

## THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

formation given by Ui Hakuju and Giuseppe Tucci. Not long ago I showed (*Koza Daijō-Bukkyō*, Vol. 9, Shunjū-sha, Tokyo, 1984, pp. 12-42) that in ascribing the text to a Hinayanist scholar, Ui, followed by Tucci, failed to recognize essential similarities between the text and VV, VP and MK, which at least make it possible to attribute it to Nāgārjuna or to a Mahāyānist close to him.

The author's most problematic assertion is his claim that the *Bodhicitta-vivarāṇa* (BV) is a genuine work of Nāgārjuna's. This text criticizes not just idealistic tendencies in general but the entire Yogācāra system of idealism at its most developed stage, including central theories such as *ālaya-vijñāna* (storehouse consciousness), *trisvabhāva* (three natures), and *āśrayaparivṛtti* (transformation of the ground consciousness). The appearance of the Yogācāra school is regarded almost unanimously as post-Nāgārjuna, from the fourth century at the earliest. Elsewhere (p. 180, n. 174) the author asserts that Nāgārjuna was acquainted with the *Lankāvatārasūtra*, a scripture that synthesizes Madhyamaka and Yogācāra philosophies, and which most scholars place in the fourth century. Such statements make one wonder when the author places Nāgārjuna. I was unable to find any reference to Nāgārjuna's dates in the book. If the author thinks that the *Lankāvatārasūtra* and Yogācāra idealism preceded Nāgārjuna, he should have included the arguments to support his contention, for it would seem to contradict the generally accepted opinion.

KAJIYAMA YUICHI

***EXISTENTIAL AND ONTOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF TIME IN HEIDEGGER AND DŌGEN.*** By Steven Heine. Albany, New York: State University Press of New York, 1985, pp. ix + 202. ISBN 0-88706-000-5

Professor Steven Heine has tackled the ambitious task of advancing Western scholarship on Dōgen's philosophy of Zen by introducing Dōgen as a dialogue partner to Heidegger and so evaluating the success of Heidegger's philosophical endeavour in a "universal setting," that is, "from the perspective of comparison with an Eastern thinker" (p. 32). The conventional notion of time—as that which flows and is separate from human existence—is for Dōgen an unenlightened view produced by self-centered deliberation (p. 141); for Heidegger it is a derivative view based on the Aristotelian substance on-

## BOOK REVIEWS

tology (p. 20). Overcoming this objectified view of time amounts to “overcoming substance ontology” (*ousiology*). Heine tells us that although Dōgen and Heidegger agree that “primordial time” is the starting point of philosophical reflection and the ground of existential freedom, they differ in their conceptual aims, methods and perspectives (p. 9). Heine thus sums up the contrast between them, saying, “Heidegger’s ultimate concern is ontology, [while] Dōgen’s concern is primarily soteriological” (p. 10).

For Dōgen, the impermanence (*mujo*) of existence is the starting point of philosophical reflection and the religious quest. The radical temporality of existence (*uji*) is the motive for Zen practice. Negating the extra-temporal presence of eternal Buddha-nature, Dōgen focuses on the “present” (*nikon*) which is the sole locus of resolve (*hosshin*), practice (*shugyo*), enlightenment (*bodai*), and nirvana (*nehan*), that is, the locus of Zen realization (p. 134). Radical temporality (*uji*) penetrates yesterday, today and tomorrow. This mutual and free penetration of the three tenses is the ontological *passage* of temporality (*kyōraku*), which extends throughout all time (p. 127), thus explaining Dōgen’s conception of time as the “simultaneity of past, present and future” (p. 131). In terms of Zen practice, this provides an ontological foundation for the realization of Buddhahood at any time: “Each and every moment could be an existential occasion to realize Buddha-nature” (p. 26). Hence, “enlightenment is not an attainable goal but a renewable insight and experience accentuated by diligent practice” (p. 135).

For Heidegger, the inauthentic understanding of time as a sequence of static, substantive now-moments shields *Dasein* (each of us, the person, who inquires after Being) from facing its finitude, i.e., its own death, and causes it to fall into everydayness, into the dichotomy of “they-self” which is “publicly interpreted and expresses itself in idle talk.” *Dasein* fallen to the status of “a thing” present-at-hand (*vorhanden*) is no longer an authentic self or presence (*Anwesenheit*). *Dasein* as *vorhanden* results from an inauthentic understanding of the present as *gegenwarten*, “making present,” while *Dasein* as *Anwesenheit*, presence, is none other than the authentic present (*Augenblick*). Only when *Dasein* recognizes itself as the “ecstatic temporality of Being” (*Ereignis*) (p. 122), that is, only when temporality temporalizes itself and gives rise to being, can it attain its freedom from the world of *vorhanden*, objectified existence. Moreover, for Heidegger, “temporality temporalizes itself as a future which makes present in the process of having been” (p. 41). As such, his emphasis is on the “futural” aspect of temporality, as opposed to Dōgen’s emphasis on the present.

In Dōgen’s philosophical stance, the ontological (the clarification of temporality of being), the existential (incessant practice) and the soteriological (the quest for enlightenment) are inseparable (cf. pp. 11, 111, 134, 151). In

## THE EASTERN BUDDHIST

Heidegger's thinking, however, there is an unresolved tension between ontology (*existenzial*) and existence (*existenziell*), and between theory and practice. Heine concludes that "Heidegger does not adequately disclose either the existential or ontological dimension precisely because the soteriological concern has been excluded from his thinking. . . . Heidegger reveals the poverty and entanglements of as well as his own bondage to the very tradition of substance ontology he attempts to overcome" (p. 149) Heine feels that Kierkegaard's existential philosophy is perhaps more challenging to traditional Western metaphysics (*ibid.*).

Heine's work discloses the beauty, the challenge and the difficulty of comparative philosophy and religion. His study, however, does not convincingly establish the appropriateness of contrasting the two systems which stand on such fundamentally different grounds as philosophy and religion, though by juxtaposing the two it delineates the similarities and differences of their common insight into the "non-substantive view of primordial time" (p. 33). Heine's critical assessment of Heidegger's achievement, however, is already implied in his own organizational framework, which places side by side a philosopher who declines to cast his eyes on anything beyond the onto-phenomenological and an enlightened Zen master-philosopher whose concern transcends the philosophic to the salvific. Heine is certainly aware of this disparity between Dogen and Heidegger, and he offers a justification of his method by mentioning the fact that Heidegger himself recognized the philosophical need for dialogue with East Asia from an original and creative perspective (p. 32), and also by pointing to the hermeneutic method and philosophical aims of Heidegger, wherein any separation between ontology and personal experience "seems to violate the unity of *Seinsverständnis* and mineness, of [the human] way to be and the potentiality for illumination, which is the very ground and framework of his thought" (p. 148).

Heine's claim that Heidegger's sensitivity to hermeneutics and language would "highlight and deepen an understanding of Dōgen, helping to clarify many doctrines and expressions" (pp. 29-30) remains open to question, however. His own article, "Temporality of Hermeneutics in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*," *Philosophy East and West* 33, 2 (1983), manages to clarify Dogen beautifully without mention of Heidegger. It is ironical in fact that, despite his hermeneutical concerns, Heidegger's own language remains at times rather opaque, and its English translations often border on the unintelligible. Clarifications of such terms as "ecstatic temporality," "present-at-hand," "present moment-of-vision," "the round dance of *Ereignis*," etc. at their first appearance in the text would have helped the reader greatly to follow the discussion. To exercise a "Heideggerian hermeneutic sensitivity" is certainly welcome, but to use "Heideggerian

## BOOK REVIEWS

language" to translate Dōgen's ideas, themselves highly original and difficult, seems to obscure rather than to clarify Dōgen's vision. One wonders as to the lucidity of such translations as "being-time" for *uji* and "the totalistic passage" for *kyōraku*. A word on the translation of a passage from Dōgen's "Zenki" (p. 110): "Therefore, life lives through me and I am me because of life." This strikes a false note. I would suggest instead: "Therefore, life gives me life; it makes my existence a living presence."

In spite of these reservations, however, it must be clearly stated that Heine succeeds in illuminating the core of Dōgen's philosophy of Zen, despite the difficulty of Dōgen's thought and the opaqueness of Heidegger's language. This work demands serious attention from Eastern and Western students of comparative philosophy and religion. The reader interested in Dogen studies will also find in it many helpful suggestions and a wealth of information, including an English translation of the "Uji" chapter of *Shōbōgenzō*.

YUSA MICHIKO

***LE SENS DE LA CONVERSION DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT DE SHINRAN.*** By Dennis Gira. Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve et Larose, 1985, pp. 271. With a list of Japanese texts cited, bibliography, and index. ISBN 2-7068-0883-7

The publication of Dennis Gira's scholarly study on Shinran's thought, *Le Sens de la Conversion dans L'Enseignement de Shinran* (The Meaning of Conversion in Shinran's Teaching), comes as somewhat of a surprise. Recent works on Buddhism have been mostly concerned with Abhidharma, early Mahayana, or Tibetan Vajrayana. There has been a flood of books on Zen, but recently their numbers have been decreasing. On the other hand, there has been a slow but steady growth of interest in Pure Land Buddhism, especially in the Shin school founded by Shinran (1173-1262). The academic world is slowly discovering that the negative attitude toward Pure Land Buddhism fostered by such figures as Edward Conze and Christmas Humphreys has resulted in an unwarranted bias against this mainstream of Mahayana thought. D. T. Suzuki has even called Japanese Pure Land Buddhism "Japan's major religious contribution to the West."

Gira's work is the first French publication touching upon Shinran since Fujishima Ryoan's *Le Bouddhisme Japonais: Doctrine et Histoire des douze grandes Sectes bouddhiques du Japon* (1889) which was published almost a