

An Analysis of Dōgen's "Casting Off Body and Mind"

Shigenori Nagatomo

1.1 INTRODUCTION

IN THIS ARTICLE, I shall offer a philosophical analysis of Dōgen's experience of "casting off the body and the mind" (*shinjin totsuraku*) by examining an experience of "just sitting" (*shikan taza*) with a primary emphasis upon its epistemological aspect. In this examination, my concern is not of articulating a particular event of Dōgen's experience, but rather its general meaning.

The linguistic expression, "*shinjin totsuraku*," is expressive of an event that is marked off from the everyday event. It was, therefore, an extraordinary experience for Dōgen. Philosophically, this may be taken to mean that there are transformations, in the process of "just sitting," from a *provisionally dualistic* tendency which characterizes the everyday mode of existence to a non-dualistic stance which is achieved in Dōgen's experience of "casting off the body and the mind."¹ It follows from this that what is cast off is the functions of the body and the mind operative in the everyday body-image. While interpreting the experience of "casting off the body and the mind" in this manner, I shall advance a thesis that the judgement operative in, and generative of, this experience may be characterized as "attunement" in which the act aspect of this judgement is *somatic* in character in contrast to the intellectual judgement in which the act aspect of the judgement is *cogito* allegedly divorced from the body. This will be examined in light of the experience of "felt inter-resonance" (*kannō dōkō*).

1.2 TRANSFORMATION OF SYNTHETIC FUNCTION

Although, generally speaking, there are a number of individual variations of what triggers an occasion for satori, there is agreement that it must be experienced as a relaxed, perhaps even ecstatic, period "after the extreme tension."² In Dōgen's case, we are told that the release came upon *hearing* the words spoken by Nyojō. This kind of altered response to stimulus in reaching satori is not unusual.

¹YUASA Yasuo, "Contemporary Science and An Eastern Mind-Body Theory," delivered at The Joint Japanese-French International Conference held at the University of Tsukuba, Japan, in November, 1984.

²TAZATO Yakumu, *Shidōsha o Kitaeru Dōgen Zen no Kenkyū*, (Kyoto: PHP Kenkyujo, 1983).

We know from the Zen tradition, for example, that Kyōgen Shikan had a great satori upon hearing a stone hitting bamboo. Under normal circumstances, however, without a prolonged period of sitting via a process of sedimentation, this kind of event cannot be an occasion which triggers a satori. Among other things, this suggests that the meditator's readiness to activate auditory perception is unusually heightened at a time immediately prior to satori experience. Of the five sensory organs, the ears are more open to the external world in a deepened sitting than the remaining senses, and hence are most susceptible to stimulation. The manner of responding to sounds coming from the external world, however, is set off from a direct reaction to the sounds, since the meditator is in the deep state of "non-thinking" (*hishiryō*), which I interpret to be a *somatic* negation in the sense that the body's readiness to respond to external stimuli is arrested through the process of sedimentation. In the meditator's initial phase of "non-thinking," he receives the sounds via auditory perception, but he *is not moved* to respond to them. As he advances deeper into the mode of "non-thinking," however, the sounds he hears could occasion the breaking of the barrier between hearing sounds and sounds that are heard. Alternatively, this might be expressed as follows: the auditory affectivity in its readiness for operation is initially brought to zero in an advanced stage of "non-thinking," but the suppressed affectivity bursts into full operation upon being triggered. At such time, the meditator *feels* that there is no difference between hearing the sounds and the sounds that are heard. That is, he achieves a oneness with them. We may consider this a practical consequence of what Dōgen calls "transforming the body upon turning the brain" (*yakushin kainō*).

This does not mean, however, that among the five sensory perceptions, only the auditory perception is accentuated, although it would seem that it functioned to occasion satori in Dōgen's case. For example, Reiun is said to have had a satori upon *seeing* the blossoming of a peach tree,³ which suggests a heightened visual perception. Generally speaking, however, it would be reasonable to assume that the synthetic center for all five sensory perceptions is brought to a heightened affective mode—the "synthetic center" which Aristotle calls the organ of "common sense" (*sensus communis*), and which he regarded as common to all sensory perceptions.⁴ In order to substantiate the contention that the synthetic function for all of the five sensory perceptions is *heightened* in samadhic awareness via its affective mode, we shall now examine Dōgen's analysis of the confirmatory experience of Dōzan, the first patriarch of the Sōtō line.

Referring to Dōzan's confirmatory experience, an experience in which he is said to have attained satori by "hearing the voice with the eyes," Dōgen writes:⁵

In studying the first patriarch's expression of "hearing the voices with the eyes," the eye is the organ [through which] the voices of insentient beings preaching dharmas are heard. The eye is the presencing voices of the insentient beings preaching dharmas. You ought to study your eyes extensively. Because *hearing* the voice with the eyes is the same as hearing the voice with the ears, they are yet different. You should not

³"*Keisei Sanshoku*," in *Dōgen*, ed. TERADA Tōru, Vol. 1 (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1980), p. 292. Hereafter, abbreviated as *Dōgen*.

⁴See Aristotle's *De Somno et Vigilia*, Chap. 2, 455a–22, and *De Anima*, 431a 20–431b.

⁵"*Mujō Seppō*," in *Dōgen*, vol. 2, p. 69.

understand that there is the organ of the ears in the eyes, nor should you understand the eyes and the ears stand in the relation of interchangeability, nor should you understand the voice presences in the midst of the eyes (emphasis added).

Ordinarily, our ear is the auditory organ, but what Dōgen claims in this passage is that one can also hear with the eyes! Many are tempted to dismiss the latter as Zen nonsense, for most of us have not heard of, let alone witnessed, such a seemingly confused experience, and, therefore, would regard it as an improper use of the language, a semantic confusion, or at best an attempt to be metaphorical. I, however, interpret it to be an instance of synesthesia, in which there is indeed a "confusion," and an exchange of sensory faculties.⁶ Needless to say, it is a "confusion" insofar as we take the five sensory faculties to have their own fixed, and determinately assigned functions without potentially interacting with each other. According to Dōgen, this notion of exclusive function arises because ordinary people "have not clarified on their own the extreme limit of [their] body and mind."⁷ What the above quotation implies is that the five sensory faculties do not have fixed and determined functions; but rather these functions can be modified or interchanged. Hence, this allows flexibility in such a way that sensory perceptions can be interacting among the functions of sensory perception, when the body and the mind are brought to "the extreme limit" in the practice of just sitting. If this does indeed take place, "confusion" is an inappropriate word to describe the synesthesia which is said to have occurred, for example, in Dōzan's experience of satori.

This special use of synesthesia to describe an experience of satori will become clear when we recognize that the perception of the eye can be different from, and yet be the same as, that of the ear. Dōgen demonstrates that he is not unaware of the difference in function between the eyes and the ears as they operate in our everyday existence, when he states: "Since hearing the voice with the eyes is the same as hearing the voice with the ears, they are yet *different*" (emphasis added). What is affirmed as the "same" must be the somatic act of hearing in samadhi awareness, where "somatic act," in sharp contrast with *cogito* as act, indicates the whole involvement of a person, while the "difference" must mean the individual function of each sensory organ. Since, however, Dōgen does not elaborate on the "mechanism" of synesthesia, we may derive, instead, its philosophical meaning by way of Aristotle's concept of *sensus communis*, as a way of approaching an understanding of Dōgen's experience of "casting off the body and the mind."

As Aristotle points out in his discussion of *sensus communis*, there is a synthetic function *common* to all five sensory organs. This synthetic function, in normal and natural circumstances, must serve as a guide to direct a stimulus to a specified sensory organ, which implies that there must be an individual circuit unique to a specific sensory organ. (Indeed, this function of directing is part of the larger function of what is referred to as the empirical ego which forms a *center* for our perceptual, everyday consciousness.) In light of this, it would appear that the circuits for the eyes and the ears, for example, are separate in normal, and natural

⁶See, for instance, Lawrence E. Marks' "On Colored-Hearing Synesthesia: Cross-Modal Translations of Sensory Dimension," in the *Psychological Bulletin* (May, 1975), pp. 303-27.

⁷"*Mujō Seppo*," in *Dōgen*, vol. 2, p. 67.

circumstances, and this prevents an auditory perception from entering into the circuit of visual perception, and vice versa. This must be the case with respect to all of the five sensory perceptions. If in fact it were otherwise, there would be "confusion." These individual circuits, in my understanding, account for the meaning of the difference between the eyes and the ears. But in Dōzan's case, in the case of synesthesia induced in samadhic consciousness, the separation of the circuits must break down, allowing him to establish an interaction between otherwise closed circuits, or to create a link between them. Perhaps more accurately, by breaking down the circuits which normally separate the two sensory perceptions, a new circuit via a harmonization of all sensory perceptions is created which allows interaction between the closed, separate circuits of all of the five sensory perceptions. When this harmonization is actually lived, the meditator feels that his everyday sensory, *somatic* self is indeed "cast off." The term which Dōgen uses to describe this lived experience is no-body (*mushin*), meaning that there is no lived feeling of one's own object-body which is opposed to the mind, where the "object-body" is that body which we objectify through our senses.

The preceding analysis of Dōzan's confirmatory experience via synesthesia should *not* suggest that every case of confirmatory experience of satori is obtained via synesthesia. The value of this type of analysis, however, lies in leading us to a general analysis of the *act* aspect of the synthetic function. Consequently, we must take the position that the act aspect of synthetic function is more significant than an analysis of the alteration of sensory circuits. We can, for example, imagine that the creation of a new circuit via the harmonization of all sensory organs would affect the manner in which synthesis functions, when, for example, it is a synthesis of judging the sounds as sounds. Insofar as the sounds are identified as sounds regardless of which sensory organ is employed, the power of recognizing the external stimuli (i.e., the synthetic function), in general, must not be impaired, while at the same time, the mode or manner employed in recognizing these external stimuli must be transformed.

What, then, is the mode of synthesis operative at the moment when "casting off the body and the mind" occurs? It is worth while to point out that the *manner* of recognizing an external stimulus must be radically different from the one operative in a normal, natural situation. Most importantly, what distinguishes this type of perception from everyday, normal perception is the degree of *affectivity*. In the extraordinary experience of "casting off the body and mind," the synthetic function is charged with a power much stronger than the normal, everyday power in creating a new circuit which harmonizes all sensory perceptions, since the power which would otherwise be used in the activation of the sensory organs is reserved via a process of sedimentation. This infusion of power occurs partly because the activation of perceptual consciousness is lowered in samadhic awareness, and hence the power of synthesis is also weakened prior to the experience in question, without, however, losing its synthetic function. If the power of synthesis is unfortunately lost, pathological phenomena (e.g., Zen sickness) would be experienced. Because of this contingency, the practice of "just sitting" has its threatening side.

The power of synthetic function which we have been discussing is *a form of judgement*. Consider the following simple, everyday example. Upon seeing a

flower, we immediately recognize that it is a flower, "immediately" in the sense that the judgement takes place *without* the intervention of reflection. To recognize a flower in this manner requires a form of judgement, a pre-reflective judgement which can, however, be realized reflectively by taking a subject-predicate form. To use Husserl's terminology, it is pre-predicative judgement; a pre-predicative or pre-reflective judgement, since the judgement takes place spontaneously, and without thinking. If the judgement is pre-predicative or pre-reflective, it is moot, however, whether the act of judgement is solely rooted in *cogito* as Sartre, for example, would have it. Merleau-Ponty, avoiding the use of the term, "pre-reflective," has employed the term "bodily intentionality," contending that since consciousness is incarnate, it is more primary than pre-reflective *cogito*. Considering a "perspectival" givenness of every perception, which presupposes a bodily presence relative to the thing perceived, it would seem that some aspect of the body is involved in forming a "pre-reflective" or "pre-predicative" judgement. I shall argue in later sections that a form of judgement is somatic in character and that it is achieved via an *attunement*.

So, when we ask the manner or the mode of the synthetic function which is operative in "casting off the body and the mind," we are concerned with articulating the mode of "judgement." In this article, I would like to advance the thesis that it is a somatic act that performs a "judgement" in the experience of "casting off the body and the mind," in contrast with *cogito* as act, and since it is a somatic act, there is no involvement of an intentional glance, which is, after all, the function of the empirical self, and which is "cast off" in samadhic awareness. In this sense, it is misleading to say that the somatic act "performs" a judgement, for "performance" may imply an intentional act. The somatic act must be taken as a performance without intending; as a performance "without thinking," in the sense in which T. P. Kasulis uses *hi-shiryo* as "non-thinking."⁸ We use the term "somatic" in recognition of the point of its origin as well as of its intrinsic features. It is induced by means of the practice of "just sitting," which is a modality of one's somaticity. To be more specific, the judgement in question is charged with affectivity which is rooted in the somaticity of a person. I contend, however, that the somatic act in performing a judgement may better be characterized as an instance of "attunement" in which the somatic act and what is judged form a *harmony* between them. We shall see shortly how this interpretation bears out Dōgen's experience of "casting off the body and the mind" when we deal with "the felt inter-resonance" (*kannō dōkō*). The important point to bear in mind at this juncture is that the act aspect of the synthesis in samadhic awareness is somatic in character, and the "judgement" that is formed is an "attunement." We shall now examine how the concept of the somatic act emerges from Dōgen's further elaboration of "hearing the voice with the eye."

Dōgen writes:⁹

Simply make it your express business to learn "hearing the insentient beings preaching dharmas" with your eyes. The gist of the first patriarch's expression is that "the ear has difficulty encountering the insentient beings preaching dharmas." The eyes hear the voices, and furthermore one's pervasive body (*tsūshin*) hears voices and the entire body

⁸T. P. Kasulis, *Zen Action/Zen Person*, (Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press, 1981), pp. 73ff.

⁹"*Mujō Seppo*," vol. 2., p. 70.

(henshin) hears the voices. Even if you cannot somatically investigate hearing voices with the eyes, you ought somatically to appropriate (*taitatsu*) and cast off "the insentient beings are capable of hearing the insentient beings preaching dharmas."

There are three significant points in the latter half of the above passage to which we would like to turn our attention, and upon which we would like to elaborate. By enlarging upon these three points we can demonstrate that the use of the term, "somatic act," is appropriate in referring to a mode of judgement (via an attunement) which, we claim, is operative in samadhic awareness as it has been sedimented within a person *qua* meditator. The first of these points is Dōgen's assertion that "the entire/pervasive body hearing the voices" is more important than "the eyes hearing the voices," which suggests that the synthetic function as it operates in our everyday existence, i.e., Aristotle's *sensus communis*, is radically altered. The second point is Dōgen's conviction that this expansion of sense perception is necessary in practice in order to experience that "the insentient beings are capable of hearing the insentient beings preaching dharmas." And the third point is that, in order to experience that "the insentient beings are capable of hearing the insentient beings preaching dharmas," Dōgen urges the aspirant to achieve what he calls "somatic appropriation" (*taitatsu*). We shall examine the first and third points now, since they are interrelated, and reserve our analysis of the second point for later when we will deal with "the felt inter-resonance," since the third point is a logical consequence of the first and second.

The first question we will explore is the experiential meaning of Dōgen's contention that "the entire/pervasive body hears the voices" as it is related to "the eye hearing the voices." We have taken "the eye hearing the voices" as an instance of synesthesia, and have concluded that it means the creation of a new sensory circuit via the harmonization of all sensory perceptions. What seems to follow from this observation, however, is that there is still a boundary of sensibility set forth by means of the sensory organs. That is, the lived feeling of one's body extends as far as the sensory organs are functionally capable. Alternatively, this may be understood as a transformation of one's body-image, where the body-image is an awareness of one's relative spatial location lived from within so that it is more or less marked off by the delineation of the boundary of one's skin. In contrast, I would like to interpret "the entire/pervasive body hearing the voices," to be among other things, a lived feeling of spatially expanding the limits of the body-image of one's *everyday* lived body, since these limits are imposed by the function of the everyday mind, and in this case, by means of the function of the sensory organs. These limits represent a physical delineation of the body. I advance this interpretation of an expansion of one's body-image in consideration of the following: the term, "*henshin*," translated as "the entire body," indicates the spatial spread of a lived body, and the term, "*tsūshin*," implies a permeation within this spatial spread. In Dōgen's own words, "The total body (*zenshin*) is a total mind. There is no obstruction when one becomes a total body."¹⁰ When these terms are translated into experience, they suggest that the lived body is transformed into an affective sensorium in its paramount sense of the term; its scope becomes broader than the one embraced

¹⁰"*Ikka Myōju*," in *Dōgen*, vol. 1, p. 105.

by the everyday experience, and its power of synthetic function becomes keener and more intense. When the body in this sense is achieved, it seems reasonable to refer to its enactment as a "somatic act."

Dōgen claims that this somatic act is effected by means of "somatic appropriation" (*taitatsu*). Somatic appropriation is an achievement term, specifically designating the existential project of "just sitting" in its consummate form. Now, that which is somatically appropriated in the present context, is the lived feeling of spatially expanding the limits of our everyday lived body—the limits that are imposed upon the body by means of the functions of the five sensory organs. The somatic act, then, is that which issues from the somatically appropriated body and mind. Accordingly, we can for now think of the somatic act as an enactment of what is somatically appropriated, which, as we shall see shortly, forms the basis for making a judgement via an attunement.

1.3 TRANSFORMATION OF AFFECTIVITY.

In the preceding analysis of "casting off the body and the mind," we have concerned ourselves with an elucidation of the epistemological aspect, namely, the sensory perception and its transformation. The purpose of this discussion has been to prepare the ground for a better understanding of a mode of judgement (via an attunement) which, we contend, is operative in samadhic awareness. This was, in fact, an analysis of what Nyojō meant in part by the phrase *shinjin totsuiraku*, namely, to "discard the five kinds of desires (related to the five sensory organs)."¹¹ We must now turn our attention to an affective aspect of the experience of "casting off the body and the mind," for it is a major contributing factor in the formation of judgement by means of attunement.

Logically, the concept of affectivity requires that affectivity be grounded in the bi-lateral interplay between what does the affecting and what is being affected. In fact, to eliminate one of the terms in this formula renders the concept of affectivity vacuous. "Bi-lateral interplay" may be understood to be a dynamic exchange in the role in "affecting" and "being affected" due to a mutual permeation, i.e., that which does the affecting can be turned into that which is being affected. This is to say that in order for x to be an affective agent, it must be both active and passive, both "affecting" and "being affected." Generally speaking, when a person is situated in space, a person *qua* body and his surrounding ambiance reveal an instance of this bi-lateral inter-relationship.¹²

As traditional Western epistemology conceives it, our sensory perception is a salient example of this affectivity, "salient" insofar as the capacity of the sensory organs permits us consciously to "take note of" or to "recognize" the feature(s) of the ambiance. As we have already observed, we carry out this function in our everyday existence pre-reflectively, or to use Husserl's terminology, we perform a pre-predicative judgement. When we base our epistemology on sensory perception, a function of the body which is naturally given, and when we view it as functioning solely within the range of its natural endowment, whatever is outside of the range of its capacity to perceive is disregarded as admitting of no

¹¹TAKAZAKI Jikidō, *Kobutsu no Manebi: Dōgen*, (Tokyo: Kadokawa Shoten, 1974), pp. 49–52.

¹²For example, a choice of a "quiet" place for sitting is a demonstration of Zen's wisdom of affectivity.

knowability. This is, for example, what Kant proposed in his first critique when he recognized "sense intuition," directly connected with the sensory perception, as the sole window to the external world. In making this move, he disregarded the subtle aspects of the phenomenon of affectivity obtaining between a person *qua* body and his ambience; for example, he left no room for the features which are revealed in samadhic awareness. Moreover, he thought only of a *lateral* relationship between the sensory organs and the ambience, by absorbing everything experiencible within the obvious and salient function of the sensory organs. Needless to say, for Kant the human body was a thing-in-itself which was denied its own knowability.

When we turn our attention to Dōgen's scheme, however, this is not the case. In our analysis of affectivity we will make certain to consider both of the qualities of "affecting" and "being affected" in a person *qua* body. We have seen an instance of "bi-lateral interplay" in Dōgen's statement "the entire/pervasive body hears the voices," in which the inter-relationship of affectivity is obtained between "the entire/pervasive body" and "the voices." The difference between the body according to Kant and the body according to Dōgen is that in Dōgen's scheme, the entire human body is capable of being affected, not simply the physical form (*rūpa*). Moreover, we can trace "that which does the affecting" in a person *qua* body back to the function of *samskāra* as ground out of which "affecting" comes forth, though its power to give rise to "affecting" appears only dimly to our everyday empirical ego. Since the power of *samskāra* is generated beneath the empirical ego, most of the time we are unaware of its origin, unless we encounter an extreme situation. Since the empirical ego is the sole performer in our everyday consciousness, our sensory perceptions are also interlaced with, and activated by, the power of affectivity coming from *samskāra*. In light of the preceding observation, the practice of "just sitting" is a method of transforming the manner through which this interlacing and activation of *samskāra* functions. By "just sitting," the nature of affectivity is also transformed both in respect to one's body and his ambience, or in respect to both "affecting" and "being affected." This is, for example, the reason why Nyojō thought that "*shinjin totsura*" meant, at least in part, to "discard the five kinds of desires (related to the five sensory organs)."

Insofar as epistemology based upon sensory perception is concerned, it would be adequate to stop at our analysis of the affectivity as it bears upon sensory perception. From Dōgen's point of view, however, this is inadequate since it does not carry us any closer to truth. One must go deeper than an analysis of affectivity as it relates to sensory perception, to the ground that supports the foundation of sensory perception. This leads up to an analysis of a special kind of affectivity, namely, "the elimination of the five kinds of barriers (*gogai*)." In Nyojō's understanding, this affectivity constitutes half of what he meant by "*shinjin totsura*."¹³ The five kinds of barriers mentioned here are (1) avarice (*musabori*), (2) anger (*ikari*), (3) a darkening of mind and a heaviness of the body, as in sleep (*konchin suimin*), (4) restlessness and annoyance (*tōkai*), and finally (5) doubt (*tamerai*). For the purpose of our present analysis, we can view these dark

¹³Nyojō's criterion for *shinjin totsura* was to remove at least one of these "barriers." Since there is no indication in the text which one of these barriers Dōgen "cast off" when Nyojō recognized Dōgen's confirmatory experience, I shall treat them generally as a form of negative affectivity.

emotions, collectively as negative affectivity, by which is meant that all are generally not conducive to the realization of the state of being a true person. Or to use Zen terminology, the negative affectivity prevents a person from showing his "original face."¹⁴ In light of the concept of somatic appropriation, we may say that negative affectivity is transformed into a positive force in such a way that the "original face" or "authentic self" is somatically appropriated. The claim here is that negative affectivity "clouds" the proper functioning of both the mind and the body, and must be eliminated. The belief that it is possible to eliminate negative affectivity is founded upon Dōgen's contention that this negative affectivity is not an essential but an "accidental" property of beings, that is "accidental dust." Moreover, this is implied in his more general thesis that everything undergoes generation-extinction, for nothing in his scheme has an essential property which persists through time. Also, this is a practical goal of eradicating "the root of all mental functions," although the "root" in the present context is specified as "negative affectivity."

If *shinjin totsuraku* is understood in Nyojō as the elimination of negative affectivity, we can surmise that Dōgen's own experience of "casting off the body and the mind" must have transformed the manner in which negative affectivity functions in his everyday existence as it relates to the somatic act of synthetic function. Since negative affectivity does not have its origin in the "transparency" of everyday consciousness, but rather is issued from the body, particularly from the function of *saṃskāra*, the transformation which Dōgen underwent must involve the region deeper than that of the empirical ego. In order to substantiate this observation, let us cite a few interpretations of this topic offered by Dōgen commentators. AKIYAMA Satoko, a depth-psychologist, supports this interpretation when she argues that a partial meaning of Dōgen's confirmatory experience is to "abandon the unconscious psychological self."¹⁵ The term, "unconscious psychological self," though it is derived from a different conceptual model than that of Dōgen, may be equated with *saṃskāra* insofar as both do not readily surface to our everyday consciousness. Similarly, UMEHARA Takeshi observes that the experience in question is "a state of freedom in which one has left behind all of the human captivations (*toraware*) (or "negative affectivity" in our terminology) of his body and mind."¹⁶ From Nyojō's point of view, to leave behind "All human captivations" likely means to eliminate the five kinds of desires and five kinds of barriers. In contrast, while TAKAHASHI Masanobu recognizes Nyojō's sense of eliminating the desires and the barriers, he interprets the experience in a more restricted but yet more concrete sense, namely, that it involves attaining a state of freedom by casting off the *dominant* force which has taken root tenaciously deep in the individual mind. It is not inconsistent to view this dominant force as having some bearing on "the five kinds of desires and the five kinds of barriers,"¹⁷ since what Takahashi means by "the dominant force" is a binding "hang-up" which takes a particular configuration in each individual, and which

¹⁴I include "doubt" [*tamerai*] in this category, because psychologically speaking, it is a vacillation of the indecisive attitude of mind.

¹⁵AKIYAMA Satoko, *Satori no Bunseki* [An Analysis of Satori] (Tokyo: Asahi Suppansha, 1980), pp. 90-91.

¹⁶UMEHARA Takeshi, in *Kobutsu no Manebi: Dōgen*, p. 272.

¹⁷Takahashi, *op.cit.*, p. 68.

prevents him from attaining a state of freedom. This interpretation reflects Nyojō's other articulation of *shinjin totsura*ku, namely, to eliminate *at least one* of the five kinds of desires and/or one of the five kinds of barriers.¹⁸

It must be apparent from our discussion that there are significant differences in interpretations by Akiyama, Umehara and Takahashi. One camp of interpreters (Akiyama and Umehara) claims that it is the negative affectivity in its entirety which is an object of elimination, while the other (Takahashi) claims only that there is a specific negative affectivity. This difference should be interpreted as a difference in the degree to which negative affectivity can be purged through the experience of "casting off the body and mind." In other words, there is an infinite "depth" to this experience, understanding the "depth" to mean a power of transforming the meditator. If we take the elimination of one of the five kinds of desires or five kinds of barriers as an initial stage, we can take the total elimination of desires and barriers as the ultimate goal of the aspirant. What is certain, however, is that all three commentators mentioned above agree that Dōgen's experience of "casting off the body and the mind" refers to a region which is deeper than the empirical ego, and hence the transformation which occurs as a consequence of the "elimination" of negative affectivity, must alter the nature of the region in which the empirical ego functions. Furthermore, we can surmise that as a result of this, there must be fundamental change in the region of the empirical ego with respect to the act aspect of synthetic function, i.e., somatic act must undergo transformation as well. But what does the general or the specific transformation of negative affectivity into its positive counterpart mean in relation to the act aspect of the synthetic function? And what is the epistemological implication of this transformation?

The experience of "casting off the body and the mind" is a somatic transformation of negative affectivity into positive affectivity. This is why, for example, satori is described most of the time as a euphoric, and even an ecstatic, experience; it is "dharma bliss." In this sense, the transformation yields an unequalled level of energy which had otherwise been undiscovered and untapped, in our everyday existence—a consequence of the removal of the "binding," dominant force which had taken root deep in the psyche (or, broadly speaking, the mind). Once this transformation has taken place, in proportion to the extent of the transformation, the affectivity becomes charged with a power and an acuteness which would otherwise have been unknown. Sensory perception, empowered and refined by positive affectivity, becomes capable of detecting "subtleties" which had previously gone undetected. The status of the external world does not change, for the stillness of samadhi "does not disturb a speck of dust, nor does it distort a phenomenon (*sō*),"¹⁹ but the manner in which it appears goes through a radical modification. According to our interpretation, this occurs in the immobility of samadhic awareness because "the entire/pervasive body" has turned into an affective sensorium in its paramount sense of the term.

At the same time, through the transformation of negative affectivity into positive affectivity, the empirical ego is released from the "bonds" which had unknowingly constrained the meditator's sense of himself and circumscribed his frame of reference. The energy which wells up from the depths of his being

¹⁸TAKAZAKI Jikidō, in *Kostustu no Manebi:Dōgen*, pp. 49–52.

¹⁹*Bendowa* in *Dōgen*, vol. 1, p. 14.

shatters the high ground of the empirical ego. And the empirical ego, to use Deutsch's terminology, becomes "unbound;"²⁰ it has "emptied" itself. In thus becoming "unbound," the empirical ego realizes that the selectivity operative in everyday perception, is "all too human"; it is no longer a selectivity infested with, and motivated by, the ego-desire. It enters into the domain of objectivity—an objectivity which has been achieved through the eradication of subjectivity. Once he is unbound, the person *qua* body has a lived feeling of spatial spread and permeation, from which a somatic act shoots out as an instance of synthetic function in judgement via an attunement.

In order to see how this somatic act characterizes the mode of judgement which obtains in the experience of "casting off the body and the mind," we shall now refer ourselves to an analysis of the "felt inter-resonance" (*kannō dōkō*).

1.4 FELT INTER-RESONANCE

Tamaki notes insightfully that the experience of "casting off the body and mind" is an instance of what I rendered here as "the felt inter-resonance."²¹ Using Tamaki's observation as a point of departure, then, we will analyze the experiential meaning of the "felt inter-resonance" with a view to bringing out more clearly the sense of somatic act which forms, as I contend, a mode of judgement via an attunement in samadhic awareness. The corresponding Japanese term for "felt inter-resonance" is *kannō dōkō*, which is made up of the four characters, *kan* (feeling) + *nō* (response) + *dō* (paths) + *kō* (to intersect). The rendition for this Japanese term as "felt inter-resonance" is purposely epistemological, as well as phenomenological. Both of these terms, "epistemological" and "phenomenological," should be understood in the broadest sense as designating a description obtaining in samadhic awareness. This approach is guided by our overriding concern, namely, to elucidate the epistemological perspective brought forth by means of somatic transformations via the practice of just sitting.

Traditionally, the term, "*kannō dōkō*," has been given an ontological interpretation. For example, in *Dōgen: Meicho*, Tamaki explains that the term means "an intersecting of paths between the feeling of sentient beings and buddhas' response," in which there is said to be an interpenetration between the self's existential ground and the transcendent Buddha.²² Since Tamaki does not clarify what he means by "transcendent," we shall take the liberty of interpreting this term in two senses: first, in the sense of being outside of, and going beyond our everyday consciousness, and secondly, in the sense of designating the things external to this consciousness, namely, the shaped things, abundant and stimulating, in the natural world. When applied to Tamaki's explanation, the first sense of the term suggests that that which is "transcendent" does not appear to everyday consciousness which has not been transformed into samadhic awareness via a process of just sitting. In turn, this means that it does appear, however, to samadhic awareness; and therefore, from the elevated perspective of samadhic awareness, what is experienced to be "transcendent" in everyday consciousness

²⁰Eliot Deutsch, *Personhood, Creativity and Freedom*, (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1982), pp. 35-55.

²¹TAMAKI, *Meicho: Dōgen*, p. 15.

²²TAMAKI, *op.cit.*, p. 15.

can no longer be regarded as “transcendent,” but is ordinary. It follows from this that once samadhic awareness is in effect, the second sense of the term also requires a re-definition, for the manner in which the shaped things in the natural world relate themselves to samadhic awareness is believed to be significantly altered. In order to capture this sense of modification, I propose to render the term, “*kannō dōkō*,” as “felt inter-resonance.” For the purposes of our interpretation, this translation is advantageous, since it casts in clear relief the characteristics of affectivity obtaining between the somatic act and the natural world, which will enable us to specify in more concrete terms a mode of judgement via an attunement. If this approach is on track, an “ontological” interpretation of the experience of “*kannō dōkō*” should also be implied.

With this preliminary interpretation of “*kannō dōkō*” we shall now turn our attention to Dōgen’s experiential account of what we call “the felt inter-resonance.” Describing a lived feeling in samadhic awareness, Dōgen writes:²³

If a person sits properly in samadhi even for a time, with the three karmic activities [of intention, speech, and action] imprinted in the buddha-seal, the entire dharma-world all becomes buddha-sealed, and the entire space becomes exhaustively satori.

The three basic karmic activities of intention, speech, and action characterize, in the Buddhist view, the basic mode of being a person as he relates himself to the other beings and to the things of the world. When these basic activities become commensurate with those of buddhas, i.e., a melding of experience which the meditator immediately realizes himself, this realization, it is claimed, extends to beings other than himself and extends its influence to those beings. In Dōgen’s own words, “the entire space exhaustively becomes satori.” For him to assert this, there must be a lived feeling within a meditator’s body-image which reveals that his inner world envelops and extends to the entire space, the world of shaped things, with the intrinsic qualities of this lived feeling bridging the gap between them. Such a world is bright and shining. When this occurs, the meditator feels that “a subtle, intimate path of mutual assistance”²⁴ is established between the beings in the natural world and himself, which is something totally other than the way in which the shaped things had appeared before. Moreover, this lived feeling has nothing to do with the meditator’s own intentional perception because it occurs in “the stillness of samadhi [and] beyond [human] fabrication.”²⁵ That is, he has somatically appropriated the mind which opposes the working of the body, and the act aspect of synthetic function has become a somatic act. Hence, there is no fabrication on the meditator’s part: he simply feels wondrous and blissful. According to Dōgen, this lived feeling is not restricted to a spatial spread but also includes all temporalities. He writes:²⁶

Even though sitting in *zazen* involves just one person for a time, it performs buddhas’ teachings and offers his guidance all of the time, throughout past, present, and future in an inexhaustible dharma-world, since it *subtly intermingles* with a myriad of dharmas and is perfectly in touch with all temporalities (emphasis added).

²³“*Bendōwa*” in *Dōgen*, vol. 1, p. 13.

²⁴“*Bendōwa*,” vol. 1, p. 14.

²⁵“*Bendōwa*,” vol. 1, p. 14.

²⁶“*Bendōwa*,” vol. 1, p. 15.

The lived feeling of spatial spread as well as "being in touch with all temporalities" is due to the meditator's lived feeling of "subtly intermingling with myriad dharmas." This "subtlety" refers to a dynamic moment concurrent with an arousal of feeling which usually escapes our notice. Moreover, this "subtlety" is closely tied to the rhythm of breathing. The "subtle intermingling with myriad dharmas" may, therefore, be interpreted as follows. The breathing during meditation establishes a certain relation between the meditator and the natural world through its in-coming and out-going psycho-physical energy in the form of vital breath (*ki*). The vital breath comes in from the natural world and it returns to the natural world from the meditator. When meditation deepens, this bi-lateral exchange between the meditator and the natural world creates a harmonic rhythm and a rhythmic harmony through "a subtle, intimate path of mutual assistance." When this interdependence is lived, the meditator can be said to have entered into a consummate state of meditation, perhaps identical with what Dōgen calls "the immobile sitting," in which the meditator is said to "think of not-thinking." "Think of not-thinking" goes beyond "the measure of thinking," although it does not exclude it. The "immobile sitting" goes beyond "the measure of thinking," precisely because "a subtle, intimate path of mutual assistance" is created independent of "the measure of thinking."

When this consummate state of meditation is firmly established, an "inter-resonance" emerges in the invigorating lives between the meditator and the shaped things of the natural world. The meditator *qua* body is *attuned* to the natural world through a complete consummation of the somatic appropriation. Once this "inter-resonance" is achieved, the shaped things, either sentient or insentient, begin to present themselves to samadhic awareness as being intimate with the being of the meditator. Hence, Dōgen observes:²⁷

At such a time, the land, the trees and the blades of grass, the walls and fences, the tiles and the pebbles in the dharma-world of ten directions all perform the work of buddhas . . . Those *co-habiting* with them, and *speaking the same language*, are mutually endowed with the limitless buddha efficacies (emphases added).

That is, there emerges a sense of complete "inter-resonance"—a bi-laterality between the meditator and the natural world in which they are mutually responsive to each other. The meditator has achieved an affective state to such an extent that he feels that the shaped things in the natural world are no longer foreign to him, for he realizes that he has been intimately "co-habiting with," and "speaking the same language" as, the shaped things in the natural world. "Co-habitation" may be taken as a description of the meditator's intimate "being-in" the natural world, while "speaking the same language" refers, among other things, to his acquisition of a natural rhythmic, vital breath, through which the insentient beings (which include the entire range of organic, vegetative life in Buddhism) express themselves. It is the *resonance* of this vital breath that becomes the means of communication, since the root of all languages is grounded in the resonance of vital breath. Elsewhere, Dōgen states, "A language of the total lands is intimate with . . . the mind, and the words; it is closely intimate with them, without any fissure."²⁸ In light of this explanation, the statement we observed

²⁷"*Bendōwa*," vol. 1, p. 14.

²⁸"*Yuibutsu Yobutsu*" in *Shōbōgenzō* ed., NAKAMURA Sōichi, (Tokyo: Seishin shobo, 1976), vol. 4, p. 405.

previously becomes intelligible: "the insentient beings are capable of hearing the insentient beings preaching dharmas." Since the meditator has acquired "the same language" as the insentient beings, he can comprehend and appreciate their "speech," which is filled with the invigorating energy of life.

These two lived feelings, "co-habiting with" the insentient beings, and "speaking the same language," give rise to a bi-laterally intimate feeling which, Dōgen believes, is unified by features of the lived experience in deep samadhic awareness. He writes:²⁹

If you sincerely practice [just sitting], putting the four elements and five skandhas in full operation, you will attain the way. If you sincerely practice, putting the trees and blades of grass, the walls and fences in their full motions, you will attain the way. For "the four elements and five skandhas" and "the trees and the blades of grass, and the walls and fences" participate in the *same* [practice], sharing the same nature (*dōsei*). They share the same mind and life, (*dōshin dōmei*) and the same body and momenta (*dōshin dōki*).

Attaining to the way in Zen Buddhism is equivalent to attaining satori; it is a realization of buddhahood. The "sameness," therefore, between a person *qua* body and the insentient beings with respect to their body, mind, life, nature, and momenta refers to the concept of "buddha-nature"; a pervasive force or energy which a Buddhist believes is present in each and every being in the world. Dōgen says, "seeing the mountains and rivers is seeing the buddha-nature."³⁰ Accordingly, the body, mind, life, nature, and momenta come to be characterized in terms of buddhahood as bearing the seal of buddha-nature. They are buddha-body, buddha-mind, and so on. These elements are characterized by a single unifying concept of buddha-nature, for Dōgen held a firm belief in the "right buddha dharma." Moreover, this buddha-nature acted as the frame of reference for Dōgen's philosophical-religious experience, and he practiced accordingly. During the early stages of the process in which just sitting is cultivated, Dōgen must have had a series of hallucinatory experiences of a buddha-image appearing before him. For Dōgen, it was a natural connection to make between the buddha-nature and the elements of body, mind, life, nature, and momenta, and, therefore, he characterizes these elements in terms of it.

We may detect a "metaphysical" or an "ontological" overtone in the way in which Dōgen identifies a "sameness" in both the human being *qua* body and the insentient beings with respect to their mind, body, life, momenta, and nature. Indeed, Dōgen's language easily lends itself to a metaphysical interpretation. For example, we can argue that, since a "sameness" exists in the human being *qua* body and the insentient beings, and this "sameness" grounds their beings metaphysically, there is in essence no difference between them. If we remove the term "metaphysical" from this characterization, it is not intrinsically in disagreement with Dōgen's own understanding. That is, if we continue to assume, as we have throughout this article, that this "sameness" is a lived feeling derived from a deep meditative state as a felt inter-resonance, it is evident that the term "metaphysical," meaning "going beyond *physis*," is inappropriate to describe "the same-

²⁹"*Hotsubodaishin*," in *Dōgen*, vol. 2, p. 212.

³⁰"*Busshō*" in *Dōgen*, vol. 1, p. 45.

ness" which is said to exist between the human body *qua* body and the insentient beings. If, however, it is necessary to identify linguistically this "sameness," we may use Yuasa's terminology, and call it "metapsychical,"³¹ since the sameness of mind, body, life, momenta, and nature are disclosed in a deep meditative experience of "casting off the [everyday sense of] the body and the mind."

Having briefly examined Dōgen's experiential account of "felt inter-resonance," we are now in a position to articulate characteristics of the somatic act which give rise to the experience of felt inter-resonance.

1.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS.

As we have demonstrated, the experience of "casting off the body and the mind" transforms the negative affectivity to a positive one. As a consequence of this transformation, the entire body pervasively becomes an affective sensorium in the paramount sense of the term, and this is simultaneously accompanied by a transformation of the body-image. The body-image that we have in our everyday existence is lived from within the boundary of the skin. In the process of transformation which occurs through "casting off the body and the mind," this body-image is changed into a lived feeling which expands beyond the physical limitation of the skin to embrace the shaped things of the natural world. Somatic act is an act that issues from this transformed image of one's body, from the body as an affective sensorium. Accordingly, a "vector" of the somatic act expands in proportion to the depth of the somatic transformation which acquires a positive affectivity.

Through a somatic transformation, the somatic act is charged with the positive affectivity, and this positive affectivity yields a powerful, yet subtle energy which is generated in the depths of the empirical ego. Moreover, this energy influences the in-coming and out-going vital breath by bringing it into harmony. The movement of the in-coming and out-going vital breath is bi-lateral, and moves from the person *qua* body to the natural world, and vice versa. An intrinsic feature of the somatic act, then, is charged with the energy of harmonization, and this energy we have termed the power of "attunement." Accordingly, the somatic act functions in proportion to the degree to which it is endowed with the power of "attunement." This was the meaning of "depth," and consequently, the "depth" of the experience is a measure of this degree of attunement.

The attuning power that is present in the somatic act is generated, *inter alia*, by the bi-lateral movement of the in-coming and out-going vital breath that joins the person *qua* body with the natural world. Through this bi-lateral movement, a certain affectivity is established between the person *qua* body and the natural world. This affectivity we have termed "the felt inter-resonance," and the experience of "felt inter-resonance" owes its genesis to the transformed body-image which accompanies a heightened, positive affectivity. The concept of affectivity is bi-lateral and constituted by the affecting and being affected. This may be interpreted that when affectivity obtains, there is an exchange of the respective qualities or features between that which is affecting and that which is

³¹YUASA Yasuo, *Jung to Kiristo Kyo* [Jung and Christianity], (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin, 1978), pp. 268-76.

being affected. Moreover, affectivity takes place only when what is affecting and what is being affected share, in some sense, *common* qualities or features. This is a logical requirement for the affective experience to obtain. The somatic act as affecting reaches the shaped things in the natural world and a target of somatic act in the natural world is in turn felt to reach the depth of being, i.e., somatic act as being affected.

In this respect, the somatic act is a function of synthesis, which relates a person *qua* body to the natural world, and the somatic act is a basic connecting link between them. Being a synthetic function, it may also be considered an act of judgement. This judgement, however, does not originate in *cogito* or in the empirical ego. For this reason, if we understand the “intentional” to mean that an act is issued from *cogito* or the empirical ego, it is not intentional in character. Rather, the somatic act has its origin of function in the “depth” of empirical ego, in the somaticity of a person. Accordingly, the “act” is said to be somatic. The term, “depth,” as it is used in the phrase, “the depth of empirical ego,” is employed in order to suggest a dimension of awareness which is brought forth by means of somatic transformations via the practice of just sitting.