific ascription of "that which is not" as the object of ignorance. 6 If we follow Plato's distinction of the three realms, namely, that which "is not," that which "is becoming" and that which "is," as the point of departure of his metaphysics, we would have the understanding that ignorance about "that which is not" is not very significant. In a particular context in the Republic (which will be discussed in detail in Chapter II), Plato tries to establish the fact that opinion has that which is becoming as its object. 7 In so doing, Plato merely sees ignorance as something postulated as the logical opposite of knowledge and its correlate realm of that which "is." In this sense ignorance is not part of the changing world of becoming.

However, ignorance might not be part of this world of becoming but it is prevalent in it. Ignorance has its expression in the world of becoming through opinion which is a kind of forgetfulness. According to the doctrine of Recollection (Anamnesis) which states that knowing is a process of recovery of what is already there, ignorance is not totally not-knowing but it is not-remembering or total loss of memory.

This tension in Plato as expressed in the fact that on the one hand Plato keeps ignorance out of the world of
becoming by distinguishing it from opinion, and on the
other, he keeps it in through the doctrine of Recollection,
will be discussed in more detail in Chapter II. It will be
argued that this inconsistency can be explained but perhaps
not resolved in Plato's idea of the philosopher king. At
this point it suffices to say that Plato's philosophy is a
continuous effort to strive towards the realm of being which
is expressed in his theory of Forms, and therefore ignorance
with its correlate of "that which is not" is not of central
significance to his scheme of thought.

On the other hand, when we turn to Aristotle, who gives
greater epistemological credence to the empirical world, we
again find that ignorance is of no major concern. Let us
see how Aristotle's contribution to philosophy is described
by a prominent scholar of his work.

Aristotle's philosophy consists in his contribu-
tions to the sciences and his reflections on the
interrelations among the sciences, for even
metaphysics, which he called "first philosophy,"
was one of the theoretic sciences, and its subject
matter included the study of the principles of
other sciences. The interest in the structure
and system of the sciences leads Aristotle into
frequent inquiries into the origins of the
sciences, both in the historical sense of
tracing the development of particular doctrines
or the course of investigation of particular
problems in the formal sense of setting forth
the requirements of scientific inquiry and
proof. 8

For Aristotle, instead of the world of Forms, the
natural world itself is the paradigm for philosophical
investigation. If McKeon is right in stating that
"Aristotle's philosophy consists in his contributions to
the sciences and his reflections on the interrelations among the sciences," then it means that for Aristotle, the natural world is the locus for the search for knowledge. Science starts its investigation in the natural world. It searches to understand its principles. Instead of being committed to a separate world of Forms, Aristotle holds a metaphysical commitment to the natural realm and sees the investigation into its functioning process itself as the task of philosophy. If the locus of knowledge is thus established, the idea of seeing ignorance as a basic contributing force of existence in the Buddhist sense does not arise.

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to deal with the rich varieties of thoughts and ideas generated in the medieval world. However, one central issue can be discerned in thinkers in this period, namely, the problem of knowledge. According to McKeon, "The problem of knowledge has been inquired into, with different emphases and different consequences throughout not only the medieval period but through the whole of Western philosophy." He explains that the Platonist and the Augustinian philosophers look for a guarantee of knowledge in the eternal things presented directly to the mind in the light of divine illumination. In this scheme, the discovery of truth indicates the necessity of Truth. Consequently, McKeon suggests,

The demonstration of the existence of God and the exploration of the eternal structure
of divine ideas constitute the philosophic enterprise most in keeping with this attitude. Any truth is the manifestation of the presence of an eternal principle or a divine illumination to us, and there were therefore few things in the metaphysics of the universe which reason and intellect were not equipped to penetrate; even the trinity, the incarnation and the mysteries of faith could be demonstrated.... But if the platonist turned to God and eternal ideas in answer to the question how we know, the aristotelian sought the answer in terms and ideas and in their combinations and separations, which are accomplished by the human intellect.... The orientation is therefore toward the problem of logic rather than to the discovery of divinity.12

In the Platonic-Augustinian system, there seems to be no room for the issue of ignorance. God is both the guarantor and the goal for human philosophic endeavor. Plato's theory of Form is expressed here in terms of "eternal ideas" which are manifestations of God. Also it seems that within the context of a system where God exists along with original sin, ignorance, as an existential concern is irrelevant, for it is a matter of "guilt" (as expressed in the concept of "sin") rather than "lack of knowledge" which explains human philosophic-spiritual deficiencies. As in the case of the Aristotelian-Thomist system, the philosophic endeavor is focussed on the empirical world and the realm of logic. Thus, as stated earlier in our discussion of Aristotle, the course of philosophic enterprise runs in an opposite direction to that of the issue of ignorance as an existential concern.
In the seventeenth century the philosophy of Descartes needs a well-meaning God as the ultimate guarantor of his philosophic foundation. Descartes does discuss the possibility of error in human judgment concerning epistemological issues. And yet, it seems that for Descartes, who holds great belief in the reasoning ability of the human intellect, an intervention of the will is necessary to account for error in making epistemological judgment. In other words, if the understanding or rationality of the intellect operated properly, errors would not have arisen. Descartes argues,

...for since I understand nothing but by the power which God has given me for understanding, there is no doubt that all that I understand, I understand as I ought, and it is not possible that I err in this. Whence come my errors? They come from the sole fact that since the will is much wider in its range and compass than the understanding, I do not restrain it within the same bounds, but extend it also to things which I do not understand. 13

At this point in the Meditations Descartes exempts the understanding from making error when he says, "there is no doubt that all that I understand, I understand as I ought." And yet, even if errors are committed by an act of will rather than of reasoning, Descartes still wants to add the dimension of "properly" or "improperly" using the will. Since the will is also God-given, it cannot function as deterrent to knowledge all the time. Therefore, Descartes accounts for errors by the "misuse of the free
will." He argues that it is not an imperfection in God when the human will is misused but "it is without doubt an imperfection in me not to make a good use of my freedom, and to give my judgment readily on matters which I only understand obscurely." 

In Descartes' scheme of thought it is impossible to conceive of ignorance as existentially constitutive of human existence. With the well-meaning God as the guarantor of human understanding and errors as acts of will, here again, we find no room for ignorance as an existential concern.

If we follow Descartes' philosophical reasoning, we would find that knowledge is a matter of necessity and error is a matter of choice. Viewed in this way, it is not surprising to see the rationalistic development from Descartes to Spinoza who vigorously articulates the necessity of relations of all things in the universe. For Spinoza, the articulation of those necessary relations is the philosophic enterprise.

As for David Hume, who is generally considered the most prominent thinker among the Classical Empiricists, he pushes empirical philosophy to its logical extreme by applying strictly empirical criteria to any knowledge claim. In the opening passage in his *A Treatise On Human Nature*, Hume gives the ground rules for his philosophy.

All the perceptions of the human mind resolve themselves into two distinct kinds, which I shall call Impressions and Ideas. The difference betwixt
these consists in the degrees of force and liveliness with which they strike upon the mind, and make their way into our thought or consciousness. These perceptions, which enter with most force and violence, we may name impressions; and under this name I comprehend all our sensations, passions and emotions, as they make their first appearance in the soul. By ideas I mean the faint images of these in thinking and reasoning.16

It is not quite clear what Hume means by the term "strike upon." It seems to indicate the nature of the relationship between the impressions and ideas on the one hand and the mind on the other. The least we can say about this relationship is that it implies a passive receptivity on the part of the mind and an active role of the imprinting of impressions and ideas on the mind. Such kind of terminology does suggest the underlying metaphysical assumption in the philosophy of Hume—a point which will be discussed in more detail in Chapter III. What concerns us here is the strict empiricist criterion which Hume sets up as a point of departure for his philosophy. Applying this criterion to the discussion of cause and effect, Hume finds himself "stopt short" of being able to make a claim to the idea of cause and effect. He describes,

Having thus discover'd or suppos'd the two relations of contiguity and succession to be essential to causes and effects, I find I am stopt short, and can proceed no farther in considering any single instance of cause and effect.17

Hume is generally considered a "skeptic" for he does not accept the empirical legitimacy of such ideas as
"necessity" or "cause" and "effect." However, some observa-
tion should be made to point out that Hume is skeptical only
when it concerns the matter of "how" we can lay claim to
such knowledge. In other words, he is a skeptic only in
the sense that knowledge, for example, of cause and effect
in this case, is not strictly given in empirical experience.
This seems to indicate that he denies our ability to grasp
certain aspects of reality. However, this does not mean
that Hume is a skeptic when it concerns the existence of
reality of the external world. For Hume, the external
world is some kind of stimuli which give rise to impressions
and ideas (which "strike upon" the mind). Viewed in this
way, Hume's skepticism is a skepticism of "how" and not of
"what." It is rather ironical to see that on the one hand
Hume is a naive realist when it concerns the existence of
the external world; on the other hand, he is a skeptic who
rejects our claim to know certain important aspects of
that external reality.

Although there are certain elements in Hume's
philosophy which leave him susceptible to being labelled
a "skeptic," he by no means considers ignorance as existen-
tially constitutive of human existence. It is quite
obvious that the human mind for Hume, is primarily a
cognitive faculty which registers the impressions and
ideas generated by the external world. Also, Hume's
unquestioned belief in the reality of the external world
as his metaphysical assumption is not conducive to a
discussion of ignorance as an existential concern. Man can make errors if he has confused ideas of impressions but he is never considered basically ignorant. This kind of naive realistic commitment, again, does not leave room for the consideration of ignorance as constitutive of human existence.

After Hume, Kant detects the basis of Hume's skepticism in the latter's attempt to find necessity and universality in empirical experience—an attempt which, in Kant's view, is necessarily futile for it looks for those ideas in the wrong place. Before Kant grounds knowledge in the a priori faculty of the human understanding he makes some amendment to Hume's strictly empirical criteria for knowledge. In the Introduction to the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant sets the stage for his transcendental philosophy in the opening passages which are primarily a direct response to Hume's opening passage in A Treatise on Human Nature. Kant opens with the following statements.

There can be no doubt that all our knowledge begins with experience....But though all our knowledge begins with experience it does not follow that it all arises out of experience. 18

Kant finds Hume's philosophical starting point too limited. He sees that the kind of empirical universality that Hume was looking for is just not given in experience. He says, "Empirical universality is only an arbitrary extension of a validity holding in most cases to one which holds in all." 19 Kant sees the necessity of
grounding empirical experience in a priori knowledge. He states, "When, on the other hand, strict universality is essential to a judgment, this indicates a special source of knowledge, namely, a faculty of a priori knowledge." This statement is Kant's elaboration on his earlier assertion, "But although all our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it all arises out of experience." Kant mentions Hume by name in suggesting that Hume was looking for the validity of our concept of cause and effect in the wrong place. Kant gives his reason for his criticism of Hume in the following.

It is possible to show that pure a priori principles are indispensable for the possibility of experience, and so to prove their existence a priori. For whence could experience derive its certainty, if all the rules, according to which it proceeds, were always themselves empirical, and therefore contingent?

Kant is not negating Hume's empiricism, he just sees it impossible to look for the necessity or universal validity of experience within empirical experience. Kant points out "a special source of knowledge" which he terms "a priori knowledge." This suggestion indicates that the Twelvefold Table of Categories is constitutive of human understanding itself. In other words, these categories, together with time and space make our experience possible. But their universality is not given in empirical experience as such. In this respect, it seems that Kant's use of the term "transcendental" points to a double aspect. Firstly,
it indicates the fact that its universality is not given in empirical experience and therefore transcendental. Secondly, it also indicates that it is the ground of experience: it makes experience possible. However, this does not mean to suggest an element of "other-worldliness" as the term is commonly understood. For Kant, the transcendental is the a priori form of the empirical and the empirical is indicative of the transcendental.

Kant's "discovery" of the a priori form of cognition seems to be his response to the skepticism left behind by Hume. In his attempt to ground the possibility of human knowledge, Kant gives us a version of man who is primarily cognitive, scientific, and logical. To put it concretely, all the cognitive apparatus as exemplified in Kant's Twelvefold Table of Categories is the very constitution of man himself. Kant sees the task of the "dissection of the faculty of the understanding itself" as the "proper task of transcendental philosophy." Kant makes a distinction between his transcendental philosophy and other philosophical investigations by pointing out that the task of other philosophies is "that of dissecting the content of such concepts as may present themselves, and so of rendering them more distinct." Kant sees his philosophy as the "hitherto rarely attempted dissection of the faculty of the understanding itself, in order to investigate the possibility of concepts a priori by looking for them in the
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Fourthly, the philosophic enterprise is the search for the transcendental ground for the possibility of human experience. This is exemplified in Kant.

In all these different phases in Western philosophy, the idea that man is the "knowing subject" seems never to have been questioned. As discussed earlier, even a so-called "skeptic" like Hume is no exception. Man can "err" or make epistemological mistakes, or certain aspects of reality might not be revealed to him in strictly empirical experience, but his basic or even essential faculty is "to know." Although the objects of knowledge might differ from philosopher to philosopher, take for example, the Forms of Plato, or the objects in the natural world for the Empiricists, they are something to be "known" by a subject nonetheless. Somehow the metaphysical given, be it Forms, natural objects or God, is at once the aim and the guarantee for philosophic enterprise. The ideas of man as the knowing subject together with one form or another of commitment to metaphysical entities act as a deterrent to the consideration of ignorance as part of philosophical endeavor.

Contrary to the general trend in Western philosophy Buddhism sees ignorance (avijjā) as the crucial contributive force of human existence itself. In the course of my investigation I shall attempt to articulate some analogical, though perhaps not exactly similar, discussions in some Western schools concerning the issue of misperception and
the concept of the "subject" with the view to use these expositions as a stage to the understanding of the Buddhist concept of ignorance (avijja). Different aspects of this dynamic concept will be delineated in three Buddhist traditions, namely, Early, Mahayana and Zen. Particular attention will be given to Dogen (1200-1253), the founder of the Soto school of Japanese Zen, for his philosophical project in general offers a uniquely interesting aspect to the understanding of ignorance (mumyo). After an exposition of this concept in Buddhism, some implications concerning the relationship between ignorance, action and responsibility, together with the Buddhist understanding of man will also be articulated.
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CHAPTER II
IGNORANCE AND MISPERCEPTION

In Chapter I I have tried to show how the course of Western philosophy in general runs on an opposite direction to the consideration of ignorance as a central issue. Now let us investigate the issue of misperception in the West, together with some Indian schools, and see how the basic concern of Early Buddhism is quite different from those articulated in the West. Special attention will be brought to the fact that the issue of misperception in the West focuses mainly on individual acts of perceiving whereas the Early Buddhist concern is more general in outlook. It points to the disposition of man as opposed to his particular perceptual acts.

MISPERCEPTION IN PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY

In the Classical Greek tradition, Plato offers an interesting metaphysics of the world together with its epistemological implications. He explains,

First then, in my judgment, we must make a distinction and ask, What is that which always is and has no becoming, and What is that which is always becoming and never is. That which is apprehended by intelligence and reason is always in the same state, but that which is conceived by opinion with the help of sensation and without reason is always in the process of becoming and perishing and never really is. Now everything that becomes or is
created must of necessity be created by some cause, for without a cause nothing can be created. The work of the creator, whenever he looks to the unchangeable and fashions the form and nature of his work after an unchangeable pattern, must necessarily be made fair and perfect, but when he looks to the created only and uses a created pattern, it is not fair or perfect.¹

This passage in Plato's *Timaeus* can be seen as an attempt to establish a basic metaphysics of the world. In Plato's scheme, the Form or the "Unchangeable pattern" after which the world is fashioned, is prior to the act of creation itself. This is very different from the Judeo-Christian version of creation; for in the latter tradition the power of creation explicitly lies in God the Almighty who creates the whole universe "out of nothing."² In Plato's case, the demiurge is merely a mediating factor between the Form and the created world. In this sense then the Form, not God himself, is the locus of creating power.

Another significant assertion is that the Form is "unchangeable" and therefore is "that which always is and has no becoming." This basic metaphysics acquires an interesting epistemological dimension when it is claimed that "that which is apprehended by intelligence and reason is always in the same state, but that which is conceived by opinion with the help of sensation and without reason is always in a process of becoming and perishing and never really is." At this point, the dual nature of man's
epistemic ability is indicated. On the one hand, inherent in man is the power of "intelligence and reason" through which man apprehends the objects of knowledge which is the unchangeable. On the other hand, "with the help of sensation and without reason" man gains opinion of the becoming and the perishing world. From this position, some people might get the impression that Plato sees a conflicting function between the senses and the intellect. However, Plato also talks about the doctrine of "Recollection," that is, sensible objects can "provoke" the memory of the intelligible objects imprinted on the immortal soul prior to the present life of a person. The possibility of Plato's doctrine of "Recollection" can serve as a testimony to the fact that he does not see the function of the senses as irrelevant or unhelpful to the attainment of knowledge. This interpretation is supported by Jerry Clegg who argues that thought with Forms as subjects can be viewed as a complete and exact vehicle of knowledge and it does not clash with sensation, but supplements and clarifies its limited and distorted testimony. 3

The relation between the senses and the intellect then is not a matter of contradiction but of complementariness. The intellect "supplements and clarifies" what is given by the senses; while the senses can serve as a "reminder" of intelligible objects imbedded in the
immortal soul. The issue of the epistemic status of the senses in Plato, then is more of a matter of inadequacy than fallacy. Perhaps it is safe to say that for Plato the sensible world, though limited and incomplete, does have some epistemological value. However, the value does not spring from itself, rather it is valid only when guided by reason or indicative of the intelligible Forms. It is irrelevant here to deal with the complicated issue of the exact relationship between the sensible and the intelligible objects in Plato. Many thinkers and scholars from Aristotle to modern day have attempted to clarify or criticize Plato for his ambiguities in dealing with the relationship between the two worlds.

A clarification on opinion or its correlate, the sensible world, is attempted in the Republic Book V. Plato here puts ignorance into discussion to explicate his point.

"...but tell us this: Does the man who knows, know something or nothing? You answer me on his behalf."

"I'll answer," he said, "that he knows something."

"Is it something that is or is not?"

"That is. How could what is not be known at all?"

"So, do we have an adequate grasp of the fact—even if we should consider it in many ways—that which is entirely, is entirely knowable; and what in no way is, is in every way unknowable?"
"Most adequate."

"All right. Now if there were something such as both to be and not to be, wouldn't it lie between what purely and simply is and what in no way is?"

"Yes, it would be between."

"Since knowledge depended on what is and ignorance necessarily on what is not, mustn't we also seek something between ignorance and knowledge that depends on that which is in between, if there is in fact any such thing?"

"Most certainly."

"Do we say opinion is something?"

"Of course."

"A power different from knowledge or the same?"

"Different."

"Then opinion is dependent on one thing and knowledge on another, each according to its power."

Some explanation of what power means follows. Then the dialogue continues.

"...If different powers are naturally dependent on different things and both are powers--opinion and knowledge--and each is, as we say, different, then on this basis it's not admissible that the knowable and the opinable be the same."

"If what is, is knowable, then wouldn't something other than that which is be opinable?"

"Yes, it would be something other."

"Then does it opine what is not? Or is it also impossible to opine what is not? Think about it. Doesn't the man who opines refer his opinion to something? Or is it possible to opine, but to opine nothing?"
"No, it's impossible."

....

"To that which is not, we were compelled to assign ignorance, and to that which is, knowledge."

"Right," he said.

"Opinion, therefore, opines neither that which is nor that which is not."

"No, it doesn't."

"Opinion, therefore, would neither be ignorance nor knowledge?"

"It doesn't seem so."

....

"Opinion, therefore, would be between the two."

"That's entirely certain."

"Weren't we saying before that if something should come to light as what is and what is not at the same time, it lies between that which purely and simply is and that which in every way is not, and that neither knowledge nor ignorance will depend on it, but that which in its turn comes to light between ignorance and knowledge?"

"Right."

"And now it is just that which we call opinion that has come to light between them."4

In these passages Plato gives an explicit discussion about the nature of ignorance (agnoia).5 He establishes that "that which is" is the object of knowledge, "that which is becoming" is the object of opinion, and "that which is not" is the object of ignorance. In this specific explanation we have the idea that, in Plato's view,
ignorance is not very significant for it does not pertain to the changing world. There is no sense of talking about non-being because ignorance is absentive by nature. It is a lack of knowledge. And yet, it is clear that non-knowledge is prevalent in the world of becoming. According to Plato's doctrine of Recollection, it is held that knowledge is already there within us, having been embedded in the immortal soul prior to birth, but we simply do not remember it. Not-knowing is a loss of memory. This doctrine of Recollection is closely related to the idea of the defilement or contamination of the soul which prevents the soul from knowing what it already knows.

From this perspective we have the idea that Plato sees the knowing process as a gradual recovery. The changing world of particular objects provokes the mind into realizing knowledge of the Forms.

However, that is not the total picture of Plato's position. In the famous Parable of the Cave, we have an image that the final attainment of knowledge has to be total and there is a radical breakthrough from the shadows in the cave. Not-knowing in this allegory is not simply partial loss of memory, for no matter how long and thoroughly one looks at the shadows in the cave one will never truly "know" them. The sage has to be removed from the cave and come out in the sun to see the "real" world. At this point, we can see that there is a tension between Plato's doctrine of Recollection and the image of the final
attainment of knowledge in the Parable of the Cave. After a careful investigation of the matter I have arrived at the conclusion that this particular tension in Plato cannot be resolved (or rather needs not be resolved) but it can be explained. I have the opinion that the kind of total attainment of knowledge as presented in the Parable of the Cave is meant to describe the realization of the philosopher; whereas the doctrine of Recollection is meant to explain the knowing process of the common people. This does not mean to say that the process of recollection is not operative for the philosopher, but that it is inadequate for the realization of total philosophical knowledge. The element of elitism is highly visible in the Republic. In that first classic work on political philosophy we come to the understanding that Plato does not attempt to educate all the citizens in the Republic to become philosophers. In Plato's idea of the philosopher king, true knowledge is necessary for the philosopher (or only the philosopher is capable of attaining true knowledge) while the true opinion may be adequate for the citizens.

Apart from his discussion of ignorance, Plato offers some interesting insights into the issue of misperception. Although for Plato, the sensible objects do help to "provoke" or "remind" the soul of the Forms which are objects of knowledge, it is clear from the discussions in Theaetetus that perception of the sensible objects
alone is not knowledge in the Platonic sense. Within this world of "appearance," to use Clegg's term, there are cases of "misperception" as well as "misjudgment."

Concerning "misperception," let us see what Plato offers as the explanation for the two types of misperception.

In *Theaetetus*, Socrates points out the case of "misperceiving" as the type of perception which has no ground in the sensible world of objects.

Socrates: Then let us not leave it incomplete. There remains the question of dreams and disorders, especially madness and all the mistakes madness is said to make in seeing or hearing or other misperceiving. You know, of course, that in all these cases the theory we have just started is supposed to be admittedly disproved, on the ground that in these conditions we certainly have false perceptions, and that so far from its being true that what appears to any man also is, on the contrary none of these appearances is real.

This is one of Socrates' arguments leveled against the alleged Protagoras' doctrine that "knowledge is nothing but perception" and that "man is the nature of all things—alike of the being of things that are and of the not-being of things that are not." Certainly, if "man" in the Protagorian dictum is interpreted as the individual man which may mean any man, then how can a Protagorian justify the perceptions, which obviously are misperceptions, of a dreaming person or a mad man? This, however, does not mean to deny that these people do have the direct awareness of their sensations as they do. As Cornford puts it, "No one can deny that the dreamer has just that experience
which he does have. However, the mere direct awareness of these people, which is true to them, cannot justify the knowledge claim that it is supposed to make. At this level of misperception, the issue of "judgment" has not yet entered the picture. Misperception in these cases means essentially a perception of something which actually does not exist at the time and place of perception.

The second case of "misjudgment" does involve a legitimate sense experience and yet somehow the percipient "judges" his sensation incorrectly. Socrates resorts to several metaphors in explicating his point.

Socrates: It remains, then, that false judgment should occur in a case like this--when I, who know you and Theodorus and possess imprints of you both like seal impressions in the waxen block, see you both at a distance indistinctly and am in a hurry to assign the proper imprint of each to the proper visual perception, like fitting a foot into its own footmark to effect a recognition, and then make the mistake of interchanging them, like a man who thrusts his feet into the wrong shoes, and apply the perception of each to the imprint of the other. Or my mistake might be illustrated by the sort of thing that happens in a mirror when the visual current transposes right to left. In that case mistaking or false judgment does result.

Unlike the first case where a perception has no ground in the world of objects, this case involves a perception of Theaetetus and Theodous. The locus of mistake is not the groundlessness of perception but the mis-matching of one "imprint" of perception for another.
"Judgment" in this case seems to mean "an act of association between imprint and the sense-impression. If the process is wrong, we have a case of "false judgment."

ILLUSORY EXPERIENCE

It is very interesting to see that the modern day treatment of the issue of perceptual illusion offers some striking similarities to that of Plato. The first case of "misperception" as presented by Plato is taken up again in an article in the Encyclopedia of Philosophy together with two more cases listed as "illusory experience."

This is stated in the Encyclopedia:

THREE KINDS OF ILLUSORY EXPERIENCE. The term "illusion" is used by philosophers to cover a range of phenomena approximately classifiable as follows.

Illusions proper. Illusions proper occur when the percipient is deceived or is liable to be deceived in identifying the object perceived or its properties. Psychologists have produced a number of optical illusions, such as equal lines that appear to be of unequal length; a stationary balloon when inflated and then deflated seems to advance and then recede; and a specially constructed Distorted Room, in which a man looks smaller than a boy...

Relativity of perceptions. A round plate that looks elliptical when seen from an angle and a square table that looks diamond shaped illustrate the relativity of perception....

Hallucinations. In pure hallucinations--for example, the pink elephant a drunkard sees, the apparitions of delirium, Macbeth's dagger-some physical object is "perceived" when neither it nor anything at all like it is present...
It is quite explicit from these passages that the discussion of illusion as presented here centers around the issue of "what" is being perceived by a percipient. Although the illusory experiences of seeing two equal lines as unequal or a square table as diamond shaped or the pink elephant are due to different reasons, namely, to the inherent structure of the human optical apparatus makeup in the first case, to the physical position of the percipient in the second and to an abnormal mental state in the third, these experiences are all analyzed from the perspective of "what" is being perceived.

Concerning the issue of illusion of perception this same emphasis on "what" is being perceived in illusory experience is taken up in some Indian philosophical schools. Since it is beyond the scope of this chapter to present the general philosophical climate of Indian philosophy as a whole, what will be attempted here is merely the presentation of the positions of some Indian schools which deal directly with this problem of illusory experiences.

According to Anil Kumar Ray Chaudhuri,

There are six principal theories of false presentation viz., Satkhyāti, Akhyāti, Anyathākhyāti, Atmakhyāti, Asatkhyati, and Anirvacanīyakhyāti. Of these theories the first denies error altogether. The content of every knowledge is objectively real. What is called error is nothing but the cognition of the inessential feature of an object as the essential feature of it. This is the reason why such cognition fails to produce successful activity. The second view also does not admit error in
the sense of a single complex knowledge. What passes for error is simply due to non-discrimination between two consecutive presentations or between a presentation and an immediately following presentation. The respective contents of these experiences also are not differentiated. Each experience, by itself, is true. We go wrong in practical behavior because we fail to distinguish between the two cognitions. The third admits error as a single complex cognition. Both the subject and the predicate of an erroneous judgment are separately real, the presented identity between them is only unreal. The fourth maintains that in illusion there is no object apart from cognition. The internal cognition appears as the external object. The fifth holds that error is cognition of the absolute naught. Correction of illusion clearly demonstrates that the content of such experience is pure non-entity. And the last maintains that error is the experience of what is anirvacanīya. The content of error is neither real, nor unreal, nor both.\textsuperscript{14}

Here too, as in the \textit{Encyclopedia of Philosophy} article, illusion is analyzed in terms of the content of experience. It can be seen that six different reasons are given to account for illusory experience. That is, according to the Satkhyāti position, illusory experiences are due to the percipient’s taking the inessential quality of the perceived object as the essential; the Akhyāti people explain that false cognition is due to the non-discrimination between two consecutive presentations; the Anyathākhyāti school argues that the presented identity between two perceptions is unreal; the Ātmakhyāti position holds that illusory objects are merely mental imagination; the Asatkhyāti position explains that error is cognition of pure non-entity; the Anirvacanīyakhyāti position says that the content of error is neither real nor unreal nor both.
All these theories are presented to explain why a certain thing is perceived as another thing rather than itself. Although they offer different explanations as to why one has erroneous cognition, they all share the same starting point of their analyses. That is to say, all these six theories deal with the problem of illusion from the perspective of "what" is experienced. From that shared starting point, they go on to offer various accounts of why these experiences come about in a percipient.

It seems that at least two Buddhist schools had joined in the discussion of the illusion of perception with these Indian schools. This can be seen in the positions of the Ātmakhyāti and the Asatkhyāti. The former is presented by the Yogācāra school which regards that error consists in regarding an internal object as the external; and the latter by the Mādhyamika school which maintains that error is cognition of the non-existent. However, if we investigate the issue of ignorance as presented in the Early Buddhist tradition, we would see that ignorance in the Early tradition does not center around the issue of illusion of perception but rather on the mode of experience in general which characterizes objects in a certain way. Ignorance in Early Buddhism is discussed in context of dependent origination and is the condition for unwholesome behavior. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter IV. The point here is that Early Buddhism does
not offer a treatment of the issue of perceptual illusion as do later Buddhist schools.

THE EARLY BUDDHIST CONCERN

In the Mahā-Vagga the Buddha has this to say about the nature of human perception.

And there in Gayā, on Gayā Head, The Blessed One dwelt, together with the thousand priests. And there The Blessed One addressed the priests:-

"All things, 0 priests, are on fire. And what, 0 priests, are all these things which are on fire?

"The eye, 0 priests, is on fire; forms are on fire, eye-consciousness is on fire; impressions received by the eye are on fire; and whatever sensation, pleasant, unpleasant, or indifferent, originates in dependence on impressions received by the eye, that also is on fire.

"And with what are these on fire?

"With the fire of passion, say I, with the fire of hatred, with the fire of infatuation; with birth, old age, death, sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief, and despair are they on fire.15

It is quite explicit from this passage that the Buddha does not deal with specific cases of fallacious perception. He, instead, talks about the whole general disposition of man who tends to view things in hatred, sorrow, grief or despair. All these emotive elements penetrate into the human cognitive activities themselves. The "fire" elements in human dispositions often add bright or gloomy colors to the objects being perceived. These elements in
human perception are the expression of ignorance in the Buddhist understanding.

It can be argued at this point that the discussion on part of Early Buddhism points to an altogether different issue from that of the general issue of perceptual illusion. A question can be asked that given the understanding of ignorance in Early Buddhism how does it explain the perceptual mistake of taking a rope for a snake, or a cloak for a man, for example? My response is that the Early Buddhist understanding of ignorance per se does not provide a definite answer for the explication of the issue of perceptual error. And yet, the Buddhist understanding of the human mind does provide a framework comprehensive enough to explain the phenomena of perceptual error. This can be seen from the fact that later Buddhist thinkers do join in the discussion of perceptual illusion, for example, by applying the doctrine of emptiness or of the Yogācāra Idealism to explain perceptual mistakes.

However, I think that the Buddha would consider the issue of perceptual illusion as existing on different levels and dimensions. It is not limited only to the physical realm. The general issue of misperception caters only to the fact of mistaking one thing for another. It does not explain why, for example, two persons who are perceiving the same event react to it in a totally different manner. Take this simple case for example. John and Larry are
sitting enjoying their coffee in a side-walk café. Suddenly they see a woman walking hand-in-hand with a man. John feels happy for the couple while Larry is obviously upset by what he sees and cannot enjoy his coffee any longer. John asks Larry what is wrong. After a long pause, Larry admits to John that "that woman" is (or rather used to be) "my Susan." In this case, physically speaking, both John and Larry "epistemologically perceive" the same event. But it can hardly be said that "that one event" is the same for John and Larry. In a case like this, the Buddha's statement that "forms are on fire, eye-consciousness is on fire" is highly relevant for it can explain the illusory nature of Larry's perception of Susan. Maybe Larry cannot come to terms with himself that Susan does not "belong" to him any more. As a matter of fact, she might never have "belonged" to him from the beginning. For the Buddha, the elements of "I," "me," "mine" in perception are continuously creating illusion in myriad shapes and forms for man.

I think that if we do not limit the definition of perceptual illusion merely to the physical aspects of things perceived we can say that Early Buddhism offers its own expression of the issue. For the Buddha, to perceive things with the attachment of the ego is perceptual illusion per se because it runs against the true characteristics of existence as impermanent (anicca), suffering (dukkha) and non-ego (anattā). If we accept the Early
Buddhist expression of this issue, we will have an alternative way of looking at the issue of perceptual illusions. For further clarification of the difference of perspective in viewing this issue, let us turn to the well-known example of mistaking a rope for a snake and see how the Buddha would have treated it differently.

The six Indian schools on false representations attempt to explain why a percipient makes a cognitive fallacy in mistaking a rope for a snake. The Ātmakhyāti people would say that the snake is a mere mental phantasy. On the other hand, the Akhyāti people would talk of superimposing a memory-image of a snake onto the perception of the rope. However, on this same issue, the Early Buddhist position would focus on the percipient's perception of the rope as my rope. If a percipient sees a rope as his rope, then he is in illusion in the Buddhist sense of the term. In other words, the Early Buddhist position is more interested in how an object is perceived, namely, whether there is an "I," "me," or "mine" involved in the cognition, than the issue of "what" is perceived in the physical sense. At this point some people might argue, how can one distinguish the issue of "what" from the issue of "how" in perception? My point is not to divorce the two aspects, but to indicate that the issue of not seeing things as they are, namely, as impermanent, suffering and non-ego is more significant for the Early Buddhist than the
discussion of mistaking one thing for another. A chart might help clarify this point.

Issue of what: Mr. B. seeing a rope, thinks, "That is a snake."

Illusory experience A

Issue of how: Mr. B. seeing a rope, thinks, "That is my rope."

In the second case, the object of perception, whether it be a snake, a rope, a man, or whatever object in this world, is not the important issue of illusion. What is more significant is the perception of a thing as my thing. The Early Buddhist position is not so much interested in explaining why a rope is perceived as a snake, rather the focus is on whether there is an attachment involved in the perceptual act.
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CHAPTER III

TOWARD THE BUDDHIST SUBJECT: CONTEXT FOR IGNORANCE

As shown in Chapter II, the issue of ignorance in Early Buddhism is different from the issue of perceptual illusion mainly in its concern with the fundamental problem of human existence itself and not in particular perceptual acts.

In spite of the fact that Western philosophical concerns in general do not provide room for a serious consideration of ignorance, there are attempts among some major thinkers whose projects can be seen as analogical to that of the Buddhists. In this Chapter, I shall pay special attention to Descartes, Kant and Husserl, who bring to focus the issue of the subject which can be expressed as "the rational subject," "the transcendental subject" and "phenomenological subjectivity" respectively. The exposition of these versions of the subject can be used to clarify and set the stage for the Buddhist understanding of man. It is important to open up the ground for the discussion of the subject within which the issue of ignorance will be discussed. In short, the dynamic subject, rather than mentalistic perceptual acts, is the appropriate context for the discussion of ignorance in Buddhism.
THE ANALOGICAL APPROACH

There are several different approaches in using ideas from one philosophical system to explicate or clarify another. The first way can be achieved through putting two ideas from two basically different systems side by side. This approach seems to be the most simplistic way of cross-system explication. What one does is to locate some common theme between two thinkers, for example, the Buddha and David Hume on the problem of self, and then go on to explicate what each thinker's idea is on the subject without really pointing out the nuances of similarities or differences between the two systems. Neither does one actively attempt to use one system's way of expression to clarify or explain the idea propagated in the other system. The attempt is merely to put one system beside another and thereby expect that the two systems would somehow automatically clarify each other.

Another more sophisticated way of doing cross-system explication seems to go one step further by making explicit in the first place what are the possible points of cross-system explication, what kind of provisions or reservations have to be taken into consideration so that the explication can be fruitful. This second approach makes use of the interaction of ideas between the two selected systems. An example of this type of cross-system explication is some scholars' attempts to explicate Dōgen's ideas by using terms from Husserlian Phenomenology. This approach uses one
system of expression to explicate another's system of thought. What is important about this second approach is the adoption of one way of expression to explicate another mode of thought. The result is that one system of thinking is understood in terms of another system's terminology.

At this point I should like to bring up another approach in doing cross-system explication, namely, the analogical approach. The basic assumption of this third approach is that each system of thought has its own gestalt or field of reference which makes it a unique system in its own right. If this is the case, then, to use an alien system of expression to explicate another particular system, can be useful, but it can also do damage to the original system. For example, the attempt to point out what the Buddha and Hume have to say about the notion of self is to be encouraged, but obviously the Buddha's notion of self is quite different from that of Hume in the first place. And if the Buddha's notion of self is expressed and thus understood merely in terms of Hume's version, a precious richness of meanings is lost in the process. However, this third approach is proposed not as an attempt to downgrade or to denigrate the second or the first approach, for that matter. Rather it proposes to give an alternative and oftentimes complementary perspective to the already existing ones.
This third analogical approach starts from the basic standpoint that the two systems which are to interact with one another are two separate, self-expressive systems. Interactions among ideas of the two systems are desirable but not exclusive. The added dimension is to point to the limitations involved in doing cross-system explication. To some extent, we are able to explicate one system of thought in terms of another. But this is not to be carried out at the expense of the sensitivity to the uniqueness of each system involved. This analogical approach is often brought into focus by Dōgen himself throughout the Shōbōgenzō through the phrase "in like manner" (kakunogotoshi - かくの ごとし), which is perhaps one of the most frequently used phrases in the entire work.

What this method does is to bring up a situation or an idea which carries its own meaning, then use this situation or idea as an occasion to explicate ideas in another system. At its best, it achieves the full acceptance of the original meanings of the two different systems. Also, it helps clarify both systems without distorting the original ones.

Apart from being a useful method in its own right, this third approach can be seen as a tool to point out the limitations involved in the second method of submitting one system to the explication of another. In this Chapter, I should try to show that Descartes and Kant's philosophical projects can be seen as two centers of concern which set the
stage for the discussion of the Buddhist issue of ignorance. Descartes goes beyond particular thinking acts and opens up the ground for the investigation of the essential rationality of man. Kant, on the other hand, grounds the possibility of knowledge in the transcendental subject. These two philosophical attempts will be seen as analogical, though not exactly similar to the Buddhist endeavor to articulate the ground of human existence.

THE RATIONAL SUBJECT

In Part Four of his **Discourse on Method** Descartes provides the ground for his assertion, "I think; therefore I am." thus.

I had noticed for a long time that in practice it is sometimes necessary to follow opinions which we know to be very uncertain, just as though they were indubitable, as I stated before; but inasmuch as I desired to devote myself wholly to the search for truth, I thought that I should take a course precisely contrary, and reject as absolutely false anything of which I could have the least doubt, in order to see whether anything would be left after this procedure which could be called wholly certain. Thus, (32) as our senses deceive us at times, I was ready to suppose that nothing was at all the way our senses represented them to be. As there are men who make mistakes in reasoning even on the simplest topics in geometry, I judged that I was a liable to error as any other, and rejected as false all the reasoning which I had previously accepted as valid demonstration. Finally as the same percepts which we have when awake may come to us when asleep without their being true, I decided to suppose that nothing that had ever entered my mind was more real than the illusions of my
dreams. But soon I noticed that while I thus wished to think everything false, it was necessarily true that I who thought so was something. Since this truth, I think, therefore I am, (or exist), was so firm and assured that all the most extravagant suppositions of the sceptics were unable to shake it, I judged that I could safely accept it as the first principle of the philosophy I was seeking. 

The first passage of Part Four of Discourse on Method is quoted at length to emphasize the whole procedure Descartes goes through before arriving at his conclusion, "I think, therefore I am." The fact that this proclamation is a conclusion has not been so much emphasized as that it is the first principle of Descartes' philosophy. However, it is my contention that this statement, "I think, therefore I am." makes sense only when it is understood as a conclusion. First of all, it seems very awkward to use "I think" as a reason for the fact that "I am." And yet, Descartes' famous statement seems necessary if we start from the other end of his argument. That is to say, Descartes attempts to establish what he considers an "indubitable truth" rather than to make an existential claim. In other words, if we set aside the issue of the "indubitable truth" how can Descartes make an existential claim on the basis of a thinking I? The circularity of Descartes' argument has been pointed out by a good number of scholars. A question such as, "Where does the "I" in the "I think" come from in the first place if the
"I am" is not already there?" would be highly problematic for Descartes. So it would seem that for Descartes, this statement "I think, therefore I am." is a logical conclusion from his even more basic principle of the "indubitable truth."

In spite of the circularity of his argument, let us follow Descartes' project by also assuming as he does that he establishes an existential claim. Descartes further elaborates on his claim by bringing out two major points, that is, the self-subsistence, independence of this "thinking" and also some explication of what he considers "thinking" to mean. Firstly, he says,

...; therefore I concluded that I was a (thing or) substance whose whole essence or nature was only to think, and which, to exist, has no need of space nor of any material thing (or body). Thus it follows that this ego, (this mind) (this soul), by which I am what I am, (559) is entirely distinct from the body and is easier to know than the latter, and that even if the body were not, the soul would not cease to be all that it now is.2

It is very interesting to see Descartes' attempt to establish the foundation of this philosophy through a radical divorce of the thinking ego from its environment. It is necessary for Descartes to radically isolate this "thinking I" from the world and even from its own body, in order to establish the absolute independence of this self-subsisting ego. For Descartes, only after this act of isolation is performed is it possible to claim absolute
independence of the subject and in turn to use this indubitable subject as the solid foundation for his philosophy.

Descartes does not elaborate on what he means by the "thinking I" in the Discourse on Method. However, in the Second Meditation, he attempts some clarification.

But what then am I? A thinking being. What is a thinking being? It is a being which doubts, which understands, (which conceives), which affirms, which denies, which wills, which rejects, which imagines also, and which perceives.3

These activities of the "thinking I" are what Descartes considers to be the testimony of the "I am." He also claims that these activities can go on their own without intervention from the world or the physical being. For Descartes these activities are the most intimate generating force of a person. He thinks that certain mental acts which he generically calls "thinking" are the essence of being human, and are also a guarantee of the certainty of his existence. In his scheme, even if all the contents of what he thinks about are false, the fact that there are mental activities going on cannot be doubted in any circumstances.

It might be rightly argued that Descartes does not aim at exploring the nature of the existence of the "I" as such. What he actually wishes to establish is the indubitable truth of the fact that "I exist" so that he can build on this solid truth other principles of his philosophy. However, in searching for an indubitable principle,
Descartes has to make a claim about the essence of existence. This issue is not whether existence precedes essence or essence precedes existence. The direction of this philosophy is how to find the essence of existence. This quest leads Descartes to the conclusion that the "thinking" is the essence of the existential "I."

The fact that human existence itself needs to be explained in terms of thinking activities in the case of Descartes, points to a very significant quest in philosophy. Except for St. Augustine, this inquiry had perhaps never been so clearly articulated in the Western philosophical scene. Descartes not only brought into focus this problem, he also made use of it as the basic principle of his whole philosophy.

THE TRANSCENDENTAL SUBJECT

Looking at Descartes' project as a whole, we can see that he did not thoroughly explore the cognitive make-up of the subject. He merely used the declaration "I think, therefore I am." as a stepping stone to establish the efficacy of God and the mechanical science of his time. He was not actually interested in exploring the aspect of subjectivity in making knowledge claims about the world. For Descartes, the seeming primacy of the subject is, in fact, a means to establish objectivity of the natural sciences. Perhaps this is why the Copernican Revolution in philosophy was never accredited to Descartes but to
Kant, who put a stop to any claim to knowledge about things in themselves prior to a thorough investigation of the subject's cognitive make-up. The "subject" seemed to have emerged in the Western philosophical scene in Descartes, but the issue of "subjectivity" had not been investigated.

It is not that philosophers before Kant did not see the significance of the subject in the process of knowing. As early as the Greek tradition, Protagoras was believed to hold the view that, "Man is the measure of all things," a position which, according to the Platonic dialogues, would result in absolute relativism. This kind of conclusion is based on the interpretation of the term "man" to mean each individual. About two thousand years later, David Hume claimed that causality derives from "custom" alone. What is actually given in experience is merely the experience of two relations, namely, "contiguity" and "succession" and never causation itself. For Hume, strictly empirical knowledge is the only legitimate form of knowledge. We can see that for the Protagorian, subjectivity was understood as subjectivism; for Hume, it is discredited altogether. Thus, the former resulted in absolute relativism and the latter in skepticism. The investigation of the subject in the knowing process results in the discrediting of any claim to knowledge. Only within the Kantian philosophy can objectivity exist side by side with subjectivity. How does Kant accomplish this awesome task?
Let us first probe the underlying metaphysics presupposed by Protagoras and Hume. For Protagoras there is nothing absolute to be known by any subject in the first place, and therefore what is considered knowledge by one person is not necessarily knowledge for another. As in the case of Hume, the assumption is that there is actually something out there which gives some kind of stimulus to the "impression" in the subject. What the human mind cooks up as "knowledge" over and above what is strictly given in sensation is not legitimate knowledge. In other words, there is a nihilistic metaphysics as the ground for subjectivism in one case and a naive realism at the basis of skepticism in the other. Regardless of any philosophical difficulties which may follow, Kant's distinction between phenomena and noumena solves just this problem. For Kant, knowledge about noumea or things in themselves cannot be claimed by the human mind and yet what appears as phenomena to the human understanding is rightly credited as knowledge. Within this realm of phenomena the subjective a priori condition for knowing is recognized while the objectivity of that which is known is fully accounted for. In the Kantian scheme, universality of the human cognitive make-up is the guarantee for objectivity not the access to reality as it is. Perhaps we can be more sympathetic to Kant's distinction between phenomena and noumena and not condemn him for this dualism, if we consider his noumena
as a hypothetical possibility and not a positive metaphysical claim. Kant himself defends his position thus.

The concept of noumena is thus a merely limiting concept, the function of which is to curb the pretensions of sensibility; and it is therefore only of negative employment. At the same time it is no arbitrary invention; it is bound up with the limitation of sensibility, though it cannot affirm anything positive beyond the field of sensibility.6

In the Introduction to the Critique of Pure Reason, Kant begins his philosophical project with the following statements, "There can be no doubt that all knowledge begins with experience...., it does not follow that it all arises out of experience."7 Here Kant seems to try to correct the Humean strict empiricism which refuses to give legitimacy to knowledge apart from that given by sense experience. Kant argues that knowledge begins with but not necessarily ends with experience. What Kant is interested in is to legitimize the a priori cognitive form of the subject himself which is universal and necessary so that objectivity of knowledge is possible within the cognitive mapping of the subject. Kant describes his project as a "dissection of the faculty of the understanding itself."8 It is interesting to see what Kant considers an exhaustive analysis of the cognitive a priori.
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This then is the list of all original pure concepts
of synthesis that the understanding contains within
itself a priori.9

From the categories we can see that Kant views the
subject as primarily cognitive, logical and scientific.
It is very ingenious of Kant to account for objectivity
by putting the intelligible as the ground for all the
sensible. Thus Kant reconciles the traditional separation
between the two realms. However, in so saying, it seems
that Kant presupposes that all experience involves intel-
ligibility--a position which can hardly be accepted when
considerations concerning the volitional, the emotional and
the subconscious aspects of human experience are to be accounted for.

Another criticism of Kant can be raised from the Husserlian perspective. If we take a close look at Kant's categories we can see that he mainly adopts categories concerning the world of objects and ascribes them subjective status. It is quite obvious that categories such as "substance and accidents, cause and effect," "agent and patient" are conceptualized explanations about the world. These categories are not given within the realm of pure subjectivity, but are results of scientific and logical thinking about things which are perceived. Husserl would criticize Kant on the ground that Kant does not faithfully start his philosophy from subjectivity itself, but adopts objective categories and ascribes them subjective a priori status. In other words, in the light of Husserl, Kant would be so concerned to establish objectivity in knowledge that he would not remain faithful to subjectivity but adopt objective categories as subjective form of cognition.

THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL SUBJECTIVITY

Kant is rightfully credited with leading a new direction of philosophizing, namely, from dealing with things in themselves to things which are for us. But his idea of subjectivity is mainly a conceptualizing faculty, a logical and scientific subject. This kind of philosophical claim is not faithful to what a subject actually experiences. It is
my contention that Husserl's phenomenological reduction can be seen as an attempt to bracket Kant's conceptualizing categories so that the realm of pure consciousness can be opened up. This realm of pure consciousness would be considered a proper ground to find true subjectivity. In other words, to be phenomenologically faithful, we must not start philosophy of subjectivity from the post-conceptualized pole. For in the light of Husserl, this pre-predicative, pre-conceptual experience is the fundamental paradigm of subjectivity. Only after putting such Kantian categories in suspension that we can explore the realm of pure subjectivity.

Husserl's phenomenological reduction was the first explicit attempt in the Western philosophical arena to give full legitimacy to the pre-conceptual realm of experience as the ground for philosophical knowledge. Philosophers before Husserl either did not pay due attention to the investigation of the subject himself or saw the intellect as the faculty of knowing. Kant himself is no exception. Although Kant is highly credited for initiating the Copernican Revolution in philosophy by bringing philosophy back to the almost unquestioned ground of the subject, his view of the subject is highly rational and conceptualizing, a position which is one of the perennial Western philosophical prejudices.

It might be interesting to point out that the very notion of subjectivity itself finds a new expression in
Husserl. Kant's philosophy might very well be termed a philosophy of the subject. But Husserl's focus seems to be the very ontology of subjectivity itself. The terms themselves change from "subject" to "subjectivity." For Kant the logical and scientific aspects of the knowing subject have to be accounted for as a reaction against the skepticism of Hume. Kant is primarily interested in how the ground or a priori condition for phenomena is possible, while Husserl's project starts from phenomena themselves. Within this phenomenal field subjectivity has to be explored prior to the very notion of subject itself.

Kant emphasizes the fact that his concept of "noumena" is to be understood merely in the negative sense for we cannot claim anything positive about it. This is because we do not have the intuition to grasp this thing in itself. Kant elaborates,

If by "noumena" we mean a thing so far as it is not an object of our sensible intuition, and so abstract from our mode of intuiting it, this is a noumenon in the negative sense of the term. But if we understand by it an object of non-sensible intuition, we thereby presuppose a special mode of intuition, namely, the intellectual, which is not that which we possess, and of which we cannot comprehend even the possibility. This would be "noumenon" in the positive sense of the term. 10

Kant calls this concept of noumenon "problematic" for its objective reality cannot be known and yet the concept contains no contradiction. 11 He explains,
The concept of a noumenon—that is, of a thing which is not to be thought as object of the senses but as a thing in itself, solely through a pure understanding—is not in any way contradictory. For we cannot assert of sensibility that it is the sole possible kind of intuition. Further the concept of a noumenon is necessary, to prevent sensible intuition from being extended to things in themselves, and thus to limit the objective validity of sensible knowledge. The remaining things, to which it does not apply, are entitled noumena, in order to show that this knowledge cannot extend its domain over everything which the understanding thinks. But none the less we are unable to comprehend how such noumena can be possible, and the domain that lies out beyond the sphere of appearances is for us empty. That is to say, we have an understanding which problematically extend further, but we have no intuition, indeed not even the concept of a possible intuition, through which objects outside the field of sensibility can be given, and through which the understanding can be employed assertorically beyond that field.12

Setting Kant's claim of thoroughness aside, i.e., that his Table of Categories is "the list of all original pure concepts of synthesis that the understanding contains within itself a priori,"13 we can still see the significance of his attempt. As stated earlier, Kant's idea of objectivity lies in the universality of the a priori cognitive categories in human understanding and not in its access to reality as it is. This means that, for Kant, the human understanding is co-constitutive of "reality" as we experience it. The traditional Classical Empiricist picture of the mind as "representing" reality is rejected in favor
of a co-constitutive picture. If we accept this point of
departure, it would indicate that all human experience is
post-categorized, post-conceptualized. For it seems that
for Kant, all sensible experience involves intelligibility.
And this intelligibility is formed by his Table of Catego­
ries. For Kant, by positing (or rather by discovering)
these transcendental conditions for human experience, he
has finally achieved the task of grounding the possibility
of knowledge, the task which was declared impossible by
Hume.

After grounding the possibility of knowledge in the
a priori pure concept Kant admits the limitation of this
possibility of positing the concept of noumenon. He
explains,

What our understanding acquires through this
concept of a noumenon, is negative extension;
that is to say, understanding is not limited
through sensibility; on the contrary, it
itself limits sensibility by applying the
term noumena to things in themselves (things
not regarded as appearance). But in so doing
it at the same time sets limits to itself,
recognizing that it cannot know these noumena
through any of the categories, and that it
must therefore think them only under the
title of an unknown something.¹⁴

By positing the existence of this "unknown something"
Kant is leaving it open for other kinds of epistemologies.
Within Kant's scheme, it seems that the other kind of
epistemology indicates the existence of practical reason
as different from pure reason. He does not seem to imply
other epistemologies than the human kind. What is
important here is the fact that by positing this "limiting concept" Kant is actually opening up a possibility of the realm of thing in itself. Kant is willing to go so far as to posit this "something" but only to indicate it as an "unknown" something. In other words, he admits its existence but denies any intuition on the part of man which would enable him to have a hold of this reality. Kant emphatically brings to focus the fact that "we have no intuition, indeed not even the concept of possible intuition, through which objects outside the field of sensibility can be given."\textsuperscript{15}

Kant's philosophical project is very important as a stage for future discussion of ignorance for it emphasizes the position that the discussion of the subject is necessary to the discussion of philosophical knowledge, one cannot be addressed without the other. In this sense Kant is comparable to Buddhism, although it has to be pointed out that Kant's understanding of the subject and his expression of what knowledge is might be very different from the Buddhist version. Another significant point is that philosophical knowledge for Kant is the attempt to articulate human cognitive a priori categories. This indicates that "reality" is structured by the human mind. This structure guarantees the possibility of knowledge for Kant. But for Mahāyāna Buddhism this structuring itself is considered a process which distorts reality, and the
articulation of this structure is by no means an articulation of philosophical knowledge. This Mahāyāna position will be discussed in more detail as we proceed.

THE BUDDHIST SUBJECT

The hallmark of the Buddhist subject is the characteristic of being a non-ego. Buddhism starts from human existence and brings out the contributive factors which are analyzed into the five skankhas or the twelvefold causal links. The existence of the "I" is analyzed in a vigorous manner with the aim to show that this "I" is never self-sufficient or independent but always co-determining with the world. In the Early Buddhist scheme, we have a holistic, interdependent picture of man. Emphasis is also placed on the characterization of human existence as 'sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief, despair.' In later traditions such as Zen, a man is asked to "show his original face before he is born." In this perplexing expression it would seem that his "original face" is the presencing-of-things-as-they-are before an ideated subject "he" would be said to exist.

Although Descartes uses his declaration, "I think, therefore I am." for other purposes than really probing the nature of human existence, his statement can be seen as an attempt to find the essence of human existence. This search lands him on the idea that "thinking" is the sole essence of man. For Descartes, at the very basis of
human existence is the reasoning faculty or rationality. And he sees this rationality as the ground for human existence itself.

It can be said that an analogical project is also attempted by the Buddhist. However, the type of rationality that Descartes sees as the ground of human existence is considered a "lower" form of cognition for it is discriminative, conceptualistic and judgmental. For the Buddhists, a "higher" form of cognition is to be discovered. This "higher intuition" is commonly referred to as "non-conceptualistic," "non-mentalistic." It is said to be "unitive" and "non-differentiating."

As for Kant, if we accept as he does that all experience has to be "filtered" through the a priori categories inherent in the human faculty of knowing itself, we can see that this is the expression of ignorance for the Buddhists. In other words, the very grounding of the possibility of knowledge for Kant is the expression of ignorance for the Buddhists.


IGNORANCE AS THE FIRST CAUSAL LINK

In the preceding chapter I have indicated that ignorance in Buddhism is discussed within the context of human existence itself. I have also indicated that the Buddhist subject is dynamically co-determinant with the world after an investigation into some Western positions on the "subject" has been presented. In this chapter I would investigate the issue of ignorance in the Early and Mahāyāna Buddhist traditions.

In the Early Buddhist tradition, ignorance (avijjā—non-knowledge) is mainly discussed within the context of the twelvelfold causal chain. It is my contention that this very context helps point to what ignorance denotes, although a clear-cut definition is not offered. Taking into consideration the context of the twelvelfold causal chain I should attempt to investigate what ignorance means as presented in the Early Buddhist Canonical texts.

It is said, in the Sāmyutta-Nikāya xxii, 90,

That things have being, O Kaccāna, constitutes one extreme of doctrine; that things have no being is the other extreme. These extremes, O Kaccāna, have been avoided by the Tathāgata, and it is a middle doctrine he teaches:
On ignorance depends karma;
On karma depends consciousness;
On consciousness depend name and form;
On name and form depend the six organs of sense;
On the six organs of sense depends contact;
On contact depends sensation;
On sensation depends desire;
On desire depends attachment;
On attachment depends existence;
On existence depends birth;
On birth depend old age and death, sorrow, lamentation, misery, grief, and despair. Thus does this entire aggregation of misery arise.

But on the complete fading out and cessation of ignorance ceases karma;
On the cessation of karma ceases consciousness;

Thus, does this entire aggregation of misery cease.¹

Here we can see what Walpola Rahula calls "the synthetical method"² at work. In this one presentation the Buddha is simultaneously talking about his understanding of the inter-causality of all things, the middle doctrine, the second and the third noble truths, as well as his understanding of karma and rebirth. In this one scheme, structurally speaking, we can see the interdependent nature of key Buddhist terms such as "ignorance," "birth," "misery," etc. Besides, content-wise, we can see the interdependent nature of key Buddhist doctrines, namely, the round of rebirth, the middle doctrine, dependent origination (paticca-samuppāda), as well as two of the Four Noble Truths (i.e., the origin of suffering (Smudaya), the cessation of suffering (Nirodha). In order to achieve
an exposition of the middle doctrine, it seems that the
Buddha devises two crucial methods, namely, "the analytical
method" when discussing the doctrine of non-self, and the
"synthetical method" when discussing the interdependent
nature of all things. These seemingly two opposing
methods, one breaking up a complex into its constitutive
elements (as in the analysis of self) the other joining
different elements to point out a thing's dependence on
other things (as in the doctrine of dependent origination)
are actually complementary if not necessary to achieve the
Buddha's aim of abstention from extremes of being and non-
being.

At another place the Buddha elaborates and gives an
analogy in his explanation of Dependent Origination.

Here, the learned and noble disciple, O
priests, attentively considers Dependent
Origination—Behold this exists when that
exists, this originates from the origina-
tion of the other; this does not exist
when that does not exist, this ceases
from the cessation of the other....

Just as, O priest, heat comes into exist-
ence and flame into being from the friction
and concussion of two sticks of wood, but
on the separation and parting of these two
sticks of wood the heat sprung from those
two sticks of wood ceases and comes to an
end: in exactly the same way, O priests,
a pleasant sensation originates in depend-
ence on contact with pleasant objects, but
when that contact with pleasant objects
ceases, the feeling sprung from that contact,
the pleasant sensation that originated in
dependence on contact with pleasant objects
ceases and comes to an end.4
The image in this passage presents a specific picture of the Buddhist understanding of reality. This is achieved in giving a picture of a co-arising interdependent world. Without a commitment to any metaphysical entity, Buddhism presents a "middle doctrine" without commitment to extremes of being or non-being. In connection with this idea of interdependence, it is interesting to pay some attention to the analogy drawn by the Buddha. The Buddha chose the image of "heat" and "flame" whose existence is defined by the "friction and concussion" of two sticks of wood. The emphasis is on the "in-between" characteristic of existence. The analogy clearly tries to avoid a substantialistic presentation of reality.

Also, in putting ignorance (avijjà) at the beginning of the twelvefold links the Buddha is giving a very specific picture of the nature of the existence of man. It might be appropriate here to point out that ignorance is better understood as "condition" than "cause" for the idea of a causal relationship would imply the idea of "production" which again will be entangled with the intricate discussion of whether the effect pre-exists in or newly arises out of the cause. This kind of speculative exercise seems to lead the thinker nowhere. Also, it does not seem feasible to read that "name and form" 'causally produce' the six organs of sense, or that the "six organs of sense" 'causally produce' "contact." Rather it is much more feasible to
understand that "the six organs of sense" function conditionally upon "name and form," or that "contact" is conditional upon "the six organs of sense."

It seems that ignorance is a necessary explanatory principle for Early Buddhism to account for the nature of existence. Without a commitment to any metaphysical entity, Early Buddhism talks about ignorance as the conditional field within which karma operates. Now let us investigate what karma indicates in this context.

Some scholars attribute a temporal framework to the functioning of Dependent Origination. It is suggested that the first links of this chain are indicative of karma performed in past lives which is still operative in the present and therefore this entire aggregation of misery arises. But if this ignorance is terminated in the present life, the cessation of birth, old age, death, sorrow, etc., will follow. This indicates the double aspects of karma, that is, the retributive and the generative aspects. When we interpret the first links of the dependent origination as arising in past life, it indicates that karma is the retributive force accumulated in the past life (or lives) which gives rise to the present life and this force is still operative. On the other hand, karma also means willful action performed in the present life. This willful action is the generative force which characterizes our present existence. In the formula of Dependent Origination,
"the cessation of ignorance" indicates that karma in its generative aspect can be terminated. This means that only the retributive karmic force will still be operative. But without reinforcement from generative karma, the retributive karma will finally lose its force.

This mode of understanding of the double aspects of karma helps elucidate some aspects of the Buddha's enlightenment. After enlightenment under the bodhi tree, the Buddha's karma as generative force is completely terminated. If there be any residual karmic force operating in his life, it is retributive. However, some scholars of Buddhism argue that the cessation of both generative and as retributive karma is prerequisite for enlightenment. The controversial issue of whether nirvana can be achieved while living or at death also arises out of this backdrop.

The fact that ignorance (avijja) is put at the beginning of the list has created an interesting trend of investigation concerning this causal chain. The reason why it is put there has been questioned by Buddhaghosa, the great Buddhist commentator as he asks, "But why is ignorance put at the beginning?" During the time of Buddhaghosa, ignorance was associated with prakrti (Matter) of the Sāṅkhya philosophers, which was understood as the "causeless primary cause of the world." This view has been rejected by Buddhaghosa as well as by modern Buddhist scholars as mistaken. The clarification that needs to be
made in order to reject this view is twofold. First of all, it has to be pointed out that the most important feature about the Buddha's theory of dependent origination is the fact that it is meant to present a dependent or relative as opposed to the absolute origination of all things. Secondly, in order to achieve this end, the sole significance of ignorance as the first link has to be rejected. For to accept the absolute significance of ignorance would lead to the indication that the whole scheme is presenting an absolute beginning of existence.

Thus we see Buddhaghosa point out,

For the Blessed One in his discourse on the round of rebirth was accustomed to choose from Dependent Origination two of the factors of being as his starting-points: either on the one hand, ignorance,... or,... or, on the other hand, desire for existence,...

Dut Nalinaksha, a modern Buddhist scholar states explicitly that *avijjā* need not be the first link of the causal chain. It is merely one of the terms found suitable by the Buddha to begin the chain. He says, "It could as well be commenced by *bhavatanha* (Desire for existence)." Another Buddhist scholar, David Kalupahana emphasizes the relationship between *avijjā* and *karma*. He sees this formula as a special application of the causal principle not indicating the beginning of existence. Rather, he sees *avijjā* as "one of the most important factors that contribute to evil or unwholesome behavior."
Given these considerations, it can be said that the
twelvefold causal chain is merely presenting the dependent
nature of all things and not the absolute beginning of
existence. Also, it is argued that ignorance is not the
sole cause of existence. Although ignorance is not the
only factor, it does seem to be one of the most important
factors by the mere fact that it is selected as the first
link. The significance and meaning of ignorance is too
often neglected by scholars whose primary interest is to
establish or explicate the Buddha's theory of causation.
However, Buddhaghosa has detected the significance of
ignorance and therefore he attempts some further clarification as to what ignorance means. He elaborates:

For the cause of the karma which conducts
to unhappy states of existence is ignorance.
Why do I say so? Because, just as a cow
about to be slaughtered, overcome by
weariness due to fiery heat and to blows
of the stick, will, as the result of that
exhaustion, drink water that is hot, although
it is unpleasant and does her harm; so the
unconverted man, overcome by ignorance, will
take life and perform many other kinds of
karma which conduct to unhappy states of
existence, although such karma is unpleasant
on account of the fiery heat of the corrup-
tions, and does him harm by casting him into
unhappy states of existence.

What is interesting here is the fact that ignorance is
discussed in relation to or within the context of "unhappy
states of existence." Unlike other Indian schools and
Western philosophical traditions in general which treat
"ignorance" in terms of some sort of "fallacy of perception"
(as discussed in Chapter II), Buddhism treats ignorance in relation to the problem of human existence itself. For Early Buddhism ignorance is not a lack of access to some particular information nor is it a fallacious act of perception. On the contrary, ignorance is discussed as "regards Suffering,...the arising of Suffering,...the ceasing of Suffering,...the path leading to the ceasing of Suffering." In other words, ignorance is the basis for the general characteristic of existence itself—in the Early Buddhist understanding.

This general characteristic of existence as suffering is conditioned upon the force of ignorance, which in turn conditions the performance of actions. In the example given by Buddhaghosa the act of the cow's drinking hot water is conditioned by its exhaustion. In like manner, an action is performed within a certain karmic atmosphere. Naturally, an unwholesome karmic atmosphere which conditions actions will give rise to unhappy state of existence. From Buddhaghosa's analogy, we can see the close affinity between action and the happy or unhappy state of existence. Seen in this way, it would indicate that Kalupahana's comment is relevant in the sense that this application of the causal principle is not seen as pointing to the "beginning" of existence. And yet the close affinity between action and the nature of existence cannot be overlooked. In other words, it can only be stated that the formula does not portray the very beginning of existence but to say that
it is wholly unrelated to the issue of the nature of existence would be highly misleading.

IGNORANCE AS BONDAGE

Apart from the context of the twelvefold causal chain, another significant aspect of ignorance is discussed where it is compared to a "bond" as in the following:

Kaccana, it is like a young baby boy lying on his back and bound around his neck with a fivefold swaddling, ... As he grows up and develops his faculties he would be released from those swaddlings, and in absence of swaddlings he would know: "I am released." ... Even so, indeed, is deliverance from the direct bond— that is the bond of ignorance. 13

Although the whole pictures are not similar, the fact that ignorance indicates being "bound around his neck" is reminiscent of Plato's Parable of the Cave, wherein the men are tied around the neck being able to see only their own shadows. The comparable point is, a person "in ignorance" is tied in a certain fixed way and he cannot see the world otherwise. Those fivefold "swaddlings" mentioned in this passage seem to indicate the five hindrances of the mind, namely, lustful desires (kāmacchanda); ill-will, hatred or anger (vyāpāda); torpor and languor (thīna-middha); restlessness and worry (uddhaccaka-kukkucca); and sceptical doubts (vivikicchā). 14 It seems that these emotional, motivational as well as intellectual hindrances are the expression of the "bond of ignorance" that fixes human perception in an unwholesome way.
The articulation of ignorance here as a bond which binds a person around the neck is significant for it points out an important characteristic of this concept in Buddhism. Ignorance is a limiting force which petrifies human perception in a certain way. The Buddha uses the phrase "I am released." in absence of these swaddlings. This image implies that ignorance is a positive force which obstructs a free flow of possible perceptions both in their quality and scope. Thus in Buddhism the bond of ignorance is a major obstacle to freedom.

In another place the Buddha has this to say concerning ignorance.

Monks, visual consciousness arises because of eye and material shapes, the meeting of the three is sensory impingement; an experience arises conditioned by sensory impingement that is pleasant or painful or neither painful nor pleasant. He, being impinged on by a pleasant feeling, delights, rejoices, and persists in cleaving to it; a tendency to attachment is latent in him. Being impinged on be a painful feeling, he grieves, mourns, laments, beats his breast and falls into disillusion; a tendency to repugnance is latent in him. Being impinged on be a feeling that is neither painful nor pleasant, he does not comprehend the origin nor the going down nor the satisfaction nor the peril of that feeling nor the escape from it as it really is; a tendency to ignorance is latent in him.15

At this point ignorance is not merely "that which causes karma which conducts to unhappy states of existence." In addition, "a tendency to ignorance" is latent
in a person who "does not comprehend the origin nor the
going down nor the satisfaction nor the peril of that
feeling nor the escape from it as it really is." The
meaning of ignorance is shifted from "that which causes
karma" to lack of comprehension of the arising and the
going down of feelings. In this latter sense, both
"satisfaction" and "peril" of feelings have to be under­
stood and thus transcended. In other words, in Buddhism
the "pleasant" as well as the "painful" feelings can be
part and parcel of an "unhappy state of existence." It
should not be understood that a pleasant feeling is
necessarily a "happy" state in the Buddhist sense of the
term. A "happy" state of existence seems to be more the
"understanding" of the nature of both pleasant and painful
experience. This is because a person can be "attached to"
both pleasant and painful feelings. In terms of the
sensation the two feelings are apparently the opposite of
each other. However, in Buddhist philosophy, a "happy"
state of existence needs to comprehend both pleasure and
pain.

However, it should not be understood that Buddhism
rejects any pleasant or painful sensations. Actually what
the Buddha calls for is the understanding of the arising
and the going down of those feelings and thus one can be
"free from" them but not to be "free of" any feelings
whathsoever. It would probably be the case that when an
enlightened person is hit by a stone thrown at him by
someone, he would feel physically hurt as anybody would, but he would not hold grudges against the deliberate thrower. It is our contention that Buddhism's aim is not to "overcome" the physical laws of nature, which may be the purpose of some ascetics, but to understand them so as to be "free from" them.

Another prevalent characteristic of ignorance in Early Buddhism is expressed in a simile of the Buddha, which is to be found in a passage in the Majjhima-Nikāya II. 259-260.

Just this is the meaning here: 'the wound,' Sunakkhatta, is a synonym for the six inner (sense-) fields. The 'virus,' Sunakkhatta, is a synonym for ignorance. 'The arrow,' Sunakkhatta, is synonym for craving, the (surgeon's) 'probe,' Sunakkhatta, is synonym for mindfulness. The 'knife,' Sunakkhatta, is synonym for the ariyan wisdom. 'The physician and surgeon,' Sunakkhatta, is synonym for the Tathāgata, perfected one, fully Self-Awakened One.16

This passage indicates two significant points concerning the operation of ignorance. First of all, ignorance operates on the six sense-fields covering the eyes, ears, nose, tongue, touch and mind. This is very inclusive. Ignorance is not merely perceptual in the mentalistic sense of the term. It covers other fields of human consciousness as well. Secondly, ignorance is fatal (as being compared with "virus") and could be the deciding factor determining the life or death or a person. This latter understanding is substantiated by the rest of
the simile which indicates the importance of the "knife" or wisdom. Mindfulness is the "probing" tool, but the deciding factor is wisdom. In other words, a wound can be painful but perhaps not fatal if not accompanied by virus; it can be tended but perhaps not cured if not for the knife. In like manner, ignorance is the fatal factor which can be taken care of by mindfulness but never uprooted if not for wisdom.

We have seen that Early Buddhism presents ignorance from a twofold perspective. Firstly, it is said that the lack of knowledge concerning the Four Noble Truths constitutes ignorance, also that not comprehending the doctrine of dependent originations is a hallmark of ignorance. Judging from these two assertions one would have the idea that ignorance is understood in Buddhism as an absence of something. However, Early Buddhism also accounts for the reason or the ground of such "lack of knowledge concerning the Four Noble Truths." Early Buddhism uses ignorance as a generic name covering the unwholesome motivations of greed, anger and aversion (lobha, dosa, moha) as well as the already listed "five swaddlings." This would amount to the claim that ignorance by nature is a positive obstruction to wisdom and conditions man to see things in a limited way (being "bound around his neck"), not realizing the impermanent, non-self and suffering nature of existence. Thus it can be said that Early Buddhism presents a theoretical articulation of
ignorance (as "lack of knowledge of the Four Noble Truths" and "not comprehending the doctrine of dependent origination") which is expressed in the unwholesome tendency of greed, anger and aversion in man. In short, the unwholesome tendency in man positively obstructs him from the vision of reality.

If ignorance in the context of Dependent Origination is seen as the macrocosmic version of the characterization of man's existence, it might be said that ignorance in context of the mind is the microcosmic investigation of the workings of the human mind. This latter analysis which concerns the mind is especially important in the development of Mahāyāna Buddhism as well as in Zen. Although we do not have sufficient historical evidence which can decide with certainty who is the author of the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra, nor are we able to establish the exact date of its composition, it is reasonable to hold that the Northern school of Ch'an Buddhism was earlier than the Southern school and that "Supposedly, Bodhidharma transmitted the sūtra translated by Guṇabhadra in four scrolls to Hui-ko, his disciple and second patriarch." In the following, an attempt will be made to investigate some metaphors used to explicate aspects of the mind. It is hoped that through the analysis of the relevant metaphors, a sensitivity to the nuances of emphases in different traditions can be developed.
In discussing the mind, the Buddha resorts to a metaphor for its explication. He compares the mind to a piece of gold-ore, temporarily disfigured by defilements of iron, copper, tin, silver, and lead.²² Also it is said that the primary defilements of the mind which weaken intuitive insight are passion and various forms of greed, ill-will, sloth and torpor, excitement, perplexity and doubt.²³ De Silva interprets this metaphor as depicting the Buddhist view of man. It is not an idealized one and that human beings possess the capacity for both good and evil.²⁴ Commenting on the same metaphor K. N. Jayatilleke sees it in context of the cultivation of mind. He states, "It is when these and other more subtle defilements are got rid of that the mind becomes relatively perfect and pure (citta parisuddhe pariyodate) (D.I. 76) and acquires its extra-sensory powers of perception and activity. It is the culmination of this process which results in the attainment of Nirvāṇa."²⁵ Although the ethical tone of this metaphor which is brought out by De Silva is not to be neglected, it seems that perhaps the more relevant aspect here is the need to cultivate the capacity of the mind. The fact that the mind is compared to "gold-ore" and not to "gold" as such seems to indicate the general spirit of the Buddha who has a distaste for extreme logical commitment. In other words, the Buddha does not wish to commit himself to the picture of absolute original purity of the mind, a position
which is so much emphasized in some of the Mahāyāna schools as well as in Zen.

THE CHINESE "MIND"

The Buddha's pragmatic orientation and his distaste for intricate philosophical categorization has left room for later Scholastic developments which offer complicated systems with intricate conceptual frameworks for the explanation of Buddhist doctrines. Especially in the analysis of the mind, multiple categories are developed to explicate in detail the workings of the mind. Among the numerous schools developed in the Scholastic period, two schools stand out as the most important in the discussion of the mind. They are the Yogācāra school which advocates the existence of the ālayavijñāna (storehouse consciousness, a depository of all past experiences) and the Tathāgatagarbha school (womb of the Buddha, Buddha-nature) which advocates universal Buddha potentiality. According to Whalen Lai, "In China, there was much debate on whether this core consciousness was or was not the pure mind itself. There was no consensus."26

Whalen Lai gives an interesting analysis of the water-wave metaphor as presented in the Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra and in the Awakening of Faith. Through this analysis it is pointed out how the Awakening of Faith leans towards a tathāgatagarbha doctrine of perfect mind in original purity over
against the ālayāvijñāna theory\textsuperscript{27} which is explicated in the \textit{Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra}. The metaphor is presented thus in the \textit{Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra}.

The sea of storehouse consciousness is permanently subsisting
The wind of phenomenal realms stirs it
Various consciousnesses spring up,
churning out like waves
The way in which the sea gives rise to the waves
Is the way in which the seven consciousnesses rise inseparably from and with the eighth storehouse consciousness.
Just as the sea agitates and the various waves swell
So too the seven consciousnesses come about, not different from the mind.\textsuperscript{28}

It is pointed out here that our core consciousness continues from one life to another (although not unchanging),
The "perceptibles" of the "phenomenal realms," namely, sight, sound, odor, taste, touch arouse our senses of eyes, ears, nose, mouth and skin respectively. In this passage, once those consciousnesses are agitated, they "swell out" of the core consciousness like undercurrents churning the water into waves. The point of this metaphor is to show the active participation of the ālayāvijñāna in the lower consciousnesses, and the non-separation of waves and water points to the working of the mind.\textsuperscript{29}

Elsewhere in the \textit{Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra}, it is elaborated,

\textsuperscript{99} Like waves that rise on the ocean stirred by the wind, dancing and without interruption,

\textsuperscript{100} The Ālayā-ocean in a similar manner is constantly stirred by the winds of
objectivity, and is seen dancing about with the Vijñānas which are the waves of multiplicity.

103. As the waves in their variety are stirred on the ocean, so in the Ālaya is produced the variety of what is known as the Vijñānas.30

This water-wave metaphor is used in the Yogācāra-oriented Lankāvatāra Sūtra to explain the functioning relationship of the Ālayavijñāna together with other vijñānas. When this same metaphor is used in the Awakening of Faith, a slight but crucial shift of presentation is made. In the Awakening of Faith, it is said:

Ignorance does not exist apart from enlightenment; therefore, it cannot be destroyed (because one cannot destroy something which does not really exist), and yet it cannot not be destroyed (in so far as it remains). This is like the relationship that exists between the water of the ocean (i.e., enlightenment) and its waves (i.e., modes of mind) stirred by the wind (i.e., ignorance). Water and wind are inseparable; but water is not mobile by nature, and if the wind stops the movement ceases. But the wet nature remains undestroyed. Likewise, man's Mind and ignorance have no particular forms of their own and they are inseparable. Yet Mind is not mobile by nature, and if ignorance ceases, then the continuity (of deluded activities) ceases. But the essential nature of wisdom (i.e., the essence of Mind, like the wet nature of the water) remains undestroyed.31

It is important to point out here that the "wind" as used in the Awakening of Faith does not symbolize the "phenomenal realms" but ignorance itself. Ignorance as wind stirs up the Suchness Mind into the phenomenal waves. The waves now stand for both phenomena, that is, the for
ignorance (wu-ming chih hsiang) and phenomenal consciousness, that is, the functions of mind (hsin-shih chih hsiang). Whelen Lai is very insightful in identifying this new point of reference in the usage of the metaphorical "wind." However, what has not been pointed out is the fact that in the Awakening of Faith the "water" itself now stands for the One Suchness Mind which is indicative of the Tathāgata-garbha and no longer the Ālayāvijñāna. This latter shift of meaning is perhaps even more important for it sets the metaphor in a new context out of which the new meaning arises.

The fact that the water is used to symbolize the Tathāgatagarbha or One Suchness Mind in the Awakening of Faith points to a very subtle but crucial transformation of the Buddhist understanding of mind under the Chinese. The Chinese Buddhists are not content with the position which advocates Ālayāvijñāna as the core consciousness. The Mind which is considered the primal core somehow has to be "pure" and ultimate. Whalen Lai offers a suggestion that the transition from Consciousness-Only to Mind-Only is a "uniquely Chinese development." He argues that "The Indian Buddhist philosophy generally holds the opinion that the illusion of the world corresponds to a deluded, tainted consciousness, seldom ever asserted that the phenomenal world and the mind are "by nature good." Whalen Lai traces the historical development of this concept of "Mind-Only" through its roots in
different Indian schools and its adoption of the Taoist concept of mind together with the mind-nature (hsin-hsing) association made by Mencius. The mind discovered by Chuang Tzu is "luminous, spirited" and "self-sufficient." It is "precognitive as well as supra-cognitive." Another important aspect of this "Taoist" mind is the fact that it "remained comparatively compact. What is often differentiated in the Yogācāra philosophy remains undifferentiated in the Chinese scheme." Apart from this Chinese transformation of the concept of mind, the mind is also associated with "nature" (hsing) in the translation process. Whalen Lai suggests that the choice of the word "nature" (hsing) in the translation process was influenced by the popularity of this term in Chinese philosophical usage, especially that of Mencius who argued that the nature (hsing) of man is good. From these various strands of concepts indigenous to the Chinese philosophical climate, the assertion of Mind-Only was advocated against the Consciousness-Only. The "Mind" in the Chinese understanding is pure and absolute without defilement. This association of mind (hsin) and Buddha-nature (fo-hsing) (or the Tathāgatagarbha in the Awakening of Faith) is virtually accepted by all the Chinese Buddhist schools.

Now let us see what is involved in the idea of "One Mind" (一念). First of all, this "One" in "One Mind" is not a numerical "one." It is suggestive of an inclusive
and unitive viewpoint rather than a numerical one. In other words, it is not that there is plurality outside it to define or circumscribe its oneness.\textsuperscript{41} Also it needs to be pointed out that the "mind" is not to be contrasted with an "objective world" which somehow exists externally to this "Mind." As a matter of fact, it seems that this "One Mind" is prior to such a differentiation. This "One Mind" is more suggestive of an ontological presence out of which the "objective world" and the "subjective world" are derived. It is highly difficult to use language which is based on discriminatory thinking to express this "state of reality" which is claimed to be "beyond words and letters." However, what is quite clear is the fact that this concept of One Mind" and its two aspects of "Suchness" and "Birth and Death"\textsuperscript{42} is influenced by the Chinese concept of the Tao (道). It is pointed out that The Buddhist absolute, tathatā, is apparently seen as something similar to the Tao: in one aspect, static; in another, dynamic. Just as the Chinese would see all activities as emerging out of a primordial active passivity (the Tao produces all things), the tathatā causation theory, regarded as a more profound causation, also is seen to be proposing that life-and-death emerged from out of the suchness itself. There is no comparable (explicit) theory in Indian Mahāyāna.\textsuperscript{43}

The Tathāgatagarbha theory is neither unique to nor initiated by the Chinese Buddhists. As early as the
third-century A.D. in South India, the Śrīmaṇa Sūtra was produced, advocating the idea of universality of Buddha-
hood potentiality. As pointed out by the translators, the word "garbha" in the term "tathāgatagarbha" is rendered "embryo" in the sense of causal potentiality for becoming the Tathāgata. In the sūtra itself, it is stated, "Lord, this Tathāgatagarbha is the embryo of the Illustrious Dharmadhatu, the embryo of the Dharmakaya, the embryo of supramundane dharma, the embryo of the intrinsi-
cally pure dharma.

The identification of One Mind with Tathāgatagarbha in the Awakening of Faith seems to go beyond this traditional understanding of the doctrine of tathāgatagarbha. Con-
sciously or unconsciously, this issue as presented in the Awakening of Faith is not so much about the future possibility of enlightenment or Buddhahood as seeing One Mind or tathāgatagarbha as the basis for phenomenal reality. In the Early Buddhist formulation of ignorance at the beginning of the Dependent Origination, enlightenment is the ideal or the "cessation of ignorance." Here, enlighten-
ment is seen as the basis as well as the ideal. This sinitic articulation of enlightenment might sound dubious even to the Buddha himself.

Now let us see if this articulation of "One Mind" in the Awakening of Faith carries with it any epistemological implication. First of all, it needs to be pointed out that
the issue of epistemology involved in the articulation of the "One Mind" doctrine is of a very different kind from that of general Western epistemology. Western epistemology in general starts from a subject-object conceptual framework. Man relates to the world as knower to the known. In such a framework, distinctions and classifications are of crucial importance. As a matter of fact, differentiation and categorization lies at the heart of the possibility of articulation or functions as the basis for the principle of intelligibility itself. The Aristotelian formulation of logic, the classical Empiricist mode of epistemology as primarily re-presentational, or the Kantian Table of categories of cognitive a priori forms, all of these seem to be the highest articulation of the principle of intelligibility in Western epistemology as a whole. All of them are discriminatory by nature.

Given such a paradigm of articulation, epistemology deals with particular occurrences of events in specific time and space. The issue of illusion in perception is seen as distortion of perspectives, relativity of perceptions and hallucinations. All these "illusory" occurrences are seen against the backdrop of a positive (or positivistic) assertion of phenomenal (or rather physical) reality. In this context ignorance, as different from "mistake" or "error" in perception, is understood as opposite to knowledge. But in this particularistic
world-view, ignorance is primarily seen as lack or absence of some particular piece of information. In Western philosophical arena, man is primarily a knower. Ignorance is never an existential threat to the possibility of human knowledge.

On the other hand, in the Early Buddhist tradition ignorance is presented as the primal conditional field within which karma operates as the generative force of human existence. And yet, that early picture of the relationship of man's existence to ignorance is transformed perhaps most radically here in the Chinese interpretation. As stated earlier, it seems that in the Early Buddhist tradition, existence as conditioned by ignorance is the given and enlightenment is the ideal, which is equivalent to the cessation of ignorance. Here in the Awakening of Faith, it is said that ignorance "does not exist apart from enlightenment." Ignorance is presented as the "wind" which stirs the water (enlightenment, one-mind) into waves (modes of mind, phenomena). This subsumption of ignorance into enlightenment is a radical alteration within the Buddhist tradition. Nāgārjuna's non-differentiation between nirvāṇa and saṃsāra is recast in the context of the One Suchness Mind and the Phenomenal Realm. Nāgārjuna showed the formalistic interdependence and therefore non-differentiation of nirvāṇa and saṃsāra but he did not posit the existence of Tathāgatagarbha.
which somehow lies at the basis of all phenomena. The interpretation of the Tathāgatagarbha as the One Mind which is the principle of purity, at once cosmological and personal, seems to be the unique Chinese contribution to Buddhism.

IGNORANCE IN THE AWAKENING OF FAITH (大乘起信論)

In my investigation of the Awakening of Faith I will argue that Hakeda's translation from the Chinese of this important sutra is highly inadequate for he fails to make a distinction between the different usages of key terms like "mind" (心), "thought" (念) and "consciousness" (識). This distinction is crucial to the understanding of ignorance (無明) in Mahāyāna Buddhism for it is claimed that "The essence of Mind is free from thoughts (調心體離心念)." In this particular place Hakeda translates "心" as "mind" and "念" as "thoughts." However, in other places he also renders "識" as "mind." This same term "識" is also translated as "consciousness." Hakeda's inconsistency in his translation indicates a crucial deficiency in his interpretation of the relationship between ignorance and enlightenment in this sutra. In his commentary, Hakeda states, "It is evident that the nature of ignorance is not ontological but is epistemological." Hakeda did not give a well-developed argument for this crucial statement. He simply says, "...ignorance has no beginning but does have an ending; while original
enlightenment, or Suchness, has neither beginning nor ending... If it (ignorance) were ontological and were conceived as "being," this conclusion that ignorance has no beginning but has an ending would be absurd." 55 It is my contention that this ascription of ignorance to the realm of the "epistemological" is arbitrary. The logic of Hakeda's explanation is simply that ignorance cannot be conceived as "being" for it would be absurd to suggest that "being" has an ending. This is a very static understanding of the ontological "being." The implication of Hakeda's position is that "being" is some kind of static metaphysical entity. I disagree with Hakeda here and think that if the Sinitic conception of mind were more carefully investigated as we already did in the preceding section, we would have the understanding that this Chinese articulation of one-mind points to an ontological mode of experiencing which is held to be most authentic to reality as it is. It is believed that this mode of being is pure, nondiscriminative and unitive. This "mind" is different from "thought" and "consciousness." We will begin our investigation with some preliminary clarification concerning three key terms in the discussion of mind.

The three key terms are: "mind" (心), "thoughts" (念), and (acts of) "consciousness" (識).

Let us consider first the third term, that is, (acts of consciousness (識).
(The mentality) which emerges in the state of nonenlightenment, which (incorrectly) perceives and reproduces (the world of objects) and, conceiving that the (reproduced) world of objects is real, continues to develop (deluded) thoughts, is what we define as (acts of) consciousness. 

This consciousness has five different names.

The first is called the "activating consciousness" (業識)
The second is called the "evolving consciousness" (轉識)
The third is called the "reproducing consciousness" (現識)
The fourth is called the "analytical consciousness" (智識)
The fifth is called the "continuing consciousness" (相續識) 

We should pay special attention to the third and the fifth consciousnesses. Concerning the third, the text says it is called the "reproducing consciousness," "for it reproduces the entire world of objects as a bright mirror reproduces all material images. When confronted with the objects of the five senses, it reproduces them at once." The issue as to what exactly the term "reproduces" means here cannot perhaps be decided conclusively. What is important is that the acts of perception through the five senses are part of what the sutra here calls "consciousness." The fact seems quite straightforward by itself, but when it is seen in relation to the fifth (acts of) consciousness we can see that these perceptual acts are of a similar nature to those of the fifth. The text has this to say about the fifth: "The fifth is called
'continuing consciousness' for it is united with (deluded) thoughts and continues uninterrupted. It retains the entire karma, good and bad, accumulated in the immeasurable lives of the past, and does not permit any loss. It is also capable of bringing the results of the pain, pleasure, etc., of the present and the future to maturity...It can cause one to recollect suddenly the things of the present and the past and to have sudden and unexpected fantasies of the things to come." Essentially three things are mentioned here as the functions of the "continuing consciousness," namely, it retains karma, brings results of pain and pleasure, recollects and imagines and fantasizes. This is a very holistic picture of human consciousness. All those acts, i.e., of perceiving, imagining, fantasizing are considered "normal" functions of the human psyche in our common-sensical consideration. However, what has to be kept in mind is that these acts are considered part of the mentality "which emerges in the state of nonenlightenment." What this claim amounts to is that there is some kind of alternative experience which is of an "enlightened" type. The question becomes, "Does the text offer an exposition of this so-called alternative "enlightened" experience? The answer is both yes and no. It is in the affirmative because the text does give a clue to what this type of experience is, but at the same time it does not provide a
clear-cut explanation as to what it is and explicitly rejects the possibility of explaining what this experience is all about. This issue will be discussed within the context of my attempted exposition of the next two terms, namely, "thoughts" (心) and "mind" (心).

In the discussion of "original enlightenment" (本覺) the sutra says, "The essence of Mind is free from thoughts." (心體離住念). 60

The distinction between "thoughts" (心) and "mind" (心) is explicitly stated here. This distinction is reiterated in the discussion of the "final enlightenment" (始覺).

Since they are far away even from subtle (deluded) thoughts, they are able to have insight into original nature of Mind.61

A claim is made here that "thoughts" (心) somehow "defile" the "mind" (心) and taint the mind's original nature. In relation to the above discussion of (acts of) consciousness, we might be able to say that the sutra uses "thoughts" (心) as a generic name for all the acts of consciousness mentioned. When the text talks about "defilements" of thoughts what it points to is the different acts of consciousness. Now let us see what the text means by "mind" (心).

In the beginning of the "Revelation of the True Meaning" part of the Awakening of Faith, the sutra says,
The revelation of the true meaning (of the principle of Mahāyāna can be achieved) by (unfolding the doctrine) that the principle of One Mind has two aspects (一心). One is the aspect of Mind in terms of Suchness, and the other is the aspect of Mind in terms of birth and death (一者心眾如門 二者心生滅門). Each of these two aspects embraces all states of existence. Why? Because these two aspects are not mutually exclusive.62

A preliminary clarification needs to be made here concerning the use of the phrase "One Mind" (一心). As stated earlier, the "One" here is not used in a numerical sense as in "one among many." This point has been brought to attention by Hakeda. Rather it seems that this "One Mind" indicates a sense of unitive immediacy of experience. The "one" here is used more like an adverb to qualify a certain kind of experience or state of mind. The quantitative sense of "one" is irrelevant here. If this line of understanding is accepted we still have to face the question why this "One Mind" is talked about in terms of two aspects, namely, suchness, and birth and death. Part of the answer lies in the fact that the text might be reiterating or re-articulating Nāgārjuna's non-differentiation between nirvāṇa and samsāra. That is to say,

There is no difference whatsoever between nirvāṇa (Absolute) and samsāra (phenomena); there is no difference whatsoever between samsāra and nirvāṇa.63
According to Hakeda, such an expression can be made only from an enlightened person's perspective. The claim that "nirvāṇa is not different from samsāra" can be made only by a person who has achieved "nirvāṇa." In his commentary Hakeda emphasizes that "The well-known words of the Buddha that everything is suffering (sarvam duhkam)" were, in fact, uttered after he had attained enlightenment." However, Nāgārjuna's dictum still faces a dilemma. How can it make sense to the unenlightened mind? How can an ordinary person understand that nirvāṇa is samsāra or vice versa? It is my contention that the expression "One-mind has two aspects." can be seen as an attempt to put Nāgārjuna's dictum in the experiential realm of a person's mind. The essence of this "mind" is said to be "free from thoughts." Also it is said,

The Buddha-Tathāgatas are free from all perverse views and thoughts (that block correct vision; therefore), there are no corners into which their comprehension does not penetrate. Their mind is true and real; therefore, it is no other than the essential nature of all things.

These expressions give rise to the understanding that at the basis of the mind lies reality or things as they are. If the sutra claims that mind is no other than the essential nature of all things it has to account for the fact of ignorance. The existence of ignorance becomes a dilemma, a threat to the claim that the mind is originally pure.
This dilemma is openly acknowledged in the *sūtra*. It is stated, "The Mind, though pure in its self nature from the beginning, is accompanied by ignorance. Being defiled by ignorance, a defiled (state of) Mind comes into being. But, though defiled, the Mind itself is eternal and immutable. Only the enlightened Ones are able to understand what this means." Although the *sūtra* implies that a clear-cut understanding of the relationship between ignorance and enlightenment is not to be expected, it does try to give some clues to the nature of the relationship. Basically the text offers two expositions: firstly, that ignorance does not exist by itself apart from enlightenment; secondly, that ignorance occurs "suddenly" (±).69

Concerning the first point, the text says,

All modes (lakshana) of mind and consciousness (under the state of nonenlightenment) are (the products of) ignorance. Ignorance does not exist apart from enlightenment; (無明之相不離性覺性).70

Also the *sūtra* says,

Because of not truly realizing oneness with Suchness, there emerges an unenlightened mind and, consequently, its thoughts. These thoughts do not have any validity to be substantiated; therefore, they are not independent of the original enlightenment. 71

It is very important to emphasize the fact that ignorance in the *Awakening of Faith* is not seen as opposite to enlightenment. As Hakeda pointed out, the Buddha stated that everything is suffering after he attained enlightenment.
This fact indicates that enlightenment should not be seen as a rejection of ignorance but a realization of it. I would like to go further than Hakeda in this matter by stating that enlightenment is nothing other than the realization of what ignorance is. It is not quite accurate to say that the Buddha understood suffering after his enlightenment but it is better to say that his enlightenment is the realization of the suffering nature of all things. If we refer to the analogy of dreaming and waking states, we would also have a different expression. That is to say, we should not say that one realizes that one has been dreaming only after one is awakened. I propose to say that the act of awakening itself is equivalent to the realization of one's dreaming state. I think that the expression "Ignorance does not exist apart from enlightenment." should be understood in this sense.

The same theme is articulated at another place in the sūtra.

Though it is said that there is (an inception of) the rising of (deluded) thoughts in the mind, there is not inception as such that can be known (as being independent of the essence of Mind). And yet to say that the inception (of the rising of deluded thoughts) is known means that it is known as (existing on the ground of) that which is beyond thoughts (i.e., the essence of Mind). 72

The phrase "there is not inception as such that can be known" indicates that the picture of the world as resulting from ignorance is all we have in our deluded
awareness. Ignorance itself remains unknown. In other words, ignorance is not recognized as such without the realization of "that which is beyond thoughts."

Another point of significance is that ignorance is discussed as arising "suddenly" (hu-jan). The text says,

What is called the essential nature of Mind is always beyond thoughts. It is therefore, defined as "immutable." When the one World of Reality is yet to be realized, the Mind (is mutable and) is not in perfect unity (with Suchness). Suddenly (a deluded) thought arises; (this state) is called ignorance.73

According to Yoshito Hakeda, Fa-tsang interprets "suddenly" as follows: "The word 'suddenly' is not used from the standpoint of time, but is used to account for the emergence of ignorance without any instance of inception. It is clear, then, that Fa-tsang interpreted 'suddenly' as 'without beginning.'"74 Other quoted commentaries take "suddenly" to mean "unconsciously" or "without being aware of the reason." "Suddenly" is also interpreted as "without reason" or "accidentally." Ignorance is also compared to dust and clouds as in "(ignorance is) like dust which has suddenly collected on a mirror, or like clouds which have suddenly appeared in the sky."75

This characteristic of ignorance as "suddenly" arising is in a sense a corollary of the idea that ignorance is "dependent on" enlightenment. For to say that "suddenly"
indicates "without reason" or "without beginning" is, in other words, to say that it arises "without known reason" or "without known beginning." The analogy of the dust and clouds itself points to its own assumption or starting-point. That is to say, this analogy is made on the basis that a pure mirror or a clear sky exists. It is significant to point out here that in one of the most important Mahāyāna texts, ignorance is viewed as something positive though not self-subsisting. The metaphor of "non-light" (無明) is not "absence of light" but rather indicating a "positive obstruction to light." And yet, this obstruction is realizable only "in dependence on" light. In other words, clouds or dust can be seen as such only "in light." 76

From the discussions so far we can see that unlike general Western philosophy, especially from Descartes to contemporary world wherein thinkers tend to discuss the issue of "mind" in the context of the relationship between mind and body or more recently between mind and brain states, Mahāyāna Buddhism as represented by the Awakening of Faith talks about "pure mind" ( deficiency') and "defiled mind" (deficiency'). It is interesting to see that those activities of mind which Western philosophy in general would accept as legitimate cognitive access to knowledge are included under "defiled mind" by the Mahāyānist. Robert B. Zeuschner attempts a succinct definition of "defiled mind." He says,
... the so called defiled mind is the activity of mind which conceptualizes, judges, distinguishes subject from object, hates, craves, and constructs the conceptual framework within which we categorize our perceptions and experiences. 77

It is important to make a distinction between mind and thought because "thought" in the Awakening of Faith is associated with the "defiled mind" indicating all these discriminative acts. It is regrettable that Hakeda did not make such a distinction in his translation. I have shown that Hakeda's translation of the term "mind" (心) is inconsistent. This leads to a lack of adequate analysis of the conception of mind. My investigation of the sinitic understanding of mind has helped articulate the characteristic of the Chinese "mind" as different from the original Indian expression. 78 This sinitic articulation of mind presents a move to understand the Buddhist enlightenment as ontological immediacy which is prior to thoughts' discriminative acts. I disagree with Hakeda's statement that the nature of ignorance is not ontological but epistemological. 79 I have argued that the problem of ignorance is not merely a matter of epistemology or of particular perceptual acts. It is improbable that an enlightened person would epistemologically see the world differently from an ordinary man. Rather, the issue is whether his ontology is authentic to reality or not. It involves the fundamental ontology of human being itself.
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Before we enter the world of Zen Buddhism, it is important to bring out certain aspects of Zen epistemology, an epistemology which is quite different from that commonly understood in the West. Western epistemology in general and that of David Hume in particular, tends to see man's perceptual faculty as an information collection center which "registers" or "represents" states of affairs in the external world. This picture of epistemology, though seemingly common-sensical enough, is hardly adequate. It presents the knowing process in a merely mechanical manner--as if there is a one-to-one correspondence between an "idea" and an "object." This approach to epistemology does not take into consideration the dynamic and complex nature and the multiple dimension of human experience. For example, "attention" and "emphasis" are highly crucial in the very formation of perception. They are not merely a minor aspect in the analysis of perception; they are constitutive of perception itself. If "attention" and "emphasis" are inherent and crucial in the perceptual process, one would have a different view of how the human sense organs function. In other words, the human sense
organs would not be seen as "registering" or "representing" information from the external world. They would be seen as organs which "shape" experience in a certain way. They also "ignore" a whole lot of things which are considered unimportant or irrelevant.

In this chapter I shall use William James' explicit statements concerning the limiting function of human sense organs to crystallize an alternative view of epistemology. The exposition of William James will serve as a prelude to Zen epistemology in that it presents an alternate version of the hiatus between man and the world.

In William James' *Principles of Psychology*, he gives his understanding of how the human sense organs work. He argues that accentuation and emphasis are present in every perception we have.¹ He gives the evidence of human experience to support his point. He asserts that people find it quite impossible to disperse their attention impartially over a number of impressions. He gives instances when, in our perceptual experience, a monotonous succession of sonorous stroke is broken up into rhythms, dots dispersed on a surface are perceived in rows and groups, lines separate into diverse figures.² He also says, "The ubiquity of distinctions, this and that, here and there, now and then, in our minds is the result of our laying the same selective emphasis on parts of place and time."³
Not only do we emphasize, James says, but we actually ignore most things. In his words,

But we do far more than emphasize things, and unite some, and keep others apart. We actually ignore most things before us.¹

James concludes,

Out of what is in itself an undistinguishable swarming continuum, devoid of distinction or emphasis, our senses make for us, by attending to this motion and ignoring that, a world full of contrasts, or sharp accents, of abrupt changes, of picturesque light and shade. ²

In one analogy, James sums up his understanding of epistemology. He says, "The mind, in short, works on the data it receives very much as a sculptor works on his block of stone."³ This is a far cry from David Hume's mechanistic picture of perception. In James's analogy, there is an intimate and dynamic relationship between man and the world: man forms and shapes perceptions in one way or another. In this process of formation man carves out certain aspects of reality as presented to him. In this sense man's consciousness is at once limited and limiting.

In the context of this dynamic understanding of human consciousness, Dōgen's advocacy of zazen-only (shikantaza-za) is highly relevant, for it deals directly with consciousness itself. Perhaps more direct than the veneration of Buddha-image, or the studying of śūtras, Dōgen's zazen is designed to bring the practitioner to encounter the nature of existence itself. It is my contention that
Dōgen's ingenuity lies in his articulation of Buddhist doctrines in ontological terms and thereby radically bringing Buddhist ideas into the realm of immediate experience. For Dōgen, to articulate authentically the nature of experience is equivalent to the articulation of Buddhist truth itself.

DŌGEN'S LIFE AND THE IMPORTANCE OF HIS INITIAL QUEST

The Kamakura period (1185-1333) in Japan was a seat for various movements of "new" schools of Buddhism. Previously, Buddhism in Japan tended to emphasize complex metaphysical theories on the one hand and esoteric rituals on the other. During this period, new movements like Zen, Pure Land and Nichiren started to take root to the extent that they continued to have a strong influence on Japanese culture throughout its long history. Among these new attempts to revitalize Buddhism, Dōgen found himself to be one of the major figures of the religious leaders of this period.

Born into an aristocratic family in 1200, Dōgen was perhaps an illegitimate son of Koga Michichika and Ishi, the daughter of Fujiwara Motofusa. Dōgen was given a traditional education in the literary arts, and it is said that he was widely exposed to both Chinese classics as well as Buddhist literature. He lost his father at the age of two and his mother at seven. According to some
sources, it is suggested that he had not been very happy in the aristocratic circle due to his illegitimate status. This, together with his sorrowful loss of both parents, could have prompted Dōgen to choose monkhood rather than a career more in keeping with his aristocratic background. At the age of twelve, Dōgen left home, visiting numerous religious masters, and was finally ordained a monk at Mt. Hiei in Kyoto, the center of Buddhist studies in Japan at that time. Tradition suggests that Dōgen was intelligent and studious, absorbing the intricate doctrines of Tendai Buddhism. However, he became more and more disturbed by one particular question.

As I study both the exoteric and esoteric schools of Buddhism, they maintain that man is endowed with the Dharma-nature by birth. If this is the case, why had the Buddhas of all ages--undoubtedly in possession of enlightenment--seek enlightenment and engage in spiritual practice?

This question represents an existential breakthrough for Dōgen. It suggests that Dōgen's religious practices on Mt. Hiei did not "connect" him with an existential realization of some basic Buddhist doctrines. The rift between specific Tendai practices and the idea that man is endowed with Dharma-nature represents a failure of the Tendai institution to provide religious realization. Kasulis takes this initial quest of Dōgen to indicate the ambivalent position of the Tendai sect at that time concerning the tension between doctrinal emphasis on original
enlightenment (hongaku) on the one hand, and practical training emphasis on acquired enlightenment (shikaku) on the other. 9

Although Kasulis's interpretation is generally illuminating, it is my contention that such a reading is too limited in its scope. If one follows strictly Kasulis's presentation, it would point to the tension between an understanding of "original enlightenment" on the one hand and "acquired enlightenment" on the other. However, it is better not to see "original enlightenment" and "achieved enlightenment" as bipolar. I tend to think that these two terms are two ways of describing the "fulfilled" experience rather than a reference to two types of understanding of how enlightenment comes about. Once achieved, a person would probably describe his enlightenment as "original" or as "already there." It seems that if a person does not articulate his achieved state of mind as "original enlightenment" he is probably still "attached to" that experience. Therefore, "original enlightenment" is better understood as a correlate to rather than an opposite of "acquired enlightenment." "Original enlightenment" can better be seen as expressing truly "acquired enlightenment."

In its broader significance this initial quest of Dōgen not only indicates the rift between particular issue in Buddhism (namely, the idea that all beings are endowed with Dharma-nature), and some particular Tendai practices;
it can also indicate the more pressing problem of how doctrinal Buddhism relates to Buddhist religious practices and realization in general. In this latter sense, Dōgen's quest is nothing less than a total quest of religious significance for Buddhist practitioners. This latter interpretation is well-substantiated by Dōgen's career itself. This initial quest is serious enough for him to initiate a radical once-and-for-all break from the institutionalized religious establishment on Mt. Hiei. It is real enough for Dōgen to set a whole new direction for his later religious quest, his trip to China, his promotion of zazen and his presentation of the Shōbōgenzō to the religious order of his followers.

In its broadest significance this quest represents for Dōgen nothing less than his whole life's philosophy. For Dōgen, there is no difference between "Buddhist reality" and "reality." In his lifetime Dōgen did not accept the label of "Zen" sect for his understanding of Buddhism. This not only indicates his rejection of sectarianism within Buddhism but also that there is no doubt in his mind that Buddhism itself is reality. From this third perspective Dōgen is questioning nothing less than the discrepancy between philosophy as a systematic presentation of a world-view and pulsating human experience itself. Thus Dōgen's quest is the quest of a philosopher.
To find an answer to his doubt, Dōgen wandered from master to master. At the age of 23, Dōgen together with Myōzen, the abbot of Kennin-ji which is a Rinzai Zen temple in Kyoto, set sail for China, which was then considered the land of authentic transmission of Buddhism. After two years of disappointment, Dōgen finally found a true master by the name of Nyojō (Ch.: Ju-ching; 1163-1228). Dōgen vigorously studied under Nyojō who had a reputation for being a strict disciplinarian. It is recorded that during a zazen session, a monk next to Dōgen was falling asleep and was shouted at by Nyojō in the following words, "In Zen, body and mind are molted. Why do you sleep?" Hearing these words, Dōgen was abruptly initiated into realization. Dōgen stayed on in China for two more years until 1227 when he decided to return to Japan, claiming that he brought back neither sūtras nor images but only his own authentic realization. After his return from China Dōgen spent his whole life advocating zazen and teaching Buddhism until he died at the age of 53 in 1253. Although Dōgen himself rejected the idea of "founding" a new "sect" of Zen, he is traditionally considered to be the founder of and the most important figure in Japanese Sōtō Zen.
DŌGEN'S ZAZEN

As stated earlier, Dōgen emphasizes a direct authentication of the nature of existence himself, rather than advocating the study of sutras or the observance of intricate rituals. Thus it is important to give an account of how zazen (坐禅, literally: seated meditation) is performed and what kind of awareness it directs the practitioner to.

After returning to Japan from the trip to China, Dōgen started his career by writing in Japanized Chinese (kambun) "Fukanzazengi" (Universal promotion of the principles of zazen). This first major writing of Dōgen was later rewritten in Japanese with slight revisions as a chapter in the Shōbōgenzō where it is called "Zazengi" (Principles of zazen).

First of all the term "zen" is ultimately derived from the original Sanskrit word dhyāna, or meditation. Meditation is practiced by almost all Buddhists, with some schools putting more emphasis on it than others. Forms of meditation also vary from school to school. And yet, it seems that Dōgen is most explicit in his ascribing primacy to zazen as he often advocates shikantazan ("nothing but sitting" or "just sitting" or "seated meditation only"). He also defends the primacy of zazen through a question-answer session explicated in the "Bendōwa" fascicle. It is my contention that zazen is
the most direct way for a practitioner to encounter or authenticate the nature of existence as it is. This mode of awareness for Dōgen is fundamental to all consciousness and thus its primacy is emphasized. Let us see how zazen is practiced.

For sanzen, a quiet room is suitable. Eat and drink moderately. Cast aside all involvements and cease all affairs. Do not think good or bad. Do not administer pros and cons. Cease all movements of the conscious mind, the gauging of all thoughts and views. Have no designs on becoming a buddha. [Sanzen] has nothing whatever to do with sitting or lying down.

At the site of your regular sitting, spread out thick matting and place a cushion above it. Sit either in the full-lotus or half-lotus position. In the full-lotus position, you first place your right foot on your left thigh and your left foot against your right thigh. You should have your robes and belt loosely bound and arranged in order. Then place your right hand on your left leg and your left palm (facing upwards) on your right palm, thumb-tips touching. Thus sit up right in correct bodily posture, neither inclining to the left nor to the right, neither leaning forward nor backward. Be sure your ears are on a plane with your shoulders and your nose in line with your navel. Place your tongues against the front roof of your mouth, with teeth and lips both shut. Your eyes should always remain open, and you should breathe gently through your nose.

Once you have adjusted your posture, take a deep breath, inhale and exhale, rock your body right and left and settle into a steady, immobile sitting position. Think of not thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Without-thinking. This in itself is the essential art of zazen.
The zazen I speak of is not learning meditation. It is simply the dharma-gate of repose and bliss, the cultivation-authentication of totally culminated enlightenment. It is the presence of things as they are.13

This might sound perplexing to a reader who is unfamiliar with Dōgen's switching from one level of meaning to another. For example, here in the middle of an exposition on how to do zazen, Dōgen says, "(Sanzen) has nothing whatever to do with sitting or lying down." Also, after describing the bodily posture of zazen, he says, "The zazen I speak of is not learning meditation." In order to clarify these seeming contradictions, we should be aware of the different levels and meanings of the term "practice" or "cultivation"14 (shu) used by Dōgen. Before we go on to explicate the mode of being Dōgen calls "without-thinking" we would attempt an investigation into Dōgen's use of the term "practice" or "cultivation."

Dōgen uses "practice" or "cultivation" (shu) on three inter-related planes.

Firstly, he uses it on the imperative plane. This points to the straightforward conventional idea of to "practice" or to "cultivate" in the sense of to train oneself to do something. Zazen as a "form" of sitting meditation among other possible postures can be said to be "practiced" or "cultivated" in this first sense.
Secondly, he uses it on the descriptive plane. When Dōgen admonishes, "Think of not-thinking. How do you think of not-thinking? Without-thinking. This in itself is the essential art of zazen." The phrase "Think of not-thinking" is an imperative statement telling a disciple what he should do with his mind. On this level, it is one among other suggestions, for example, to sit in a quiet room, how to fix one's bodily position, to leave one's eyes open, etc. However, when it comes to the phrase, "How do you think of not-thinking? Without-thinking." This "without-thinking" (hishiryō) is appropriately rendered in the gerund form for it does not carry the weight of an imperative statement any longer. Instead, "without-thinking" is suggestive of a non-contrivance state of mind, the letting go of an alert awareness without any conceptual superimposition. In this sense, cultivation is authentication, practice is realization. An imperative has become a descriptive.

Thirdly, he uses it on the cosmological plane. Practice or cultivation is also used by Dōgen to indicate the dynamic state of reality as it is. Dōgen has a peculiar idea of "on-going enlightenment." He holds that realization or the state of without-thinking as described in the second meaning of cultivation is not based on the individual practitioners of zazen. Rather, the individual realization is an authentication of primordial reality. He also holds
the view that the Buddha's enlightenment does not end under
the Bodhi tree, but is still going on as the activating
force shared by all practitioners. Enlightenment is
still practicing itself across time. This third meaning
of practice or cultivation is clearly illustrated in the
"Gyōji" fascicle (Continuous Practice).

Therefore, because of the continuous practice
of all the Buddhas and patriarchs, our own
continuous practice becomes a reality (行持
現成) and the Way of the Buddha is opened
for us. Because of our own continuous
practice, the continuous practice of all
the Buddhas and patriarchs is manifested,
and the Way of all the Buddha is opened.15

It is important to remark here that the second and
the third meanings of "practice" or "cultivation" are what
Dōgen calls "realization" or "authentication" for the two
are correlates and inseparable in experience. When Dōgen
talks about "practice" or "cultivation" he seems to shift
from one plane of meaning to the other. It is important
to point out that for Dōgen, the cosmological plane is the
basis for the personal realization of a Zen practitioner.
It is not possible that enlightenment be limited to and
by the individual. And yet, this "on-going enlightenment"
should not be seen as a static absolute reality outside
the pulsating experience of the practicing individual.

Given these three alternate meanings of "practice"
or "cultivation" we can better understand why Dōgen would
say, "(Sanzen) has nothing whatever to do with sitting or
lying down." In this case sanzen is used in the sense of
authentication or realization and therefore it is not limited to and by the bodily posture of the practitioner. It is the experience that Dōgen is addressing here. Also Dōgen says, "The zazen I speak of is not learning meditation." Again he is pointing to the dynamic reality as experienced rather than meditation as merely a psycho-physical posture.

Now let us go on to investigate that mode of being designated as "without-thinking" by Dōgen. Kasulis uses phenomenology to clarify Dōgen's distinction between "thinking" (shiryō), "not-thinking" (fushiryō), and "without-thinking" (hishiryō). It is important, first of all, to disassociate "without thinking" from an unconscious state of mind. Kasulis explains that a prevalent misconception about Zen meditation is that it is a form of not-thinking. For Dōgen, contrary to the common view, zazen is not a conscious effort to blank one's mind or turn off all conceptual processes. Kasulis asserts, "... although one should sit in zazen as immovable as a rock, one should not try to be as unconscious as a rock." Kasulis goes on to explicate what "without-thinking" indicates,

Without-thinking is distinct from thinking and not-thinking precisely in its assuming no intentional attitude whatsoever; it neither affirms nor denies, accepts nor rejects, believes nor disbelieves. In fact, it does not objectify either implicitly or explicitly. In this respect, the noetic (or act aspect) of
without-thinking is completely different from that of thinking or not-thinking. Even though without-thinking circumvents all objectification, it is nonetheless a mode of consciousness, and through reflection on a without-thinking act, one may isolate aspects of its formal contents. The point, though, is that at the time of without-thinking's actual occurrence, those contents were neither affirmed nor negated—they were merely unobjectified presence without any conscious or unconscious attitude directed towards them. In short, it is a non-conceptual or prereflective mode of consciousness.

What is interesting is the fact that Dōgen sees this mode of consciousness as the most fundamental. This state of mind is some kind of "Paradise Lost" in the sense that it is originally here within us but somehow we have lost it in our attempt to categorize our experience in a certain way. Dōgen starts from the understanding that this "prereflective" mode of consciousness is the most faithful to reality as experienced: this prereflective mode of consciousness is most dynamic indicating the presencing-of-things-as-they-are. With respect to our explication of the three-leveled meanings of "practice" we can see another interesting aspect of the coming about of this model of "without-thinking." When a person achieves a certain state of mind in the practice of zazen, he is not described as having actually "achieved" something. Rather it would be more appropriate to describe him as having shown his "original face before he was born." It would seem that this "original face" is nothing other than the
presencing-of-things-as-they-are. The "achievement" of a person in meditative practice is more accurately described as a "return" to an original state of purity rather than an "accomplishment." In other words, the highest form of achievement is no achievement.

DÔGEN'S PHILOSOPHICAL PROJECT

It is my contention that Dōgen's initial quest represents the most significant step in the formation of his lifelong philosophical and religious career. His initial doubt indicates a direction, an area of concern for his quest. It also foretells the philosophical project of Dōgen as exemplified in his major work the Shōbōgenzō (Treasury of the correct dharma-eye). In the course of my investigation, I shall attempt to show the intimate relationship or rather the identification of three basic concerns for Dōgen: namely, Buddhist traditional doctrines, practice (shū) and realization (shō). It is my understanding that Dōgen's ingenuity lies in his articulation of traditional Buddhist doctrines in ontological terms as authenticated in experience, and thereby identifying that experience with Buddhist realization. In other words, for Dōgen, Buddhist doctrines, whether the doctrine of Buddha-nature or the basic Buddhist ethics of "Do no evil," are meaningful only in an authenticated mode of experiencing. Buddhist doctrines are
"meaningful" not only in conceptual paradigm, but a "state of meaningfulness" has to be achieved as well.

It is my contention that such a project is highly significant for it attempts to de-petrify doctrines or philosophy which can be easily venerated but not authenticated. I chose to express this petrified philosophy or doctrine as "culture" in its widest sense indicating the historical, ideological and conventional dimensions. My investigation will show that Dōgen's identification of practice and realization, of expressing doctrines in ontological terms are attempts to prevent Buddhism from becoming merely another form of culture and thereby petrifying rather than liberating human experience. It will also become evident that my interpretation of Dōgen's philosophical and religious endeavor can serve as a solid justification for Dōgen's advocacy of zazen as the most significant of Buddhist practices. This is because zazen is least conducive to becoming a petrifying culture, far less so than Buddhist scriptures, Buddha images, etc. The indication that Dōgen returned from China to Japan "empty-handed" is not to be deprived of its significance. At such an early phase in his career, Dōgen's emphasis of the significance of practice is already evident.

At this point I shall go through several major fascicles in the Shōbōgenzō to bring out a persistent attempt of Dōgen to de-petrify traditional Buddhist
doctrines by expressing them in experiential terms as authenticated in practice. Dōgen's presentation is achieved by giving creative readings and thereby new understandings to traditional Buddhist doctrines. He is noted for his freely using possible, though not commonly feasible, meanings of terms and phrases in the medieval Japanese language to give rise to new aspects of conventional ideas. In an attempt to de-petrify ideas, Dōgen thus de-petrifies language. He is at once creative and puzzling.

It might be appropriate to enter Dōgen's philosophy by starting with Dōgen's own criticism of the position of the untrained. In the "Shoakumakusa" fascicle, Dōgen criticizes Po Chu-I the poet saying,

The poet, Po Chu-I, of the T'ang dynasty was the disciple of Zen Master of Po-Kuang Ju-man of the (Ma-tsu) transmission. While he was governor of Kang-chou, he studies under Zen Master Tao-lin. In this regard, Po Chu-I once asked "What is the true meaning of the Buddha-dharma?" Tao-lin replied, "Shoakumakusa, shuzenbugyō" (the first two lines of the verse that begins this fascicle, namely, "Do no evil. Do much good."). Po Chu-I rebutted, "If it is only such as that, even a three year old baby might express it." Tao-lin replied, "Even if a three year old baby might express it, (even) an eighty year old man cannot practice it." Po Chu-I thanked him and left.

Dōgen's main criticism of Po Chu-I lies in the fact that Po Chu-I takes the Buddhist saying at face value, thinking that "even a three year old baby might express it." Theoretically speaking, this Buddhist saying of "Do no evil, do much good" can be recited by a three year old
child. But such a viewpoint is hopelessly inadequate, if not misleading. It seems that for Dōgen such a saying cannot be taken as merely a theoretical statement. It needs to be authenticated in practice. In other words, a Buddhist saying is meaningful not merely as a theoretical statement: it needs to be made existential to one's being. Dōgen is suggesting that without the experiential grounding of such statements, the statements themselves are meaningless. Thus Dōgen radically advocates "practice."

Using such a criticism as a point of departure we might gain more insight into Dōgen's radical re-reading of a famous Buddhist saying. In the opening of the "Shōkumakusa" fascicle, we find,

In the words of an honorable Buddha of the past:

(Ordinary reading)

Do no evil;
Do much good;
Purify one's own intentions;
This is the teaching of all Buddhas.

(Dōgen's reading)

The non-production of evil;
The performance of good;
The purification of one's own intentions;
This is the teaching of all Buddhas.²¹

The general understanding of ethics as providing norms as guidance for action is seen as inadequate by Dōgen. In the ordinary reading of "Do no evil; do much good" the phrases are understood as normative or imperative statements. In addition to this reading, Dōgen offers
the readings, "The non-production of evil; the performance of good." In other words, the meaning is shifted from an imperative statement to a descriptive account of a person's state of mind. However, the significance of this new reading does not limit itself to this interpretation. What is important is the fact that the second way of understanding the statement is possible only as a result or as an expression of a vigorous practice of these precepts understood as moral imperatives. It is inadequate just to understand what Dōgen's intended new meaning of the statement is. One has to ask further why or on what ground Dōgen bases his radical interpretation. Part of the answer lies in the fact that Dōgen internalizes the Buddhist precepts to the extent that they have become part of his being. At that moment of fulfilled internalization the precepts take on a new meaning, a new form of actualization. They cease to function merely as an external norm or imperative principle for actions. These precepts have become an integral part of Dōgen's existential being. Only on this new experiential basis is it possible for him to make the claim for the new reading of these Buddhist precepts. In other words, the existential marriage between the precepts and one's own being is the basis for giving the new reading of this Buddhist saying.22
In the "Busshō" (Buddha-nature) fascicle of the Shōbōgenzō Dōgen reiterates his point through his re-reading of a traditional Mahāyāna sūtra.

"What is the essence of the World-honored One's Words, All sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature?" It is his utterance, his Dharma teaching of "What is this that thus comes?" You may speak of "living beings," "sentient beings," "all classes of living things," or "all varieties of living being" the whole being (shitsuu) means sentient beings and all beings. That is to say, whole being is the Buddha-nature. I call one integral entity of whole being "sentient beings." Just when things are thus, both within and without sentient beings is in itself the whole being of the Buddha-nature.

It is recorded that the Buddha once compared four types of people in respect to their ability to attain enlightenment to four types of lotus. The most relevant type of lotus in this simile is the last type, which is depicted as being unable to grow above the water and bloom in the sun. This is understood to refer to a certain category of people who are unable to attain enlightenment. With respect to this traditional understanding, the above quoted statement "All sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature" would seem to be a very liberal proclamation for it does not exclude any person from the possibility of enlightenment. Thus understood, this Mahāyāna expression constitutes a point of departure from the early teachings. However, Dōgen seems to be still dissatisfied with this liberal understanding of this
Mahāyāna sutra. He goes on to say that "whole being is Buddha-nature." Why is this unusual reading of the text so important?

According to Abe Masao and Norman Waddell, what Dōgen finds essentially inadequate in the traditional reading of the phrase "All sentient beings without exception have the Buddha-nature" is twofold. Firstly, the conventional reading implies a highly anthropocentric perspective: it limits the potentiality of enlightenment exclusively to "sentient beings." Secondly, the traditional reading implies a duality between sentient beings and Buddha-nature, a duality which regards the Buddha-nature as a potentiality to be actualized in the future, and a duality of means and end, where practice is taken as a means and realization of Buddha-nature the end. Unsatisfied with this traditional reading, Dōgen re-structures the whole grammatical syntax. A chart might be a useful illustration here.

In Chinese: 一切衆生悉有佛性

In literal English translation: All, sentient beings, without exception, have, Buddha-nature.

Dōgen's reading: All, sentient beings-whole being, (is), Buddha-nature.
According to Abe Masao and Norman Waddell, "This he does by reading the characters shitsuu-念有," normally "without exception have" as "whole being" (he is aided by the fact that the character u (有) means both "to be," or "being," and "to have").

The basis for such a radical re-reading is the fact that Dōgen does not treat the statement "All sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature" as a theoretical statement, but rather as an expression of an existential reality. The issue here is not so much whether Dōgen "re-reads" or "re-interprets" the statement in a new theoretical framework. If that were the case, Dōgen would just be offering an alternative theory of the relationship between Buddha-nature and sentient beings—something which could be done without "internalizing" or "making experiential" the statement to the point that a new expression of the old statement is available through practice. The point of significance is that the new expression is possible only through the experiential basis of Dōgen's practice: it is not that he re-interprets the old version with a new conceptual framework of his own.

Another point of significance is that Dōgen's new interpretation is not readily intelligible through intellectual reasoning. In comparison to the conventional reading "All sentient beings without exception have Buddha-nature," which can readily be understood as a theoretical
expression that "sentient beings" and not other beings that have the potentiality of being enlightened, Dōgen's reading of "All sentient beings-whole being is Buddha-nature" can be grasped only in an authenticating practice. In other words, the experiential basis is an essential factor in the understanding of Dōgen's expression.

What is also significant is the position that experiential practice is testimony to the meaningfulness of Buddhist sayings in the past. Here Dōgen is pointing to a dialectic relationship between experience and theoretical expression. In Dōgen's Zen, it is not that the sutras are totally rejected as advocated by some Zen masters: rather the idea is to authenticate them, to re-understand them, to re-enact them. This is perhaps the only way to make meaningful not only the sayings in themselves, but what is even more important, the experiences of the Zen masters in the past. The experiences have to be brought forth again so that the real meaningfulness can be grasped. In other words, the state of meaningfulness, not just the meanings of past Buddhist sayings, sutras, etc., has to be strived for.

Dōgen's consistent attempt to "make experiential" or, to use his own term, "to authenticate" (shō) Buddhist sayings carries an interesting implication for his understanding of epistemology. For Dōgen, it is not the case that a subject has already been taken for granted or established
a priori and then this subject comes about to investigate the Buddhist sayings. The "subject" is not an independent being but is seen rather as a cognitive subjectivity who in himself the "object" is an integral part. Objects of study, or statements, or Buddhist sayings are not seen in relation to a "subject." A radically intimate relationship is perhaps more accurate than the subject-object relationship.

A very fundamental characteristic of Dōgen's understanding of epistemology is that epistemology does not start from a pre-given subject who roams about in the world "perceiving" things. This unquestioned and naturalistic "subject" is essentially understood as an agent who "collects" data, "investigates" the world, "judges" about reality, "makes" assertions about whether some statements are true or false. This is one epistemic paradigm shared by most Western epistemologies. In the Buddhist view, on the other hand, the "subject" is seen more as an integral process in the constitution of the world. For Dōgen in particular this "pre-existing subject" has to undergo a vigorous investigation. In that process the subject understood as an independent individual, data-collecting center is rejected in favor of a more interrelated and integrated subjectivity whose existence is radically embedded in the so-called world of reality or objective world itself. In such an alternate view, "object" can be grasped not as in
relation to "subject" for the subject himself has been put into question in the first place. Dōgen's statements like, "We set the self out in array and make that the whole world,"28 "To practice and confirm all things by conveying oneself to them, is illusion; for all things to advance forward and practice and confirm the self, is enlightenment,"29 point to a radically new picture of how a man "is" the world and the world "is" man.

ON TEMPORAL EXPERIENCE

In his discussion on time, Dōgen challenges some conventional understandings of time. He asks for the experiential basis of several traditional understandings of time. We find in Dōgen some very interesting discussions not on time as such, but on temporal reality. It should be made clear that for Dōgen time is not a metaphysical container in which events take place. His identification of time and being points to a different dimension from which to view time. This is perhaps due to the fact that Dōgen, as a Zen master, does not merely aim at philosophizing about time in the sense of a speculative and systematic reasoning. In other words, Dōgen is not trying to offer a theory about time. Rather his exposition of time is more of an expression of his deep zazen practice: he expresses what temporal experience is. The basis for his exposition of time is his experiential realization in his practice.
In "Uji" fascicle Dōgen asserts,

As the time right-now is all there ever is, each being-time is without exception entire time. A being-grass and a being-form are both times. Entire being, the entire world, exists in the time of each and every now. Just reflect: right now is there an entire being or an entire world missing from your present time, or not?30

For Dōgen the time "right-now" (nikon に続) is the initiation into his understanding of his idea on time. He does not aim to offer a theory about time, and therefore in bringing into focus the right-now aspect of experiential time, he is actually asking the reader to authenticate their own presencing now. In asking, "...is there an entire being or entire world missing from your present time, or not?" Dōgen is challenging us to authenticate whether the conventional idea of time as something existing by itself in which events take place, or time as merely coming and passing by has any experiential ground. It seems also that zazen practice brings forth this absolute presencing of awareness. In thus authenticating we would not see time as one dimensional linear continuum; rather we would see the multi-dimensional and interpenetrative nature of time. From this experiential "right-now" we would come to understand more about the nature of time.

Another passage in "Uji" says,

Being-time has the virtue of seriatim passage: it passes from today to tomorrow, passes from today to yesterday, passes from yesterday to today, passes from today to today, passes from tomorrow to tomorrow.31
In Hua-yen metaphysics the discussion of the interpenetration of all dharmas as depicted in the analogy of Indra's net does not bring forth the issue of temporality. In the Hua-yen world-view, co-temporality or simultaneity is the basic temporal feature. It is Dōgen's unique contribution to Buddhism as a whole that he radically pushes the principle of Paticcasamuppāda or Dependent Origination to its logical extreme in terms of its temporal implications. Clearly the dynamic fluidity of time is depicted.

Although in this passage Dōgen brings out the interpenetrative feature of time in a limited context of yesterday, today and tomorrow, actually he is pointing to something very radical and far reaching. He holds the idea that the "past" Buddhas and patriarchs' practice and enlightenment are actually "penetrating into" Dōgen's or his disciples' practices and authentication. In other words, the past Buddhas and patriarchs' efforts and achievements are not something dead and recorded in Zen literature. Their influence helps to bring forth the present-day authentication in a very real sense: they constitute "continuous practice." Dōgen's own practices are "continuous" in any present day Sōtō followers. In this sense the Buddha's enlightenment is still continuing and offers infinite merits and influences. Dōgen tries to bring forth this multi-dimensionality of temporal experience. A single moment for Dōgen incorporates all times within itself.
Even given the idea that the experiential "right-now" is testimony to the nature of time as interpenetrative dependence, there can still be a mistaken view of time and self. At another place in the "Uji" fascicle Dōgen says,

In spite of this, man holds various views at the time he is unenlightened and has yet to learn the Buddha's Dharma. Hearing the words, "the time-being (uji), he things that at one time the old Buddha became a three-headed, eight-armed creature, and at another time he became a sixteen-foot buddha. He imagines it is like crossing a river and a mountain: while the river and mountain may still exist, I have now passed them by and I, at the present time, resided in a fine vermillion palace. To him, the mountain and river and I are as far distant as heaven from earth.\textsuperscript{32}

In line with the mistaken view presented in this passage, the self is seen as a distinct metaphysical container in which events take place. The I is distinct from the external world of the river and the mountain. The "I" is an autonomous agent who comes to "experience" external physical nature. In such an understanding the river exists as such, the mountain exists as such, "I" exist as such, the experience of the river and mountain is just a representational copy of the river and mountain and is only "registered" in me.

AN ALTERNATE MODEL OF EXPERIENCE

The type of epistemology which stems from the subject-object differentiation necessarily implies the making of distinctions as the primary feature of knowing. In this
scheme, for a subject to "know" something it is necessary that he know it as different from himself as well as from all other things. This is to say that this "something" has to be brought forth by negating or pushing aside the background from which it arises. This type of epistemology is vividly explicated by Alan Watts in his prefatory essay to D. T. Suzuki's *Outlines of Mahāyāna Buddhism*. He suggests that this kind of epistemology itself is the paradigm of ignorance in the Buddhist sense.

The hallucination is an unhappy by-product of the high degree to which man has developed the power of conscious attention—the power of concentrating awareness upon figures to the exclusion of their backgrounds, upon things and events to the exclusion of their environmental contexts. The penalty for this brilliant but circumscribed form of awareness is ignorance (avidyā) of the ground that goes inseparably with the figure, of the context that goes with the event, and of the cosmic environment that goes with the individual organism. In short, an over-specialization in this mode of highly selective and exclusive consciousness gives man the illusion that he himself—his identity—is confined within his skin. But a proper correction of perception would show him that "he" is as much the universe outside the skin as the system of organs within it. The behavior of one is the behavior of the other, and the existence of the two is as interdependent, reciprocal, or correlative as that of front and back.33

As against this "circumscribed form of awareness" which has the "power of concentrating awareness upon figures to the exclusion of the backgrounds," Dōgen suggests an alternative mode of cognition which can grasp the world in an all-inclusive way. The dynamic as well
as the all-inclusive nature of one experiential unit is depicted in the "Total Dynamic Working" ("Zenki") fascicle. It is said,

Life is like a man riding a boat. Aboard the boat, he uses a sail, he takes the tiller, he poles the boat along. Yet the boat carries him, and without the boat he is not there. By riding the boat, he makes it a boat. You must concentrate yourself to studying and penetrating this very time. At this time, all is the world of the boat. The heavens, the water, the shore—all become the boat's time, and they are not the same as time which is not the boat. It is for this reason that life is what I make to exist, and I is what life makes me. In boarding the boat, one's body and mind and the entire surrounding environment are all the boat's dynamic working; both the entire earth and all space are the boat's dynamic working. The I that is living, the life that is I, is just like this. 34

In this beautiful imagery, Dōgen analyzes human experience in terms of the dynamic interdependence and complexity involved. His way of expressing epistemology does not follow a differentiated physicalistic model. The simple action of a man rowing a boat is not explained in terms of a man, rows, a boat, on the river, with the shore on either sides, under the sky above. Such a model of analysis presumes the distinct individual existence of a man, a boat, and the rest of the physical picture as if these physical existence carried within themselves independent meanings. In Dōgen's model, the action of rowing the boat involves and in a way, defines the meaning of the total environment. At that moment the man's meaning is
defined by his action, his action makes the boat "a boat." ("By riding the boat, he makes it a boat.") The heavens, the water, the shore—all become the "boat's time," and "they are not the same as time which is not the boat."
The dynamic interdependence of man and his environment is explicated in "In boarding the boat, one's body and mind and the entire surrounding environment are all the boat's dynamic working." Within or together with this simple action of rowing the boat, the entire earth and all space are united. Dōgen says, "both the entire earth and all space are the boat's dynamic working." In this sense, man's existence is radically dependent upon his immediate environment as well as on its continuum with the entire universe. In this kind of epistemological model there are some basic features that need to be brought out.

Firstly, the physicalistic model of a one-to-one relationship, either between man and his world or between one physical object and another is rejected.

Secondly, the mechanical model of a one-to-one relationship of man's perceptual faculty which "copies" or "represents" the external world is rejected. So is the mechanical mode of relation between one object to another.

Thirdly, a multi-dimensionality of time and space is involved in any one particular unit of experience. In this imagery, the multiple dimensions of space are presented. The boat, the river, the shore, the heavens, the entire
earth and all space are interlocked in the event of "a-man-riding-a-boat." The image of the multi-dimensionality of time is presented in "Uji" fascicle.

Fourthly, an imagery of fluidity is advocated in preference to a mechanistic one. The river, the shore, the heavens and the entire earth seem to "flow" into the act of rowing the boat. This image of fluidity of time is also presented in "Uji" fascicle. This is to go one step further than the merely formalistic interdependence of things.

This image of a man rowing a boat is given in the context of a discussion of birth and death. This prompts us to speculate that Dōgen is presenting a very novel picture of the nature of Buddhist dharma.35 It should be noted that the Buddhist Dharma is commonly compared to a vehicle (yāna) which helps accommodate the sentient beings in the suffering sea to the "other shore" of enlightenment. No matter whether this yāna is small (Hīnayāna) or large (Mahāyāna), it is an image of "going beyond" the samsaric sea. In this context Dōgen is discussing the issue of birth and death which is commonly associated with the samsaric world and often compared to a vast body of water, usually the ocean. Dōgen uses the image of a boat going on the river: but what he sees here is not a boat going beyond the samsaric water. Instead he ties together the
boat, a man's body and mind, the river, the shore, the heavens, the entire earth in the very act of rowing. This is a picture of the Buddhist dharma which is "total dynamic working." Buddhist dharma in Dōgen's view must be more inclusive than just a mere means to cross the samsaric sea. In connection with the sectarian dispute prevalent in his time, the argument for the superiority of one doctrine over another does not make sense to Dōgen. In his view Buddhist dharma is not seen as a "vehicle" in the first place—then why would one dispute over its being big or small? In his own unique way, Dōgen points to a radical experiential primordiality which undermines sectarian controversies. The ultimate testimony of experiential purity must be investigated rather than having different doctrines advocated.

In Dōgen's epistemological framework not only the fluidity of space is presented but also the fluidity of time. In the "Uji" fascicle he asserts that a multi-dimensional time frame is operative within one experiential unit. It is not that in an analysis of one perception, the temporal dimension is fixed only in the present moment. All the possible pasts and the possible futures are somehow operative in the present moment. This, again, is a rejection of a linear one dimensional time frame which is prevalent in general Western epistemological analysis. Dōgen thinks that time is not well-regulated into consistent
units like the twenty-four hours in a day. Rather, experiential time is pulsating with all dimensions of temporality interlocking and interpenetrating.

Apart from its temporal and spatial aspects, Dōgen's picture of reality has its own logical implications. For Dōgen, the logic of radical interdependence is more faithful to reality as experienced than the conventional logic of differentiation. To use the image of a-man-riding-the-boat as an illustration, this would suggest that the act of the-man-rowing-the-boat is accomplished by virtue of the rest of its environment. In this respect, it is not so important to differentiate that the boat is not the river, the river is not the shore, the man is not his action, the sky is not the water, etc. This kind of differentiation would involve the three basic laws of logic, namely, the law of identity, the law of non-contradiction, and the law of excluded middle. From the Zen perspective, on the other hand, what is significant is the fact that the action of rowing the boat is possible or is defined by the river, the shore, the trees, the sky, etc. In other words, the boat can be a boat by virtue of the man riding it, the river is the river by virtue of the shore, the shore is the shore by virtue of the river, the earth is the earth by virtue of the sky, etc. This kind of logic seems to suggest that the river is a river by virtue of its-not-being-a-river. The shore is the shore by virtue of its-not-being-the shore.
This logical formulation might sound bizarre if not outright non-sensical to a general reader who accepts the three basic laws of logic as the fundamental principle of intelligibility. And yet the Zen masters would say that intelligibility in this respect necessarily involves differentiation, an act which is considered unfaithful to reality as experienced.

In Dōgen's epistemological scheme, a situation (じせつ) gives rise to meanings for a physical object as well as for man. A thing or a person is neither self-defining nor self-sufficient. Concerning our understanding of a "thing" Heidegger explains that there are generally three meanings. Firstly, a "thing" is understood as "that which can be touched, reached, or seen." Secondly, a "thing" is "every affair or transaction..., the things that happen in the world--occurrences, events." And thirdly, a "thing" understood as "thing-in-itself" as distinguished from the "thing-for-us." For Dōgen we can see that a "thing" in the first meaning of "that which can be touched, reached or seen" and in the third meaning of "thing-in-itself" takes on its meaning only under the second meaning of an event. For Dōgen in order to highlight the dynamics involved in any event, he sees it more in the sense of a situation wherein the meanings of a thing or a person arise. Let us go through a simple everyday example of our understanding of a "door" and see how the dynamics
of the situation gives rise to new meanings to the "door" as a physical object as well as the people involved in that situation.

Imagine a classroom with about fifteen students. In the middle of a lecture, a student being late for class comes in through the door. In that moment, the classroom door functions as a door in the conventional understanding of the term.

Imagine the same class. The lecture is still going on. Suddenly a killer maniac escaping from an asylum comes in through the hallway heading towards the classroom. At that moment, the teacher ducks behind the "door" and all the students follow suit. In a very real sense, at that instant the "door" gets on a new meaning--maybe we can call it a "bunker."

So much so for the "door." How about the teacher?

It seems that in the first situation, the person who is talking in front of the class is a lecturer. In giving a lecture, he is a lecturer.

In the second instance, however, when the lecturer ducks behind the "door," he is a "potential crime victim."

If we put this into a chart, we would have two different understandings of the relationship between a subject and an object.

```
Model I

subject A --- verb B --- object C
```

```
Model II

subject A --- verb B --- object C
```
In scheme I, we see subject A as an autonomous agent performing a certain action B to an autonomous object C. With or without certain actions to object C we conventionally believe that subject A has his own self-sufficient meaning unrelated to object C which, again, has its own meaning independent of the action of subject A or of any other subject. In this scheme the mode of explanation of epistemology is a mechanical one.

In scheme II, we can see the dynamics of the situation. First of all, how subject A acts towards object C helps define what C is. (Ducking behind the "door," the teacher "makes" it a "bunker.") What subject A acts towards object C helps define the meaning of subject A himself. (In "making" the "door" a "bunker," the teacher now "becomes" a "potential crime victim.")

This dynamic interdependence between a person, his action and object is clearly articulated by Dōgen. In his terms, "It is for this reason that life is what I make to exist, and I is what life makes me. In boarding the boat, one's body and mind and the entire surrounding are all the boat's dynamic working."

This example of the door is not meant to argue that there is absolutely no limitation to what one can do to a physical object. For instance, obviously one cannot "drink" the "door" to make it water. However, given all the physical limitations, there is still a whole range of various actions that can be performed on a physical thing
so much so that the conventional meaning of a thing is downplayed in favor of an emphasis on other possible meanings.

REALITY IS "MAKING REAL"

The unitive dynamism of Dōgen's epistemology is to be a direct expression of the Zen understanding of reality. This reality is articulated in the Chinese T'ien T'ai doctrine of "one-mind" (一念).

Considering himself a radical continuing force of past buddhas and patriarchs and seeing himself as a faithful dharma-heir to the Chinese Sōtō school of Ch'an Buddhism, Dōgen affirms the efficacy of the "one-mind" doctrine in the "Bendōwa" fascicle.

Understand this: the teaching in the Buddha Dharma that the mind-nature is the great and all-embracing characteristic of phenomena, referring to the universe as a whole, does not make distinctions between form and nature, or speak of difference between birth and annihilation. Even enlightenment and nirvāṇa are nothing other than this mind-nature. All dharmas—the myriad forms dense and close of the universe—are simply this one Mind, including all, excluding none. These various dharma gates are all the same one Mind. 37

This kind of articulation seems to carry no doctrinal difference between Dōgen and the general tenet of Tendai (Chinese: T'ien t'ai) Buddhism which suggests that "one thought is the three thousand worlds." 38 However, Dōgen's contribution lies in his ingenuity of expression. He does this by arguing for equal primacy of practice to realize
this "one-mind." He says, "This Dharma is amply present in every person, but unless one practices, it is not manifested, unless there is realization, it is not attained."39

As stated earlier, Dōgen's usage of "practice" (shu 修 ) can be explicated into three essential meanings. Firstly, it conveys the meaning of meditation as a form of body-mind exercise. This is the conventional understanding of meditation. Secondly, practice for Dōgen tells of the experiential dimension of the practitioner which can be expressed in the mode of "without-thinking." Thirdly, his idea of practice is not only a personal realization, it is a cosmological matter as well. He holds that due to the enlightenment of past buddhas and patriarchs there is a continuum going on in a most radical sense. When a person is practicing, ultimately speaking, he is but achieving or subsuming himself to the on-going enlightenment of all buddhas and patriarchs. This third meaning is also pointed out by Waddell and Masao.40

Another aspect which is very important in our understanding of Dōgen's idea of practice is his claim that practice and realization are not two different states. Dōgen uncompromisingly claims that practice and realization are one (修証 修行実現 ).

To think practice and realization are not one is a heretical view. In the Buddha Dharma, practice and realization are identical. Because one's present practice is practice in realization, one's initial
negotiation of the Way in itself is the whole of original realization. Thus, even while one is directed to practice, he is told not to anticipate realization apart from practice, because practice points directly to original realization. As it is already realization in practice, realization is endless; as it is practice in realization, practice is beginningless. 41

What is interesting here is that for Dōgen, although realization cannot be achieved without practice, this does not mean that practice can exhaust realization. For Dōgen, instead of seeing one-mind as some kind of absolute immutable principle underlying all phenomena, he seeks to articulate this one-mind as the dynamic on-going all-embracing realization of buddhas and patriarchs. Dōgen also cautions that "Thus, even while one is directed to practice, he is told not to anticipate realization apart from practice." This statement is important for it cautions against seeing "reality" or "enlightenment" as "external to" one's own immediate experience in practice. Reality is dynamic and better understood as "making real" (genjō 現成 ) rather than the noun form of "reality." Enlightenment is better understood as "enlightening" experience.

Dōgen expresses the on-going enlightenment of buddhas and patriarchs in term of "continuous activity" (gyoji- 行持 ).42 He says,

By virtue of this continuous activity, there are the sun, moon and stars. Because of this continuous activity there are the earth and
the empty sky. Dependent on this continuous activity are our body and mind. Due to this continuous activity there are the four elements and the five skandhas. Although this continuous activity is not the fancy place for the worldly people, it is the true place they return to.43

What is intriguing is that Dōgen expresses this continuous activity as even more fundamental than dependent origination itself. He says,

You should thoroughly examine and understand that because continuous activity is not dependent origination, dependent origination is continuous activity. The continuous activity which realizes that continuous activity is but our continuous activity right now. The "now" of continuous activity is neither the self's primordial being which is eternal and immutable nor is it something that enters and leaves the self. The expression "now" is the "now" of the continuous activity as realized, and it does not precede continuous activity.44

"Even enlightenment and nirvāṇa are nothing other than this mind nature" is a statement concerning the ideal state of being human. The significant point here is the lack of the "other" in the fulfillment of man. Buddhism is different from the Judeo-Christian tradition which expresses the element of the "other" in a "divine" entity. Buddhism accounts for the ideal of man within himself. This identification of nirvāṇa with "mind-nature" is a novel articulation in the Mahāyāna tradition which is absent in the early form of Buddhism. When it comes to Dōgen who considers himself a continuing force of the Chinese Zen tradition, he also upholds the efficacy of the one-mind doctrine. However,
he does not see this doctrine as merely a metaphysical principle but tries to articulate it in experiential terms. He thus discusses it in the context of practice and realization. For Dōgen, "nirvāṇa," "one-mind," "mind-nature" are not to be understood as "concepts" within a conceptual system, but as the pulsating experience of the practitioner himself. Thus Buddhist doctrines are brought to the ultimate test, that is, in the human realm of experience itself.

Not only is the doctrine of one-mind relegated to the authenticating process of experience, even the theory of dependent origination itself is tied up with the process of "continuous activity" which, in turn, is expressed as the "'now' of continuous activity as realized, and it does not precede continuous activity." It seems that the former "continuous activity" indicates the experiential dimension while the latter seems to indicate "continuous activity" as an explanatory principle.

In "Genjōkōan" fascicle Dōgen recounts a beautiful episode to bring home the difference between an intellectualistic understanding of Buddhist doctrine and the pulsating experience of it. It seems that for Dōgen the "genjō" or "making real" (現成) is the ultimate "kōan." The articulation of this "making real" mode of experience is the art of a Zen master.
Let us go through the famous passage of the Zen Master fanning in the "Genjōkōan" fascicle.

As Zen master Pao-Ch'ê of Maku-shan was fanning himself, a monk came up and said: "The nature of the wind is constancy. There is no place it does not reach. Why do you still use a fan?" Pao-Ch'ê answered: "You only know the nature of the wind is constancy. You do not know yet the meaning of it reaching every place." The monk said: "What is the meaning of 'there is no place it does not reach'?" The master only fanned himself. The monk bowed deeply.

This episode can be seen as a re-iteration of the original doubt which plagued Dōgen to the point that he decided to leave Mt. Hiei when he was twelve years old. The question being asked here seems to be parallel to Dōgen's initial quest. Here it is asked, "The nature of the wind is constancy. There is no place it does not reach. Why do you still use a fan?" Dōgen's original quest was "Why practice if we are (already) enlightened?"

If one takes the statement, "The nature of the wind is constancy" only at face value, that is, only as a theoretical fact, one would think that one "understands" the statement completely without having to "authenticate" the statement in any way. And if this kind of intellectual understanding is adequate then the necessity of practice is irrelevant. If "practice" and "enlightenment" are understood only within the limit of a theoretical framework, the contradiction between the two as gasped by Dōgen in his initial quest is inevitable.
However, if both "practice" and "enlightenment" are understood in their experiential dimension, then no contradiction arises between "practice" and "original enlightenment." As a matter of fact, once "practice" and "enlightenment" are "authenticated" then Dōgen is ready to claim, they are identical, not contradictory at all. In this quoted passage the act of fanning is the authentication or actualization of knowledge about the nature of the wind. Perhaps Dōgen himself would go so far as to say that without the act of fanning the "knowledge" about the nature of the wind would never be adequate. In like manner, without practice there is no enlightenment. However, a word of caution is needed here to qualify this assertion. It is true that Dōgen emphasizes the importance of practice, but at the same time he also talks about practice in realization as discussed in the "Bendōwa" fascicle. On the one hand, Dōgen wants to say that enlightenment is the basis for practice; while on the other, he also says that only in practice can one realize enlightenment. In this case, a theoretical statement "The nature of the wind is constancy" has to be made experiential in the act of fanning, and the authentic fanning is achieved in realization of the nature of the wind.

At so many places and in so many words Dōgen tries to establish the identity of practice and realization.
This identification is crucial to Dōgen's philosophical project for it justifies his dynamic and unconventional interpretation of Buddhist doctrines. Ideas in conventional sūtras have to be "authenticated" in experience and only within experience can those "ideas" become realization. The episode of the Zen master fanning is a powerful illustration of the inadequacy of the understanding that "The nature of the wind is constancy" without the actual act of fanning. At another place in the "Genjōkōan" fascicle Dōgen illustrates the intimacy of practice and realization.

Fish swim the water, and however much they swim, there is no end to the water. Birds fly the sky, and however much they fly there is no end to the sky. Yet the fish and the birds from the first have never left the water and the sky....Yet if a bird leaves the sky it quickly dies, if a fish leaves the water it immediately perishes. We can realize that water means life (for the fish) and the sky means life (for the bird). It must be that the bird means life (for the sky) and the fish means life (for the water); that life is the bird and life is the fish....It is similar to this with practice and realization, and with the lives of practitioners.47

This beautiful metaphor points to a life-giving, intimate relationship between fish and water on the one hand and bird and the sky on the other. The sky means life to the bird as much as the bird means life to the sky. Water means life to the fish as much as the fish means life to the water. This metaphor does not follow
the logic of conventional discourse. According to conventions we usually talk about "a bird," "flies," "in," "the sky" as if each party involved has some kind of autonomous existence. In this conventional scheme the relationship between a bird and the sky is established only in the verb "flies" and the preposition "in." This conventional analysis also applies to the picture of "a fish" "swims" "in" "the water." The autonomy of the fish and the water seems to be assumed in conventional discourse. But Dōgen, in order to establish the intimacy between practice and realization, calls into question this conventional understanding. For him, birds and the sky, fish and the water are life-giving forces for each other: a vision of dynamic interdependency rather than distinct autonomy. In like manner practice and realization cannot be seen as different from each other.

The significance of Dōgen's identification of practice and realization cannot be underestimated. First of all, it is an attempt to obliterate the distinction between means and ends. Meditation is not a means to the realization of Buddhahood; it is within the meditative mode of experience that Buddhahood is authenticated. Secondly, the identification of practice and realization indicates the fact that realization needs practice in the sense of "cultivation" to realize itself. A parallel indication can perhaps be drawn from the field of music or art
appreciation wherein a "taste" for the beautiful can be "developed." This indicates that certain form of cultivation is necessary to "initiate" a person to his sense of beauty. Thirdly, the identification of practice with realization can be seen as an attempt to depetrify Buddhist doctrines. This is because realization is not seen as different from practice and practice indicates the dynamic experience itself. Also if realization is articulated in term of practice, it would indicate that realization is an on-going process which gives rise to the necessity of continuous practice. Fourthly, if realization is practice, it would mean that Buddhist doctrines cannot be taken at face value. They are meant not to be merely a "prescription" for a way of life, they must also be a "liberating" force for human beings. Dōgen talks about "Non-production of evil" and not merely "Do no evil." This indicates that Buddhism is not to be taken just as another form of culture which prescribes people's way of living and their mode of experiencing. This expression of Dōgen is necessary for it points out the liberating rather than just merely the prescriptive force of Buddhism.

ON IGNORANCE (MUMYŌ)

In bringing out the identity of practice and realization Dōgen is also pointing to a unique aspect of the
understanding of ignorance (mumyō 無明). Literally mumyō means "non-light": it can indicate "absence of light" and thus metaphorically "absence of knowledge." This metaphor can also indicate the "positive obstruction" to light and thereby to knowledge. This latter sense, though not so evident in the Early tradition, has been prominent in the Mahāyāna tradition especially in the Awakening of Faith. For Dōgen ignorance may be a "lack of knowledge" but the more prominent aspect seems to be its manifestation in petrifying the human mode of awareness. Ignorance is seen more like a "culture" which prescribes and thereby limits man's mode of experiencing. As stated earlier, Dōgen's advocation of the primacy of zazen can be most feasibly justified because meditation brings the practicer directly to his fundamental experience and thereby least conducive to becoming another form of culture. Unlike scriptures and Buddha images, etc., which can be more easily attached to, meditation is the consumate testimony to Buddhist experience.

When Dōgen discusses the issue of ignorance (mumyō) he does not talk about the cessation of ignorance and consequently the cessation of suffering. On the contrary, he admonishes his disciples to "authenticate" ignorance. For Dōgen one should not merely see ignorance as a logical opposite to enlightenment. Rather, to authenticate
or to understand ignorance is nothing other than enlightenment itself. As he says in "Genjōkōan," "[Those] who greatly enlighten illusion, are buddhas. [Those] who are greatly deluded about enlightenment, are sentient beings." 

In the "Bukkyō" fascicle Dōgen discusses,

You should know if ignorance itself (無明) is one-mind (一念), then karma and consciousness are also one-mind. If ignorance itself is extinction, then karma and consciousness are also extinction. If ignorance itself is nirvāṇa, karma and consciousness are nirvāṇa. By virtue of the fact that generation is extinction, it is asserted thus (彼岸 ). Ignorance is one expression (名色 ) consciousness, name and form and the rest (of the twelve-fold causal links) are all like this.

You should know, ignorance and karma are "I have this axe, and give it to you to dwell in the mountains." (A metaphor to indicate a sequence of two events in mondo (門前 )). Ignorance, karma and consciousness are "when you leave, take the axe to the Master's place." (Transmission of the Lamp.5).

Dōgen is not denying that, conceptually speaking, ignorance is the "opposite" of enlightenment. And yet the conceptual understanding of ignorance is not adequate. It is more important to authenticate it in experiential "one-mind" and consequently, like the "sequence of two events," the rest of the causal links will also be "one-mind." This implies that depending on how ignorance is authenticated, the rest of the links will follow suit.
It is interesting to note Dōgen's use of the conditional "if" (なれば nareba) in these statements. It is as if he is inviting the reader to take ignorance "ontologically" rather than merely "conceptually." The phrase "if ignorance itself is one-mind" seems to indicate a qualitative ontological change from taking ignorance as a concept to the realm of ontology. This reading of Dōgen is congruent with the interpretation of dependent origination as "not a theoretical explanation but an ontological fact." According to Hee-Jin Kim, "Ui is emphatic in pointing out that the original intention of functional interdependence was not to probe into the process or causation of origination so much as to envision the state of fact of functional interdependence of the conditions and forces of the world."

It is significant that Dōgen does not talk about the cessation of ignorance as stated in the formula in the Early Buddhist Pali Canon. The absence of such a statement points to the underlying rationale behind Dōgen's position. He does not wish to articulate ignorance as opposite to enlightenment, an expression which is quite common-sensical in conventional discourse. In the "Immo" fascicle Dōgen is very explicit about his reluctance to see "knowing" and "not-knowing" as opposites. He says,
We are within the endless cycle of birth and death, and although we have this wisdom (wisdom), we go through our futile labors. Even though the stone is embedded with jade, one does not know that jade is also embedded in the stone, nor does one know that wisdom embraces both the jade and the stone. A person who knows this will benefit. In other words, it is neither the opinion of the jade nor the thinking of the jade. In like manner, although a person and wisdom are not known to each other, the Way is always heard in wisdom.

There is this Buddhist saying, "Without wisdom (wisdom) one doubts, and because of it the wisdom is lost forever. Even though wisdom does not necessarily indicate being, neither does it necessarily indicate non-being, yet there is the one time (spring pine tree) being of the spring pine tree and the non-being of the autumn chrysanthemum. (At) the time of this without-wisdom, the three bodies all become dubious. So are all dharmas. (At) this time it is lost forever."

Dōgen attempts to find a new mode of expression which would not indicate "wisdom" and "without-wisdom" as opposites. He is driving at a new perspective which gives legitimacy to existential reality without further reference to other mode of explanation. Take for example, the analogy of the jade and the stone. Dōgen wants to say that the reality of the jade is not to be negated on account of the reality of the stone, nor vice versa. When the stone is still a stone, and if it is authenticated as a stone, then there is no point in discrediting it by comparing it to the jade
within. Dōgen uses this analogy to explain the relationship between man (人), wisdom (道) and the Way (道). For Dōgen, even if man is not expressive of wisdom, the Way still is. Even if, for example, man makes mistakes by not authenticating the stone as a stone or the jade as a jade, this very mistake can still be expressive of the Way.

"Wisdom" or "without-wisdom" can both be an occasion for the Way to express itself. The expression of the Way is not limited to man's realization. This does not mean to say that the Way or Truth or Reality has its own absolute independence outside man's authentication. Rather what is meant here is that whether man thinks he knows reality or not does not change the face of reality itself. And yet, the expression of reality can be authenticated in man's vigorous practice. "Wisdom" for Dōgen is not a logical negation of "without-wisdom." Rather "wisdom" in the real sense can accommodate both. Also "wisdom" or "without-wisdom" can both express higher form of "wisdom."

This same theme is re-iterated in the "Daigo" fascicle. Dōgen asserts,

A man of great enlightenment increases (or "furthers" the course of) great enlightenment. A man of great illusion increases (or "furthers" the course of) great enlightenment. 53
Perhaps the ability to live this tension is the realization of the Buddhist wisdom without being attached to either. It seems that for the Zen Buddhists in general and for Dōgen in particular to be able to accommodate both is itself the realization of the Buddha Way. Dōgen says,

As it is already such as it is. There are being of wisdom and non-being of wisdom like the faces of the sun and the moon.⁵⁴

The position that ignorance or non-wisdom should not be understood as opposite to enlightenment can illuminate and support numerous expressions of the "enlightened" persons who seem to indicate that what they have achieved is a "re-discovery," a "reinforcement." a "bringing forth" of what is already there. Achievement is just a "return" to original purity.
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CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

From our investigation of the concept of ignorance we have come to the conclusion that for Western philosophy, which generally commits itself to one form or another of a metaphysical entity, either in the realm of being as in the case of Plato, or in the realm of nature as in the positions of Aristotle and the Classical Empiricists, the concept of ignorance is primarily absentive in nature. In other words, ignorance is simply an absence or lack of knowledge. This knowledge can be formal (Plato), naturalistic (Aristotle, the Empiricists), rational (Descartes, Spinoza) or transcendental (Kant). The task of philosophy in its commitment to a metaphysical entity is a flight from ignorance. This philosophical understanding of ignorance is in congruence with the commonsensical understanding of ignorance as an absence or lack of a particular piece of information. In the West, knowledge, no matter how it is defined, is "acquired," "attained" or "achieved."

The understanding of ignorance as essentially absentive in nature is not prevalent in Buddhist traditions with their different concerns and assumptions. From our
investigation, we can see that ignorance (avijjā) in the Early Buddhist tradition is karmic by nature. The term "karmic" points to the fact that ignorance is at once retributive and generative. It emphasizes the unwholesome desires of greed, anger and aversion (lobha, dosa, moha) which are the basis for unwholesome actions, which in turn, lead man to an unhappy state of existence.

In later traditions such as Mahāyāna, ignorance (wu-ming) as presented in such a crucial sūtra as the Awakening of Faith is depicted as being constitutive and thus distortive by implication. Being compared to the wind that stirs up the water into phenomenal realms, ignorance is given a distinctive cognitive power which constitutes things into multiple existence. Ignorance in the Awakening of Faith is also compared to the clouds which "suddenly appear in the sky."¹ This metaphor not only explains the fact that ignorance appears "suddenly" or without ground, it also implies that ignorance carries with it some form of distortive power which constructs the shape of the sky in a certain way. The Awakening of Faith holds an ambiguous view of ignorance in so far as it is seen as at once distortive of and yet dependent on One-Mind. Ignorance is positive for it constitutes the phenomenal world and yet it is dependent on the tathāgatagarbha.
When it comes to Dōgen, ignorance (mumyō) is seen as primarily limiting in nature. For Dōgen the ultimate consciousness is one of a cumulative, all-inclusive viewpoint in multi-dimensional time and space. In this scheme, any viewpoint which is differentiated, discriminatory or segmentary is not faithful to the interdependent nature of reality, or the presencing-of-things-as-they-are. And yet for Dōgen this limiting ignorance can be accommodated into the all-inclusive one-mind. Ignorance is not to be "got rid of" or "terminated" rather it needs to be "authenticated" in the mode of one-mind.

In these three Buddhist traditions ignorance is taken to be a positive obstruction to wisdom. Although there are cases when the Buddhist wisdom is said to be "attained" or "achieved," it is perhaps more accurate to render the experience as a "rediscovery" or "re-awakening." This points to the fact that ignorance in the Buddhist understanding is obstructive in its very nature. It is essentially a kind of discursive construction which is imposed upon the presencing-of-things-as-they-are, thereby positively obstructs the arising of wisdom. The task of a wise man is to reveal and unveil this epistemological cloud.
The intent of this dissertation is to develop the point that ignorance is fundamentally understood in Buddhism, not as a statement about the absence of particular piece of knowledge, but as the articulation of a state of mind, a mode of experiencing. This latter point is highly significant for it brings out an additional dimension of the understanding of ignorance. In other words, ignorance is not articulated merely through its content (namely, the ignorance of, for example, dependent origination, the existence of "Forms" in Plato); but through its mode of experience. I have tried to show that Buddhism is unique in its contribution to philosophy in general in so far as it points out the content of which one is ignorant as well as the very mode of experience within which ignorance is most apparent.2

Now the question seems to be: if ignorance is manifested in a particular mode of experience, what then are the basic contributive factors which help articulate that mode of experience? Let me list three basic categories of these factors: desires, culture and language. The category of desires is more prevalent in the Early Buddhist tradition while the latter two categories of culture and language are more emphasized in the later Zen tradition.
It seems that, in Buddhism, desires indicate not only physiological needs, like the desire for food, air and water, or psychological yearnings, like the desire for wealth and fame, but, perhaps more importantly, the human propensity to give meanings to objects or events. Take the example of a perception of an apple. That particular piece of fruit can be appropriated by a subject to mean (in which case "to mean" is not different from "to be") something to be eaten, or to be appreciated for its beauty, or to be investigated for its chemical components, or calculated as a potential marketable produce. The meanings of that one piece of fruit are varied in accordance with the subject's particular "desires." The important point here is that these different "desires" define the mode of relationship between the "subject" and the "object" (apple) in point. The "presencing-of-the-apple-as-it-is" is obstructed by that mode of relationship defined by "desires." Of course, "desires" may be complex and multiple and may vary across time in one subject, but the point remains that desires circumscribe the "object," in a particular way and appropriate it accordingly. This example is designed to illustrate the multiple possibilities of meanings given to one object at one point in time. Another example will be given to point to the limitation a desire can impose upon the scope of possible meanings.
Let us investigate the case of a man who wishes to have a new car but cannot afford it. It happens that while walking along a lonely road at night, he sees a man driving a new model car all by himself. He decides to get the car then and there. The only means to reach that goal at the time seems to be a violent one. He walks towards the car, which stops at the red light, knocks on the window and uses a knife to stab the driver. He then pulls the man out of the car and drives away. The point is, at the time the car-thief decides he desires the car, the driver of that car is no longer perceived as a man driving the car but instead he is perceived as an obstacle to his wish, as something to be got rid of. At that point in time the driver is severed from his other infinite possible meanings, namely, possibly a loving father, a keen sportsman, a well-respected district officer, etc. All this other potential meanings are cut off and in this case fatally jeopardized by the "desire" of the car stealer. The aspects of ignorance articulated through these two examples are the double dimensions of the limitation of qualitative alternatives (as expressed in the first example), and the limitation of quantitative possibilities (as expressed in the second example). These two limitations in a person's mode of experience are conditioned by desires.
As for culture, it is taken here to mean the sum total of a society's history, ideology, tradition, and conventions. In a very subtle and all pervasive way, culture prescribes us to do things. Some of the most visible features of culture are expressed in the system of government, the organization of family units, the use of languages, and rituals. Culture persistently molds people and is a major source of a person's identity. But identification necessarily involves discrimination and fixed discrimination is another hallmark of ignorance. It is my contention that ultimately speaking, all forms of cultures and conventions are a mode of ignorance—in its collective expression. In its power of prescription culture controls people's ways of experiencing and thereby shapes their mode of experience. By virtue of the formative and limiting nature of culture, the actions of some Zen masters, who admonish their disciples to "burn Buddha statues" or "to neglect the scriptures," can be more readily understood. In a most radical manner, it seems that these Zen masters most vigorously push their disciples out of the possible or actual attachment to Buddhism as another form of culture. Dōgen's identification of practice with realization can be seen as another attempt to achieve the same purpose.
Although language is generally considered part and parcel of culture, I prefer to treat it as a separate category. This is because, although language necessarily operates and derives its meaning within a cultural context, its significance as a distinct logical form needs to be emphasized. It is not my purpose to divorce language from culture but rather to highlight its unique character. It seems that language basically operates on two fronts. Firstly, it prescribes a way of articulation and therefore thought itself. Grammar in a language allows certain elements and disallows others. For a statement to "make sense" it needs to follow certain grammatical rules pre-established within a certain language. Secondly, in its actual use in a socio-cultural context, language is generated from convention and in turn reinforces it. Through language, certain actions are socially allowed and others are not. Terms like, "ladies," "gentlemen," "the royalty," "a student," "a teacher," incorporate within themselves certain "permissible" as well as "non-permissible" actions.

In the first instance, language shapes people's way of thinking in a radical sense for it has the power to define what is "logical," what "makes sense" and what does not. In the second instance, language directs people's actions. In both cases, language is a conceptual
framework which constitutes the world for us. It dictates man's mode of experiencing, his way of thinking and cor-
relatively influences his socio-cultural world. These two aspects of the function of language are emphasized in Buddhist traditions and are brought to its radical form in the Zen masters' practices. Language as super-imposition on man's immediate experience is expressive of the ignorant mode of relating to the world.

In my discussion of the three major contributive factors which help articulate the ignorant mode of experience, we can see a direct relationship between ignorance and action. All these factors of desires, culture and language prescribe actions in a particular way. Now let us take up the issue of ignorance, action and responsibility.

IGNORANCE, ACTION AND RESPONSIBILITY

In conventional understanding, it is generally thought that responsibility whether personal, social or legal--is attributed to a person on the condition that he is conscious of the right or wrong of what he is doing at the time when he is doing it, or with the advance knowledge of what will be the result of his present choice. Conscious intention is an essential factor in deciding the meaning of an action, together with its responsibility. It would seem preposterous,
according to this conventional understanding to hold a
person responsible for what he did in ignorance.\textsuperscript{4}

However, Buddhism seems to suggest that ignorance
(āvijjā) is a condition for action (karma). Karma in
this context is clearly suggestive of responsibility--
in the sense that this karma itself is at once a result
of past action (that is, a fruit of past action) and a
spring-board for future responsibility. In this way,
Buddhism extends the meaning of responsibility by seeing
it at once a \textit{product} and a \textit{process} which is itself a
generative force for future actions. Moreover, Buddhism
indicates that responsibility, especially moral responsi-
bility, is generated within a wider picture of the law
of retribution. In other words, when a willful action
is performed, its fruit or consequence is its shadow
and responsibility is an aspect of this more general
law of retributive force operative in all willful
actions. The paradox here seems to be that for Buddhism,
willfulness is put within the context of ignorance. It
is not just that willfulness correlates with responsi-
bility, but rather that willfulness in its nature as
willfulness is a \textit{product} of past ignorance. Thus
ignorance is the very \textit{condition for} responsibility
rather than an \textit{excuse from} it.
If ignorance is a condition for responsibility, it would seem that without the articulation of the concept of ignorance, a discussion of the correlation between action and responsibility would be inadequate. The same framework might be sufficient for the understanding of action and responsibility in general Western philosophy, but it seems highly inadequate for Buddhism without bringing into account the concept of ignorance. Thus it is my contention that without an articulation of the concept of ignorance, a presentation of the Buddhist theory of moral responsibility would be inadequate.

Apart from its implication for the theory of moral responsibility, the articulation of the Buddhist understanding of ignorance highlights the Buddhist ideal of man. It also brings out the basic difference between the Buddhist and the Western-Christian understanding of man.

IGNORANCE AND THE BUDDHIST UNDERSTANDING OF MAN

In the Book of Genesis in the Bible, it is said that man is created after the "image" of God. From the beginning Christianity establishes two distinctive orders of being, namely, the divine and the human. The story of Adam and Eve, which is the history of man in
Christianity, indicates that man falls from grace because he sins by the persuasion of a woman to rebell against God and thus committing the "original sin." That fatal act of sin cost man his paradise. The union between God and man was severed. And thus man first experienced suffering and acquired the knowledge of good and evil.

In the New Testament we have Jesus, the only being with a double nature of divinity and humanity. He was the one who came to bridge the gap between God and man. He achieved his mission on earth by offering his suffering and death as a token for the sins of humanity. It is believed that Christ's death made man's salvation possible. In this sense suffering in Christianity can be made meaningful. Jesus gives meaning to his suffering by offering it to the divine order and thus saving the human order. For Jesus, it is not so important to overcome suffering as to give it meaning.

In Buddhism, the questions about the divine order together with metaphysical speculations are kept at bay. For the Buddha, the human order is the *alfa* and *omega* of religious endeavor. This does not mean to imply that the human in the Buddhist sense is merely anthropocentric. On the contrary, the Buddha preaches the interdependence of all things, and for him, there is no clear-cut line drawn between the human as opposed to the rest of nature. However, there is no room for
the divine either. Suffering in Buddhism is one of the three characteristics of existence as such. It is part of the natural laws of things. Suffering does not arise as a result of the human rebellion against the divine. In Buddhism the cause of suffering is ascribed to ignorance, and ignorance has to be understood and overcome. This is very different from the Christian attempt to give meaning to rather than to overcome suffering.

In Buddhism, the understanding of man is not set against the divine order. There is a definitive ideal for man to be achieved, possibly within this human life. If true to the nature of existence, existence is a reward of itself. This very life may be the fulfillment of itself.
1. See chapter IV of this dissertation for a more detailed discussion.

2. That is to say, the content of which one is ignorant is the Four Noble Truths. The mode of experience within which ignorance is most apparent is the subject-object dualistic distinction of self and the world. This issue has been discussed in chapter IV and reiterated in Dōgen's thought in chapter V.

3. The claim of this dissertation that culture is an expression of ignorance in the collective level might be considered an overstatement for a counter-argument might very well be that culture can also be an expression of enlightenment. My response to this is to use Dōgen's idea of cultivation. I would argue that a culture is an occasion for enlightenment only when it is a cultivation or a making real. If there were no cultivation there would be no authentication of culture.

4. Aristotle makes a distinction between "acting by reason of ignorance" and "acting in ignorance." He considers actions performed by reason of ignorance "involuntary" and therefore the agent of action is not held responsible. However, he argues, "...for the man who is drunk or in a rage is thought to act as a result not of ignorance...but in ignorance." (Aristotle, Nichomachean Ethics Book III: ch. 1, 25. Emphasis added.) As a man who chooses to drink knows fully well what the result will be, he is held responsible for his actions, even when they are performed in a state of drunkenness or, to use Aristotle's terms, "in ignorance."
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