

Self and Other

A Parallel between Dōgen and Nishida

Laurentiu ANDREI

A major theme in Nishida Kitarō's philosophy is that of the nature of the self and its place in the world as determined by its relationship to the other. In Buddhist thought, a paradigmatic case is that of the monk Dōgen Kigen (1200–1253) who, in many places of his major work, the *Shōbōgenzō* 正法眼藏, deploys a discourse concerning the importance of the master-disciple relationship in the transmission of Dharma. Although Dōgen makes no theoretical claim concerning otherness, it is, nonetheless, possible to recognize in this work an attempt to think about the relationship between self and other. His reflection is focused on awakening to the truth of Dharma, something which according to him, can be confirmed only by a true master, as a figure of otherness. Nishida explores similar ideas through a conceptual structure based on a logic of place (場所的論理). This logic is one of absolutely contradictory self-identity (絶対矛盾的自己同一) and it is set up in order to explain one's understanding of reality, depending on the transformation of consciousness through self-awareness. Within this structure, the reflection on self-other relationship is one of the ways Nishida uses in order to explain self-awareness (自覚).

Obviously, for both Dōgen and Nishida, the relationship between self and other is directly linked to awareness. The purpose of this essay is

to examine how each author links his understanding of the relationship between self and other to his conception of awareness. In this article, I will compare and contrast their respective discourses. After an exploration of Dōgen's thought concerning the master-disciple relationship, I will take up Nishida's understanding of the I-Thou relationship. Finally, it will be suggested that in both cases the self-other relationship rests on a certain conception of space and time, which is itself grounded in ideas of emptiness and non-duality. This analysis will suggest that Nishida saw in the Buddhists texts and teachings in general and perhaps in Dōgen's work in particular, more than a source of inspiration: he found a key to dialogue with other philosophies.

DŌGEN: THE SELF-OTHER RELATIONSHIP AS MASTER-DISCIPLE RELATIONSHIP

The Place of Encounter

Even though Dōgen does not explicitly thematize otherness as a theoretical concern, the self-other relationship plays an important role in his thought, both in his conception of Dharma transmission, and in the idea of awakening. This relationship can therefore be understood as a master-disciple relationship. A supporter of direct transmission (單傳), Dōgen stresses the importance of meeting with a good master. Indeed, he considers the truth of Dharma—Śākyamuni's truth—to be transmitted from generation to generation, and from mind to mind (以心傳心). This is to say that though there are numerous encounters with the master in the course of history, the same truth is transmitted each time. Before discussing Dōgen's account of the encounter with the master, it is necessary to analyze his conception of time and space—i.e., where and when the master confirms awakening. More specifically, in what place can such an encounter be possible?

Dōgen uses two well-known terms, the “world of water” and the “world of mountains,” to refer to the place where the master can confirm that the awakening has occurred. Thus, “from the distant past to the distant present, mountains have been the dwelling place of the great sages” (*Sansuikyō*, tr. BIELEFELDT), and “since ancient times, wise men

and sages have also lived by the water” (*Sansuikyō*, tr. BIELEFELDT). These metaphors point to a place that extends beyond the small world of human society, to encompass the world of nature—a mysterious world filled with wisdom. As the home of the wise, this place appears to be the opposite of the ordinary world of society, so that at first glance it would seem to be outside the world of society.

Water and mountains, says Dōgen, are places formed by the wise actions of sage men, meaning that these places are nothing but sage’s actions. As such, they are not just the home of the sage, but his body-mind (心身) (*Sansuikyō*) and, in that sense, they are not external to his body-mind. Further, the relationship between the master’s actions and the environment of mountains and water is bidirectional: the environment is fully determined by these actions, which are in turn determined by the environment. This generates a kind of dialectical relationship between the environment and that which is situated in it.

Further, Dōgen argues that, even if an individual enters the world of water or the world of mountains, he cannot meet any of the sages, as entering this environment concomitantly erases all traces (蹤跡) of entrance. There remains only the actualization of the mountain’s lifestyle (山の活計の現成), sometimes as walking, sometimes as mountains moving on water.¹ Further, in the world of water, the wise actualize a lifestyle, as expressed by Dōgen’s metaphor of fishing.

When they live by the water they hook fish. Or they hook people, or they hook the way. These are all “water styles” of old. And going further, there must be hooking the self, hooking the hook, being hooked by the hook, and being hooked by the way (*Sansuikyō*, tr. BIELEFELDT).

The sages, living in the mountains or by the water, constantly inter-

1. These are images of the underlying activity of reality. This activity, as emphasized by the Buddhist truth, is essentially non-action (無為), i.e., unconditioned, characterizing a reality beyond arising-changing-cessation (DDB). In this sense, it would be simplistic to characterize water just by the fact of flowing. Indeed, beyond its flow, water’s virtue is to be the aspect of reality as suchness (眞如). The same is true for the mountains. To doubt their walking would be a mistake and a sign of ignorance of the true aspect of reality.

act with other people, showing them the way of Dharma. Therefore, their world is not foreign to the ordinary world; rather, through its many unspeakable, seemingly contradictory virtues,² water extends to include all reality. Insofar as water and mountains are places where reality becomes manifest, they encompass reality as a whole. Thus, the sage, who lives in the mountains or by the water, is an enlightened being who can see reality as it is. Given that his actions determine his environment (reality itself) and are determined by it, the wise man does not retain his identity as an individual; this is why one cannot meet him in the mountain. The identity of the sage is determined entirely by his interacting with the place where he lives, a place where all traces are erased, where the categories of identity and difference work differently than they do in the world of society. Therefore, one can ask: how does the self-other relationship operate in such an environment? How does the encounter between the master and the pupil happen in this context?

Entering this place implies a change of perspective. According to Dōgen, an individual's view is different depending on whether he sees the mountains from inside or from outside, from an absolute or a relative point of view. In addition, in the universe or Dharma-realm (法界), each being has a particular condition, a unique relationship with their own "environment": birds fly in the sky and fishes swim in the water. It follows, for example, it would be wrong to assume that humans see water in the same way as fishes do (*Sansuikyō*). This is what Buddhism calls Dharma-condition/position (法位, (*Uji*)).³ Dōgen states that, just like ashes, firewood has its Dharma-condition, it has a before and after. The firewood does not become another thing (ashes), because the firewood does not retain its self (われ) or essence. Nor do the ashes appear (不生), or the firewood disappear (不滅). The case is rather that, as with life and death, these changes are affairs of an instant (一時).

Awakening itself is an instantaneous event, that is, it occurs at a specific and appropriate time that is the only moment of awakening. However,

2. "Water is neither strong nor weak, neither wet nor dry, neither moving nor still, neither cold nor hot, neither being nor non-being, neither delusion nor enlightenment" (*Sansuikyō*, tr. BIELEFELDT).

3. The appropriate condition/place of each thing in terms of its suchness (DDB).

that moment belongs neither to the past nor to the future, but to here and now. Therefore, when awakened, the master

correctly transmitted [this eye] to “his own buddhahood” and to the “buddhahood of others.” Though we may say that he has studied together with the Buddha Śākyamuni, he studied at the same time as the seven buddhas [of which Śākyamuni is the last] and, in addition, has studied together with the buddhas of the three ages [of past, present, and future]. He realized the way before the King of Emptiness [who rules in the eon when all is reduced to emptiness]; he realized the way after the King of Emptiness; he practiced together and realized the way precisely with the Buddha King of Emptiness (*Tashin tsū*, tr. BIELEFELDT).

This passage suggests that while transmission has a history, awakening extends, always the same, to the totality of time. It follows that, since this time does not pass, it is always an appropriate time for the awakening to occur. However, this time is not opposed to the passage from past to future. It is not frozen time but “absolute now” (而今). Dōgen says that if one is attentive enough, one can see that nothing is missing from present time, and that this is “being-time” (有時). One’s actions or practices are not merely situated at a “certain moment” (有時) in the flow of time, but in “being-time” (有時). In this sense, time has the “consistency” of a place, determined by practice or action as “non-action” (無為). Living in this place, the wise man simultaneously fishes his own self, fishes the way, and is fished by the way. In other words, when his actions follow the movement of mountains and water, the sage’s self is time (自己の時なる). This means that, in his practice, the when and where of awakening overlap.

Thereby, the encounter with the master takes place when and where time and space have the same “consistency,” as determined by the sage’s practice. Without leaving his place in the mountains or by the water, the master transmits the Dharma throughout the world by its practice, similar to mountain’s walking, flowing and non-flowing of water, i.e., action as non-action. Therefore, according to non-duality, when one grasps the flowing and non-flowing of a single drop of water, countless dharmas

suddenly realize (*Sansuikyō*); for the follower of the Buddhist path, this leads to the world of water and mountains, i.e., to reality as it is.

Without Leaving His Place, Abandoning Self and Other

In the mountains and near the water, one has no attachment because one is free from the veil of duality. The change in perspective that takes place as one enters the world of the mountains or the water causes dualities such as inside and outside, before and after, to vanish. Thus, without leaving his place, one suddenly realizes the original integration in the movement of reality

The Buddha has said, “All things are ultimately liberated; they have no abode.” We should realize that, although they are liberated, without any bonds, all things are abiding in [their own particular] state (*Sansuikyō*, tr. BIELEFELDT).

The change of perspective is not, in fact, a change of place. In other words, all beings are originally enlightened;⁴ they are already within the Dharma-body (法身). Thus, the encounter with the master, as other, should not be looked for in another place, because in order to meet the master, one must return to oneself. Dōgen wrote in a famous passage that:

To learn the Buddha’s truth is to learn ourselves. To learn ourselves is to forget ourselves. To forget ourselves is to be experienced by the myriad dharmas. To be experienced by the myriad dharmas is to let our own body and mind, and the body and mind of the external world, fall away. There is a state in which the traces of realization are forgotten; and it manifests the traces of forgotten realization for a long, long time (*Genjōkōan*, tr. NISHIJIMA and CROSS).

It is only when the individual self has learned to detach from itself and to surpass the distinction between self and other as categories of identity and difference, that the Buddhist way can be opened to him.

4. Without radically rejecting the original enlightenment theory (本覺), Dōgen insisted on the necessity of a constant practice and stressed the unity of practice and realisation (修證一如).

Dōgen's realization in Sung China testifies to the fact that the encounter with the master is precisely the abandonment of the body-mind (心身脱落), of both self (自己) and other (他己). The encounter with the master cannot be apprehended by means of a projective logic because that would merely be an encounter with the master's image or incarnation as another individual self. If it is genuine, the master's realization is one where the individual self has abandoned its limits and, carried away by its own overtaking, abandoned the other as other. How, then, could it still be possible to meet the master as another individual self? Such an encounter is doomed to failure, for it is not a true one.

A true encounter is like the one on Vulture's Peak, where Śākyamuni passed the law of Dharma to Mahākāśyapa, or like the one between Bodhidharma and Huike. In this discussion of the latter, Dōgen expresses the self-other relationship in the following terms:

We should realize that there is, “you've got me”; there is, “I've got you”; there is, “got my you”; there is, “got your me.” In our examination of the body and mind of the Ancestral Master, if we say that inner and outer are not one, or that the whole body is not his entire body, then we are not in the land where the buddhas and ancestors appear (*Kattō*, tr. BIELEFELDT).

To reach the land of the wise is precisely to realize this particular relationship between I and Thou, between master and disciple. Thus, when I (吾) seizes Thou (汝) Thou is seizing I, just as the seizure of I by Thou is the same as that of Thou by I. This dialectic implies the overcoming of all duality between inside and outside, mind and body, past and present, master and disciple. Similarly,

The self of yesterday which is the subjective self (自己) is not one who does not realize, and the self of today which is the objective self (他己) is not one who does not realize. If we search among mountain people and water people, past and present, looking for non realization, we will never find it (*Daigo*, tr. NISHIJIMA and CROSS).

As one's original nature is awakening, what meaning can a “before” or an “after” awakening have? Indeed, a person who is able to meet master Tokujō 徳誠和尚, who lives by the river Katei, is master Tokujō

(*Sansuikyō*). Even though to meet or to be master Tokujo is to become like him (i.e., awakened), this transformation does not hinder the identity of the master who lives by the river Katei.

This ultimately answers the question of who meets whom: awakening meets awakening, so that wise men always encounter wise men (*Kenbutsu*). Dharma transmission, which is mind-to-mind transmission, appears under the guise of a tension between master and disciple; this is a polarity where, through the moment of awakening, the self recognizes itself in the other without confusion.

NISHIDA: THE SELF-OTHER RELATIONSHIP OF I AND THOU

Otherness and Spatial Time

In the first part of the work *I and Thou*, Nishida points out two dimensions of the relation to otherness, namely the sphere of oneself and the sphere of intersubjectivity. Even though one could refer to these two dimensions as internal and external, we shall see that they are not heterogeneous: the sphere of oneself is that of I, which is capable of knowing whether I is thinking a new thought, or remembering something it had thought before. Thus, the I of today and the I of yesterday can be combined directly, without mediation. On the contrary, in the sphere of intersubjectivity, I does not know if others think of something, because in this case, it cannot know without the mediation of spoken or written expression. A mediator is necessary in the intersubjective sphere where interaction is indirect and relationships are spatial; this is the environment that Nishida calls the outside world. The outside world, defined as the world of bodies (物体界),⁵ is one in which things interact through bodily phenomena such as sounds and forms (NKZ 6: 341). Nevertheless, the outer world is not opposed to the inner world because the same raw material is used to construct them both.⁶ If they were opposed, the

5. Like the material world, which sense is given by the present time self-determination as determination of nothingness, the bodily world has already a dialectical significance (NKZ 6: 349).

6. The material world is not the true matter. Originally historical, it is founded by

relationship between I and Thou would be incomprehensible to such a point that we would be forced into solipsism (NKZ 6: 347). Nishida further stresses that everything real is situated in time. Therefore, the two worlds are also consistent with the form of time.⁷ Accordingly, within the inner world, the I of yesterday and the I of today seem to combine directly. This idea however needs to be nuanced. An expressive determination (NKZ 6: 342) is necessary to establish an internal unit of the phenomena of consciousness.

In other words, there is a sort of mediation even in the inner world. The relationships between I and Thou, and between the I of yesterday and the I of today, are also situated in the “world of expression” (表現の世界). Yet the mediation in question is, quite simply, time itself. So determined, time has the “consistency” of a place.⁸ It is a spatial time, an interval that determines itself as “eternal now” (永遠の今). This means that there is a dialectical and temporal self-determination of everything that concretely exists, namely active things. The dialectic is therefore grounded on action⁹ and, as such, it is a polarity characterized by a dynamic and simultaneous tension in two opposite directions. One leading figure of this polarity is the self-other relationship, and this relationship is dialectical, because things are situated in an environment or in a *basho*.¹⁰

The individual is not born by itself. There would be no individual if it were absolute. For the individual to be born, there must be a ground

the dialectical movement of concrete things (NKZ 6: 353). It is described as historical, the relationship between the individual and the environment. This is where the self-determination of the environment gives place to the individual who acts and self-determines and, thereby, in return, determines the environment (NKZ 6: 354–5).

7. Real time, understood as self-determination of the “eternal now” and as a “continuity of discontinuity” (非連続の連続), is historical time (歴史時) (NKZ 6: 342–343).

8. The bodily world, supposed at the foundation of reality, extends the same way as the world of absolutely determined present that Nishida calls the world of spatial time (空間的時の世界), a world without center (NKZ 6: 349).

9. Nishida argues that even passivity must be a kind of action (作用) (NKZ 6: 353)

10. (NKZ 6: 346–7). What Nishida calls *basho* is not a mere space, but rather a place where everything appears or establishes as it is. Thus, he distinguishes three kinds of *basho*: the *basho* of being (有の場所), the *basho* of oppositional nothingness (対立的無の場所) and the one of absolute nothingness (絶対無の場所) (See TREMBLAY 2000, 29–36).

to be born into. In other words, there must be an environment that is its own. (NKZ 6: 347)¹¹

One way of conceptualizing *basho's* determinations would involve considering this environment as something similar to what Buddhist thought expressed as Dharma-condition (法位). Perhaps echoing this idea, Nishida explained that:

The individual (個物) must be determined by the environment. Nonetheless, it exists where it determines the environment. When the individual is thus determined by the environment, the latter being a *basho's* determination, countless individuals are therefore supposed.... What determines I as an I is what determines Thou as a Thou. This means that I and Thou are born from the same environment and they are within the same universal extension. (NKZ 6: 347–8)

Everything is situated somewhere and determines the environment where it is situated. Correlatively, the environment where it is situated determines everything. This double determination is intrinsically singular and takes the form of a dialectical movement, which is the same movement at work in the relationship between individual and environment, instant and time, and I and Thou.¹² It follows that the I and the Thou are each subject to the same determination, because they are in the same environment.¹³ Similarly, our self, an acting entity, is individually self-determined. Moreover, the true self is confronted by the absolute: “to be born by absolutely dying” (NKZ 6: 355). This absolute, the basis of the dialectical determination, is absolute nothingness. Nishida compares the absolute to a circle without circumference whose center is everywhere (NKZ 6: 357), which in turn means that absolute nothingness is

11. All NKZ quotations are drawn from TREMBLAY 2003.

12. The individual as multiple, by self-determination, determines the universal as one; therefore, one is determined as multiple. Elsewhere, Nishida calls *basho* the self-contradictory identity between multiple and one (NKZ 10, 564).

13. Nishida argues that personal interactions can occur if I and Thou are situated in the same environment, as personalities (NKZ 6: 369). If this environment is a material or physical world, it is only in the sense that it already has dialectical significance, since the real matter is historical, i.e., time is spatialized by the action of which it is individually self-determined.

the place (*basho*) of everything. When self-determined, countless circles appear within such a place; self-determination is important in this regard because each of these circles corresponds to a self-determination of the “eternal now” (NKZ 6: 359). This is another way to account for the temporal and dialectical movement that also operates when the individual self confronts absolute nothingness.

Finally, it is important to notice that the self-other relationship occurs in a spatial time or “eternal now,” an interval that consists of absolute nothingness. Consequently, it is the dialectical dimension of absolute nothingness—i.e., the confrontation of self and other—that enables the self to be conceptualized. What self is resides in this confrontation.

Self-awareness, Love and Absolute Nothingness

For Nishida, the true self is personal (NKZ 6: 408): this enables the philosopher to argue for the corporeality of the self, without having to reduce it to corporeality alone.¹⁴ Corporeality, characterized mainly by the desiring and sensory aspects of the self, must be dialectically overcome because, in and of itself, it does not grant access to see the absolute other inside the self (NKZ 6: 411). Yet, the very meaning of self-awareness, which ultimately consists in knowing thyself (NKZ 6: 385), lies precisely in seeing the absolute other inside oneself. Indeed, self-awakening, as the principle of determination of I and Thou, occurs when I sees in itself the absolute other and thus sees itself.

Since both belong to absolute nothingness, the relationship between I and Thou is dialectical (NKZ 6: 391). Thus, through the echo of their personal actions, I knows Thou and vice versa. However, this is not a straightforward unification of I and Thou. For if the true self consists in seeing through self-awareness (the absolute other inside itself), then this only happens when the absolute other expresses himself with the consistency of a self. Only then, I and Thou call each other and respond to

14. The self must not be reduced to a mere biological determination. If interpersonal relationships have the body as condition of possibility, they cannot be reduced to it. Otherwise, the only self-determination would be processive or teleological. It would be merely a determination from the infinite past, without taking into account the real time (NKZ 6: 373), the “eternal now,” where the dialectical movement rests.

one another. Thereby, I comes to know itself through Thou as absolute other and, conversely, Thou knows himself through I. The very unity of our consciousness, namely the direct combination of the I of yesterday and the I of today, supposes an infinite depth that cannot be expressed. Nonetheless, this depth must express itself, because through self-negation, the self sees the absolute other, because self-negation makes it possible to overcome the subject–object distinction. This means that the other should not be conceived of as outside oneself, in an oppositional manner.¹⁵ Correspondingly, the self must avoid the pitfall of seeing the other in oneself as oneself; this would only confront it with itself as an extended self (大なる自己). The self can only be apprehended as non-self when the self is not opposed to an other. Yet, to apprehend the non-self is to deny oneself, or to see the absolute other in oneself. This dialectical relationship between I and Thou is specified by Nishida in terms of love because in his writings, to love is to see the self in the other. Love is the place where both the personal self and the reality, as self-determinations of absolute nothingness, become manifest.

True love must be for I to see himself in the absolute other. There, I must live in Thou dying to himself. What I call self-awakening of absolute nothingness through which I is I seeing himself in the absolute other, that is to say, seeing Thou, must have love at its root level. (NKZ 6: 421)

Self-awakening occurs when one dies to oneself, through love. The meaning of this advent is that of emptiness. One must become empty in order to greet what it is, as it is, i.e., absolute nothingness. Ultimately, emptiness encounters emptiness whenever and wherever self-awareness occurs. Thus, self-awareness of the self is self-awareness of absolute nothingness. From the perspective of self-awareness, that which includes (於いてある場所) and what is included (於いてあるもの), the place and what is in it, are the same. Therefore, in order to have access to reality as it is, one must welcome it. To this end, the self must be overcome through the relationship to the other, i.e., through self-awareness. Self-awareness is thus openness to reality. However, the self does not welcome reality as

15. This is the dimension of the struggle between self and other (NKZ 6: 423).

a receptacle would: the self gains access to reality only insofar as its place is reality, as self-determinations of absolute nothingness. In this sense, to borrow an expression from the *Heart Sutra*, self-awareness reveals nothingness as form *qua* emptiness and emptiness *qua* form. When the self experiences self-awareness, it experiences the absolute other. In other words, the self experiences self-awareness of absolute nothingness itself.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has shown the notable similarities between Dōgen's and Nishida's conceptions of the self-other relationship. One of the key disparities, on the other hand, is that while Dōgen's main purpose is soteriological, Nishida's point is more theoretical. Determining to what extent Buddhism and Dōgen's work influenced Nishida's thought can be a risky enterprise because his work draws on a rich variety of sources. Thus, I do not argue that in Nishida's thought the will exists as a means of providing a conceptual framework for Buddhism, because this would imply either that such a framework is lacking in Buddhism, or that Nishida's thought is a philosophically refined version of Buddhism. Both approaches are misguided. Nonetheless, one cannot ignore the influence of Buddhism—including Dōgen's writings—on the cultural framework that undoubtedly shaped Nishida's thought.¹⁶

Further, it is possible to see this influence in Nishida's conception of otherness. In this respect, I have argued that a very similar conception can be found in Dōgen's *Shōbōgenzō*. Indeed, for both Dōgen and Nishida, otherness is related to awakening or self-awareness. Moreover, the self-other relationship calls for a particular place that is one of absolute nothingness or emptiness. In addition, the characteristics of this place are founded on similar conceptions of time and space. Thus, the self-other relationship, which is not merely intersubjective, takes place in a time and space that are not heterogeneous, but layered. This implies that time is no longer considered only in its flowing dimension, but as

16. For instance, influences from the Buddhist schools of Kegon Rinzaï and Tendai, see TREMBLAY 2003, 31.

an eternal present that has the “consistency” of a place. It is spatial time of action as non-action. This also means that, from the outset, spatialized time has a dialectical dimension. So conceived, time determines and is determined by everything in it, allowing for interactions in its inner realm. While Dōgen refers to it using metaphors like the world of mountains and water, or using concepts such as being-time, Nishida thematized it as *basho* (see RAUD 2004). Even if it can appear to the disciple as a mysterious place, it is in fact the place of reality itself. It is from its background that the latter can be seized just as it is through self-awareness, when the self relates to the other. In this sense, the self-other relationship could appear as a necessary condition of enlightenment, if enlightenment could ever be considered as conditioned.

Yet, both Dōgen and Nishida understand the self-other relationship as a kind of polarity that extends beyond a given situation, a tension through which self and other are determined simultaneously by their interaction. It is what Buddhism describes as dependent co-arising or interdependent arising, and what Nishida conceives of as love. The interaction between self and other, as well as the interdependence underlying reality, has a background of absolute nothingness, a place for everything. If this place is a condition of possibility of the self-other relationship, the latter is itself “required”—though not as a cause or a condition—for awareness. Therefore, the self-other relationship contributes to the understanding that reality cannot exist independently, and that it does not lock up any isolated substance. Actually, nothing can be what it is by itself: it can only be what it is through interaction. This is what Nishida calls mutual determination. Similarly, Dōgen believes that to realize the interdependence of all dharmas is to actualize (現成) their emptiness while dropping off the body-mind of self and other, an expression Nishida also adopts (NKZ 6: 107).

Even though many commentators have remarked on the Buddhist influence on Nishida’s thought, what seems even more important to point out is that he could have seen in Buddhism an open horizon that can dislodge philosophical questions in order to approach them from a different perspective so as to engage in a trans-cultural philosophical dialogue. His philosophical task could therefore be described as an attempt to bring emptiness into dialogue with the other beyond otherness.

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to Tiffany Israel, Carolina Caliaba Crespo, and Henry Martyn Lloyd for their suggestions and stylistic improvements to this paper.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations

- NKZ 『西田幾多郎全集新版』[Complete works of Nishida Kitarō] (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 2003–2006), 20 vols.
 DDB Charles Muller, ed., *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism* <<http://buddhism-dict.net/DDB>>.

Other sources

- BIELEFELDT, Carl, trans.
 Soto Zen Project. <<http://hcbss.stanford.edu/research/projects/sztp/index.html>>
 DŌGEN Kigen,
 『正法眼藏』[Treasury of the eye of the true Dharma] <<http://www.shomonji.or.jp/soroku/>>.
 HEISIG, James W.
 2008 *Les philosophes du néant* (Paris: Cerf).
 NISHIJIMA, Gudo Wafu and CROSS, Chodo, trans.
 1998 *Master Dōgen's Shōbōgenzō*. (London: Windbell Publications), 4 vols.
 RAUD, Rein
 2004 “‘Place’ and ‘being-time’: Spatiotemporal concepts in the thought of Nishida Kitarō and Dōgen Kigen,” *Philosophy East and West* 54/1: 29–51.
 TREMBLAY, Jacynthe
 2000 *Nishida Kitarō: Le jeu de l'individuel et de l'universel* (Paris : CNRS Éditions).
 2003 *Nishida Kitarō: L'éveil à soi* (Paris : CNRS Éditions).