

# Meiji-Era Academic Philosophy and Its Lineage

## —Monism of the true form and organismic philosophy—

Inoue Katsuhito

### I.

The Meiji Restoration heralded the commencement in earnest of the modernization of Japan. Faced with the looming necessity of fostering a *rich country (with a) strong army* by way of the rapid development of a domestic system for promoting Japanese independence and security to counter the encroachment into Asia of the Western powers, the leaders belonging to the new government believed that the aggressive adoption of Western modern civilization was urgent business. In response, they quickly unveiled a series of measures for the Westernization of the country. Amane Nishi (1829–1897), Mamichi Tsuda (1829–1902), and other Western scholars who came together to form Meirokusha responded positively to and took up, in their capacity as private citizens, the role of promoting these measures for Westernization as put into effect by government leaders at the time. Nishi and Tsuda studied for approximately two years in Holland, where they were drawn, under the tutelage of Leiden University professor Simon Vissering (1818–1888), to the world of Dutch ideas that were prevalent at the time as well as to utilitarianism, a predominant theory of a generation in Europe as espoused by Englishman John Stuart Mill (1773–1836), and positivism, an idea that was put forth by Frenchman Auguste Comte (1798–1857). After absorbing these philosophical concepts, they returned to Japan to introduce them to their compatriots. Such scholarship was exceedingly timely for the modernization of Japan, which was then oriented towards practical branches of learning. In search of a hub of ideas for modernizing Japanese people's lives and their way of thinking, Nishi, Tsuda, Yukichi Fukuzawa (1834–1901), Hiroyuki Katō (1836–1916), and other Western scholars who came together to form Meirokusha focused on the modern Western philosophies of positivism and utilitarianism and endeavored to transplant them into the fabric of Japanese society. In particular, the written works of John Stuart Mill were widely read in order to understand modern notions of human rights and social rights or as the ideological cornerstones of the civil-rights movement. Translated by Keiu Nakamura (1832–1891) and published in 1871, John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* garnered broad exposure and helped significantly to spread the idea that an individual enjoys certain freedoms and rights. The arrival of the second decade of the Meiji era, however, saw attention given to the works of Mill fade as works relating to social Darwinism as espoused by Herbert Spencer (1820–1903) were actively being introduced and translated and published in large numbers. In particular, *The Theory of Social Peace*, as translated by Ko Matsushima, was referred to by Taisuke Itagaki (1837–1919) as a *textbook on democratic rights* and read by many who strove to be exposed to its contents.

Nevertheless, from around the middle of the second decade of the Meiji era, Germany, an underdeveloped country in Europe, began to garner attention as a neo-capitalist country just as Meiji government absolutism began to take hold. In November 1881, House of Peers member Kowashi Inoue (1844–1895) endorsed measures to

bring the democratic rights movement, which was then giving rise to anti-government language and conduct, under control. He proposed to guide newspapers and fortify the government school system, promote the study of the Chinese classics and teach *the way of devotion and allegiance*, and encourage the study of Germany and dampen the enthusiasm for British and French ideas that could stoke revolutionary notions. Among the countries of Europe, Germany at the time was especially notable for being led by a form of government built around a royal household, such that it was believed that encouraging German studies would be helpful in fostering a conservative spirit. The administration of government henceforth stayed more or less true to this path of opposition to the democratic rights movement. Academic philosophy in the middle of the Meiji era also came to be constituted in line with this shift from English-French studies to German studies.

## II.

Incidentally, the reception of modern Western philosophical thought during the Meiji era encouraged people to fundamentally reflect on Japanese studies and ideas that had been cultivated on a traditional basis. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to suggest that Japanese people at the time had been most directly exposed to Confucian knowledge since the Tokugawa era in terms of their mode of living and mode of thought. When the generation of intellectuals born in the early years of the Meiji era learned languages and felt their hunger for knowledge aroused, they found that what was primarily available to them were the Chinese classics. The use of these works to satisfy their own curiosity served as their scholastic springboard. Confucian ethical traditions were meaningful during the Meiji era as can be seen in the example of *An Essay on Modern Japanese Church History* as written by Aizan Yamaji (1864-1917) in which he wrote: "While I have rejected the teachings of Confucius, I nevertheless regard the way I must live as a human being and the providence of heaven to be one and the same. I simply cannot ever forget the attraction of Confucian teachings that sees the essence of moral sentiment as being timelessly immutable." <sup>1</sup>

How did modern Japanese philosophers, steeped as they had been in such traditions, receive or grapple with modern philosophies as unique academic products of the West? A salient feature of Western philosophies, which began in ancient Greece, is their adherence to a coherent system. In other words, they can be traced back to ultimate principles that constitute the fount of all knowledge, on top of which all systems are constructed. Thus, the fundamental concern of philosophy was rooted first in the quest for ultimate principles and in the exploration of the means by which all knowledge can be accordingly organized. Philosophy described the classical mindset of learning in Western Europe. The establishment of modern science, however, represented a revolution that upended this classical mindset of learning. Science is academically characterized not by the deductive method of demonstrating truth based on an assumption of ultimate principles but instead by the inductive method of learning as carried out primarily through experimentation and verification in line with empirical facts. In this sense, Western studies in Japan truly constituted an empirical science. The philosophy that was transplanted into Japan at the beginning of the Meiji era was also the modern philosophy of Western Europe, a philosophy that had prevailed since the Scientific Revolution. The characteristic essence that helped make the *modern* age truly unique can be summed up by the notion of *separable ideas*. First, the separation of human beings from nature is indeed a salient marker of the modern age, which coincided with the establishment of science in modern times. The world since modern times began is rendered most distinctive by the culture of science and technology. Cognizant actors as discerned through inseparability with the concomitant discovery of objective, mechanical nature could also be described in terms of the self-awareness of human values and the discovery of the universal self or mind. In other words, a sharp line was drawn between the subjective and ob-

jective ways of looking at things. As a method of thinking to be forged by awareness-based subjectivity, external law, beginning in the Meiji era, represented a groundbreaking way of looking at things to which Japanese people were forced to face for the first time in the course of contact with Western thought.

Incidentally, the neo-Confucianism that formed the bedrock of Confucian thought as an ideological tradition dating from the Tokugawa era emphasized practical ethics based on the Four Books: the *Analects* (『論語』), the *Book of Mencius* (『孟子』), the *Great Learning* (『大学』), and the *Doctrine of the Mean* (『中庸』). The underlying foundation of neo-Confucianism reflects a unification of human beings and heaven and earth according to the same principles. The notion that moral grounds are to be sought in heaven and on earth (“the compassion of heaven and earth as one body”) is a highly salient aspect of this thought. Thus, moral issues plaguing human beings are to be resolved by dispelling selfishness and self-interest to become one with heaven and earth. Confucian tradition, which seeks to subsume human beings into eternal nature, rigidly distinguishes between subjective and objective ways of thinking and represented the polar opposite of modern Western epistemology, which subordinates the world to cognizant actors.

### III.

From December 1892 to February 1893, Rikizō Nakajima (1858–1918) introduced *Prolegomena to Ethics* by Thomas Hill Green (1836–1883) in articles entitled *About British Neo-Kantianism* that were published in the *Journal of the Society of Philosophy*. After setting forth essays on the theory of knowledge and the theory of ethics, Green’s theory of self-realization enjoyed a degree of popularity in the realm of ideas. According to Kazuyasu Watanabe, this was discussed and understood particularly in the context of Confucian ethics. In the preface of *The Philosophy of Japanese Neo-Confucianism*, Tetsujirō Inoue (1855–1944) argued that the moralism of neo-Confucianism “frequently corresponds to and is the same as aspects of British neo-Kantianism as espoused by the likes of Green Muirhead.” Likewise, Shigeta Oyanagi (1870–1940), a scholar of the Chinese classics, wrote that the theory of self-realization “conforms closely to the explanation of the Diagram of the Great Ultimate as put forth by neo-Confucianism and Confucianism in that our minds are seen as being subject to none other than the workings of the Great Ultimate” in “The theory of self-realization and the ethics of Confucianism” as posted to the *Journal of the Society of Philosophy* in October 1905 (p. 242, Issue 224, Vol. 21).<sup>2</sup>

In fact, Green’s views were exceedingly easy to digest for people raised in the Confucian tradition. Forming an aspect of his *Prolegomena* is a strong awareness of personality, the basis of which is self-realization. Green studied the philosophy of German idealism as put forth by the likes of Kant and Hegel and eventually became emblematic of neo-Hegelianism in Britain. He envisioned transcendent spiritual principles as derived from all phenomena and believed that the actual world was steeped in these principles. It is on the basis of this framework that he came up with his theory of self-realization. In other words, according to Green, the human spirit may be nothing more than the expression of the transcendental spiritual principles of the universe. Nevertheless, this expression occurs only after experiences are unified in the awareness of each individual, such that the self only becomes the true self when the self is unified as an expression of the absolute mind. Proximate to this unification is the personality and the realization of the true self constitutes goodness of the self as well as a common good. This thinking, as espoused by Green, calls for “*xing is li* (性即理)” and is clearly highly similar to the neo-Confucian ethics that exhorts human beings to return to the nature of inborn (本然之性 *benranzhixing*). The idea that self-realization concurrently brings about a common good corresponds to the points set forth in *The Great Learning* (own persons, own families, own states, and the tranquility and happiness of the whole em-

pire). In other words, this idea is similar to the basic notion that respect for the individual (through a suppression of personal lust and a rigid tempering of the self) will be channeled into the sense of ethical responsibility (among leaders) exercised in the public realm.

From the fourth decade of the Meiji era, personal and idealistic ethics, which incorporated the movement of German idealism represented by Kant and Fichte, were being actively adopted and introduced. While this represented a chance to promote a sense of individuality in terms of ethical personality, a dispute was raging at the time between those who subscribed to the British school of personal idealism (Seichi Yoshida) and those who subscribed to the German school of absolute idealism (Sadakichi Kitazawa and Tadayoshi Kihira) over the establishment of a metaphysical basis for such ethics. Sanjūrō Tomonaga (1871–1951) explored the significance of the philosophical history of this issue in his *Musings on Personality and Philosophy in 1909* and discussed the direction that Meiji philosophy should take.<sup>3</sup> In the course of this exercise, he divided philosophy into three types: “philosophy centered on the personality and contrasting philosophies based on absolutism and naturalism” and indicated that *ethnic distribution* for each is possible. In other words, the personality-oriented philosophy of Britain and the United States “deprives the individual mind of metaphysical values.” German absolutism (spiritualism and pantheism) harbors a “tendency to magnify or reject personality” while French naturalism harbors a tendency towards sensationalism, hedonism, determinism, and materialism. It has been determined that each set of ideas will be made to assimilate with the tendencies of whatever country into which it has been imported. Incidentally, while the importing of a personality-oriented philosophy was highly significant for Japan as a country that adopted a constitutional form of government and a system of local government, it was indicated that “needless to say, the original ideology governing our country corresponded to either a magnified personality or rejected personality in both a good and a bad sense” and that “the Buddhist ideology of selflessness broadly and profoundly controls the sentiments of the people as they flounder in the darkness; yet, universal customs, as relics of feudalism, give further rein to impetus.” In this connection, Tomonaga predicted that “once personal idealism is introduced to Japan, the magnification or rejection of personality will be imposed to some extent.”

As predicted by Tomonaga, many examples involving the construction of German philosophy through Japanese traditional Buddhism and neo-Confucianism subsequently arose. These include ideas on religious exaltation evident in *Genshō-soku-Jitsuzai-ron* (the idea that phenomena are nothing but a true ultimate reality), as written by Tetsujirō Inoue; *Shinnyo-busshin no Sōsoku-ron*, as written by Enryō Inoue (1858–1919); *Seishin-shugi*, as written by Manshi Kiyozawa (1863–1903), a thinker who expounded on the deliverance of the self through reconciliation with absolute beings corresponding to a magnified personality; and *Yo ga Kenshin no Jikken* (1905) (『予が見神の実験』), as written by Ryōsen Tsunashima (1873–1907). While Setsurei Miyake (1860–1945), who leaned towards Romanticism, also appeared on the scene and published *Uchū* (『宇宙』) and other works based on the harnessing of sublime metaphysical speculation, Mineo Hashimoto aptly gave the name *organismic philosophy* to a unified, overall perspective on true being as the means by which non-duality can be achieved.<sup>4</sup>

#### IV.

Incidentally, what is an organismus (organic body) or *das organische* (organic being)? According to the Kōjien dictionary (fifth edition), it is something “for which many parts are organized into a single entity with each part unified under a given purpose, such that the parts and the whole are bound together by necessity.” To elaborate, the term refers to a living whole constituted by the unification according to a single principle of different parts, each of which operates differently. The parts of an *organismus* do not simply come together to

form outwardly accidental relations by some disorderly process. Instead, each part forms certain inwardly necessary relations with the whole and with all other parts. The principle unifying the whole is not conferred from outside but exists within itself. A good example of an organismus is a living *organism*. The term also applies to the nation, society (social organic theory), history, the cosmos, and other unified entities.<sup>5</sup>

In *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, Hegel summarized his views on *organismus* as follows.<sup>6</sup> That is to say, an *organismus* “exists to maintain itself while relating to others.” In other words, an *organismus* exists to furthermore ceaselessly return the self and maintain the self while relating to others at all times; it exists for the purpose of the self. This purpose inherently exists in an *organismus*, such that all actions and all processes represent processes to fulfill this purpose. An *organismus* seeks to fulfill its own purpose by returning to the self while relating to others; thus, it is unable to exist without others. Its relationship to others is itself internal and essential and it relates to others in the same way that a cause is related to its effect; it becomes subsumed in the process of realizing its own purpose and will treat its relationship to others as an opportunity towards this end. If one were to see things from the standpoint of a mechanical theory, the individual first exists on its own terms, such that relationships with others will emerge as extrinsic relationships of cause and effect. Here, the purpose is not intrinsic but is rather nothing more than something that is entirely imposed from the outside. In other words, in contrast to a divisible outwardly accidental uniformity possessing an inorganic mechanical perspective on nature, nature from an organismic perspective on nature consists of “beings perceiving one another through a state of mutual harmony as individual beings aspirate onto the whole” as aptly expressed by Goethe in *Faust*. According to his morphology, everything that can live forms itself according to an archetype and its metamorphosis; as such, everything undergoes differentiation and identity is maintained. In other words, inner essential uniformity exists in nature and congruent attributes are possessed by all.

The purpose of an *organismus* as referred to here is nothing less than *life*. It is in *life* that specified beings and universal beings as well as limited beings and unlimited beings become mutually subsumed and unified; thus, meaning is given to each individual part and to each individual process. A mechanical perspective on nature that ascertains nature only by way of the law of causality to which individual beings are subject cannot express the reality of nature. Such a perspective only results in the destruction of the organic linkages possessed by nature.

Nevertheless, organic, ecological nature steeped in *life* can never constitute objective nature as ascertained by awareness-based subjectivity on a targeted basis. If anything, each individual person exists at all times in his or her spot, which is, in a manner of speaking, the location to where the individual has been flung and in which the individual has been enveloped. The modern Western perspective on mechanical nature regards such nature as the target of contraposition to awareness-based subjectivity, such that nature is seen as comprising inorganic substances that are capable of dying and that have come to be handled as materials for processing with scientific technologies. It is as if living nature in its primary glory has been forgotten.

Let us return to the main topic at hand. German idealism was introduced in detail to Japan beginning in the third decade of the Meiji era. While such idealism may have been grasped in terms of mystifying, religious aspects, attempts to discern such underpinnings in European scientific theories was a unique aspect of the world of philosophy at that time. The aforementioned Tetsujirō Inoue and Enryō Inoue were most active in this sphere. The basic hallmark of their philosophy was rooted in the recognition of unwavering metaphysically absolute beings known as *real existence* and *true thusness* at the core of phenomena. In particular, Tetsujirō Inoue

used and discussed the theory of energy as it was applied in the natural sciences. Irrespective of such scientific theories, their philosophical standpoints could be succinctly summarized in the notion of *phenomena as reality*. In other words, *real existence* is thought to subsist right in the middle of phenomena rather than exist as part of the background of phenomena. This is the mindset for *monism of the true form* (where transcendent beings are not outwardly assumed), which forms the core of the thinking behind Mahayana Buddhism. This is expressed in the following formula in *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* (『大乘起信論』), an important Buddhist treatise to be discussed later: “All beings are nothing but a true reality-principle. A true reality-principle is nothing but all beings. (万法是真如、真如是万法)”

The philosophical perspective espoused by Tetsujirō Inoue is also referred to as *ennyū* realism. The term *ennyū* (円融 perfect and fused together) is derived from *ennyū sōsoku*, a term that appears in the Tendai doctrine (reality-principle establishing that all existences are in themselves perfect and interfused). While this thinking was disclosed in volume twelve of the *Philosophy Journal*, his theoretical perspective had already been presented in *A New Theory on Ethics*, which was published at the height of the democratic rights movement in 1883. *Universal establishment and power (energy)* were asserted as concepts that lay hidden as part of the background of global phenomena. It was explained that the accommodation of *trends in power* was the essence of ethics. However, this *power or reality* subsists right in the middle of phenomena rather than exists as part of the background of phenomena. This represents nothing more than Oriental pantheism, or the conversion of Buddhism into a philosophy. The following may give some insight in order to understand what *universal establishment, power, and reality*, as emphasized by Tetsujirō Inoue, means:

Do persons who can clearly explain the fundamental basis on which all things are established carry out this task in today's world? Space, time, and power are all nothing more than phenomena arising out of our awareness. Thus, we only trust that the existence of all things is formed through phenomena that disappear from and appear before our eyes. The connections to the establishment of all things are in fact unfathomable, feared, regarded as divine, respected, and worshipped.<sup>7</sup>

In Buddhism, *true thusness* exists as something that unifies the *discriminatory* world from its foundation; indeed, this *true thusness* is embodied in all phenomena. According to Inoue, however, it cannot be denied, with electrons constituting *real existence* and efforts made to scientifically prove the existence of *real existence*, that the blatant distortion of arguments is being perpetrated. In addition, this *real existence* is not the subject of awareness but is richly imbued with a Buddhist palette in light of the explanation that it is to be intuited.

## V.

The Buddhist notion of *ennyū* realism as espoused by Inoue came to be influenced by Tanzan Hara (1819–1892) and corresponded to the philosophical principles contained in *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, which was selected as a textbook for a course on Buddhist scriptures at the University of Tokyo. In other words, *phenomena as reality* is the generic term that was given to certain metaphysics and transcendental realism as asserted by some of Tanzan's students, including Tetsujirō Inoue, Enryō Inoue, Manshi Kiyozawa, and Setsurei Miyake (1860–1945). Tanzan carved out a path of research based on Buddhism being regarded as a philosophy of the mind or as Indian philosophy by comparing the philosophical contents of the fundamental doctrines of Buddhism with Western philosophies. Young people who were fascinated with the new Western philosophies were once again made aware of the fact that an original philosophical framework comparable to Western philosophies

had existed since ancient times in Japan, a country on the eastern edge of Asia, and urged to adapt the contents of this Oriental thinking into the conceptual structure of Western philosophies. Consequently, they gave rise to the philosophical perspective that later came to be known as *philosophy as reality*.

In 1877, the University of Tokyo was established. Hiroyuki Katō (1836–1916), then head of the faculty of literature at the University of Tokyo and an aficionado of philosophy, paid a visit to Tanzan Hara (1819–1892) and implored him to serve as the first lecturer for a course on Buddhist scriptures that would be newly set up by the university.<sup>8</sup> In this way, Tanzan came to be placed in charge of this elective course on Buddhist scriptures as offered by the faculty of literature at the University of Tokyo beginning in November 1879. Tanzan wrote an annual report to the university authorities as follows:

From November 1879 to June 1881, I will be giving lectures to resolve issues posed by the three main Buddhist sutras—Sutra of Perfect Enlightenment, Awakening of Faith, and Treatise on the Hundred Dharmas—at this institution (university) as ordered by the president of the university. In September of the same year (1882), Buddhism will be referred to as *Indian philosophy* and added to the regular coursework as given by the faculty of literature. That this institution has seen fit to begin counting Buddhism as a part of the university's course load in this manner gives me great pleasure. Two textbooks to be placed under my charge have also been assigned; they are *Fukyohen* and *Vimalakirti Sutra*. [The remainder has been omitted.]<sup>9</sup>

His course on *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, going so far as to teach students to think about *true thusness and reality* in connection with the metaphysics of German idealism, was philosophically more advanced than anything else among the Buddhist doctrines being explored at the time. While the name of the “course on Buddhist scriptures” was changed to what is now referred to as “Indian philosophy” in 1882, Tanzan did not think of Buddhism in terms of the Western notion of *religion*, that is, in terms of integration with a transcendental absolute being in whose image man is conceived. Indeed, regarding Buddhism as an *Indian philosophy* or *philosophy of the mind* yielded an area of Buddhist study through the understanding and interpretation of aspects of the understanding of existence in accordance with the transformation of the one spirit of all living things. Thus, it was utterly no surprise at all that his favorite *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* (hereinafter referred to as *Awakening of Faith*) was selected as a textbook. It goes without saying that the exponents of *philosophy as reality*, without exception, were students who attended classes for the course on Buddhist scriptures (Indian philosophy) as held by Tanzan.

Tetsujirō Inoue was a student who belonged to the first class of the faculty of literature at the University of Tokyo and graduated in 1880. He wrote of Tanzan, his professor during his student days, in his memoirs that he wrote in his later years as follows:

And interestingly a Zen priest by the name of Tanzan Hara arrived at the university as an instructor who came to deliver lectures on Buddhist scriptures (*Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* and others). In attending these lectures on Buddhist scriptures as given by Tanzan Hara, I finally understood the exquisite flavor of the philosophy found in Mahayana Buddhism. Henceforth, I was ever more bound to Buddhism. To this day, I study the philosophy of Mahayana Buddhism and harbor a great interest in this topic.<sup>10</sup>

## Vl.

Enryō Inoue, four years younger than Tetsujirō Inoue, entered the department of philosophy of the faculty of literature at the University of Tokyo in 1881 and graduated in 1885. While he was a learned monk of the Ōtani School of the Buddhist Shin sect, he became strongly influenced by Fenollosa in particular during his college years and chose to forge a path of understanding Buddhist thought in terms of Western philosophies. He expounds on the idea of *philosophy as reality* based on *Awakening of Faith in An Evening Discourse on Philosophy*, his first work as published in 1886. This work was widely read at the time and was counted as one of the favorite books of Kitarō Nishida (1870–1945). Enryō Inoue subsequently released numerous works on *philosophy as reality* and actively asserted the superiority of Buddhism over Western philosophies and Christianity while philosophically reconstructing Buddhism. Allow me to briefly introduce the contents of *An Introduction to Buddhist Action* (1887) below.<sup>11</sup> Enryō Inoue explained that official recognition of Christianity would be impossible to reconcile with the expansion of sovereign rights and the revisions of treaties and expressed his own bold views as follows:

I absolutely expect that Buddhism will be reformed into a flowering religion based on the reasons enumerated above. This is because I believe that this expectation is in line with the purpose behind the search for the truth as carried out by scholars and because I believe that each individual in society assumes obligations towards the state. [p. 354]

In this connection, he chose to ascertain the points on which Buddhism and philosophy (German idealism) could be brought together. According to him, *matter and mind* are not separate in the beginning. Instead, these two elements emerge from a *primary substance*. Only Buddhism is capable of clarifying their differentiated states and the relationship between a primary substance and *matter and mind*. Thus, the Buddhist perspective on *true thusness* will be developed with the same logic. In other words, *true thusness* and *matter and mind* go to the relationship between the original being and phenomena. Beginning with the words “Matter and mind are phenomena, *true thusness* is the body, and force is what is developed through the *true thusness* of matter and mind” (p. 368), a theory on body and mind as it relates to *true thusness*, and all creation is explained using expressions found in *Awakening of Faith* (“All beings are nothing but a true reality principle. A true reality principle is nothing but all beings. Form is emptiness. Emptiness is form.”) and with the famous “analogy of waves on water” that appears in *Awakening of Faith*. In other words, “Behold the origin of *true thusness*: just as waves follow water and water follows waves, all things and *true thusness* are intertwined with one another, such that there are no waves away from water and there is no water away from waves” (p. 370). The logic of *ennyū sōsoku*, according to which “the relationship between *true thusness* and matter and mind is described as being the same or different, as being different or the same, like two after one, and like one after two” (p. 371) is laid out over the course of a large number of pages.

In this way, Enryō Inoue essentially succeeded in terms of many points to the way of thinking contained in *Awakening of Faith* as taught by Tanzan. The indication of these points constitutes an argumentative stance that was shared among the exponents of the idea of *philosophy as reality* other than Enryō Inoue himself. When each is seen, the basic structure of *philosophy as reality* is believed to have already been presented by Buddhist philosopher Tanzan Hara.

Like Enryō Inoue, Manshi Kiyozawa was a student who had been dispatched by the Ōtani school of the Buddhist Shin sect. His relationship with Tanzan Hara, however, was regarded as rather weak. After graduating

from the department of philosophy at the University of Tokyo in 1887, he was to have majored in religion and philosophy in graduate school but he had expressed a deep interest during his student days in lectures on the history of philosophy as delivered by E.F. Fenollosa (1853–1908). In particular, he studied the philosophy of Hegel. Indeed, Kiyozawa's student days coincided with the time when Fenollosa himself converted to Buddhism. Kiyozawa comprehensively studied similarities between Buddhist philosophy and the agnosticism of H. Spencer (1820–1903), German idealism (especially Hegelian dialectics as well as R.H. Lotze (1817–1881)), and other philosophies covered in Fenollosa's lectures and developed his own perspective on *philosophy as reality*. However, it is believed that he, as a learned monk of the Jodo-Shin sect, directly inherited the basic form of *philosophy as reality* as a Buddhist philosophy from Enryō Inoue, his senior. Kiyozawa's main works on *philosophy as reality* consist of *Pure Philosophy* (1889), which was ostensibly written under the influence of Lotze, and *Shukyo Tetsugaku Gaikotsu* (1892), a book that outlines the author's excellent theory on religion.

Setsurei Miyake was someone who by disposition possessed a large quantity of materials normally compiled by certain types of journalists and demonstrated an exceptional talent for writing about philosophical and ideological history. His understanding of dialectics was truly something to behold. After graduating from the department of philosophy at the University of Tokyo in 1883, he worked for a publisher and the Education Ministry as an associate professor at the University of Tokyo, researched the history of Buddhism, and released two works, *The History of Japanese Buddhism and A Short History of Christianity*, in 1886. A small work entitled *Gakan Shōkei* (1892) was particularly notable apart from his many works and writings for the fact that it referred to *philosophy as reality*.

## VII.

In placing the focus of this paper back on Tetsujirō Inoue, we cannot ignore the aforementioned Fenollosa, an instructor of Western philosophies, as someone other than Tanzan who was influential on the young man during his student days. Dedicated research into philosophy was fully commenced under American Fenollosa's stewardship at the University of Tokyo shortly after its founding in 1877. He covered Kant and other German philosophers as well as the theory of evolution and Spencer, a favorite thinker who was at the time regarded as a foremost philosopher in Britain, and mainly taught philosophical and sociological ideas based in particular on *First Principles* (1862).

Inoue learned about the philosophy of Spencer from Fenollosa and developed his own philosophy after focusing in particular on his concept of *the unknowable* as it was laid out in *A New Theory on Ethics*, which was published in 1883. This concept represents the philosophical expression of a metaphysical, transcendental divine concept and is also referred to as the *undefinable unlimited being*, the *primary cause of the universe*, and the *unlimited absolute being*, among other such examples. Having studied the philosophy of Spencer, Inoue compared phenomena subject to sensory experiences and *reality* and posited that *reality* resides on the reverse side of phenomena and is utterly beyond our reach and unascertainable with our senses.<sup>12</sup> Incidentally, Inoue wrote the English word *reality* alongside the Japanese word “*jittai*” (実体) that he used for this term. Nowadays, *reality* is normally translated into the Japanese word “*jitsuzai*” (実在). According to Kiyoshi Watanabe<sup>13</sup>, the English word *reality* was also translated as *jittai* in the *Philosophy Glossary*, Japan's first dictionary of philosophy terms as compiled under the leadership of Inoue in 1881. An explanation that is highly interesting for us was added to this entry. The heading for this term was simply laid out as follows: “Reality / *jittai*, *shinnyo*, *an*, *kishinron*, *tōchi-issaihō fukasetsu*, *fukanen*, 故名為真如。” An means “see (as in ‘refer’).” In other words, he understood the English word for reality, which was to be translated in later years as *jitsuzai*, in light of its connection to *shinn-*

yo as used in *Awakening of Faith*. As noted in this paper, *shinnyo* truly means nothing more than transcendental true existence at a depth beyond all explanatory words. It once again goes without saying that this also corresponds to Spencer's *undefinable unlimited being* and *the unknowable*. I would now like to explore the contents of *Awakening of Faith* in the next section.<sup>14</sup>

## VIII.

*Awakening of Faith* appeared in the sixth century (A.D.) and its authorship is attributed to Aśvaghōṣa. As it is widely known, only two Chinese translations of this text remain in existence. The first was produced as a single volume by Paramārtha (499–569) in 550 while the second was produced as two volumes by Siksananda between 695 and 700 during the era of Empress Sokuten. Neither the original Sanskrit text nor the Tibetan translation exists and no cited references can be found in Indian Buddhism. Accordingly, the theory that the earliest known text is a Chinese composition is asserted but the question remains unsettled. In any case, this textbook on Buddhist treatises represents the quintessence of Mahayana Buddhism, or Buddhism of the north, and its impact on Buddhism in China and Japan is simply immeasurable. The word *hongaku* (本覺) as referred to in the Tendai-Hongaku philosophy first emerged in *Awakening of Faith* and was explained in terms of reaching *kukyōkaku* (究竟覺) along with *shikaku* and *fukaku* (不覺). Key terms at the core of this paper consist of “the minds of living beings” of “one mind” or the *ālayavijñāna* (阿黎耶識) of the *tathagatagarbha* (如来藏 the potential within all living things to become a Buddha) and, ontologically speaking, *true thusness*. *True thusness* (真如 *shinnyo*) literally means “remaining innate.” “*Shin* (真)” refers to the rejection of falseness while “*nyo* (如)” refers to self-equivalence of equality without discrimination. In breaking down the Chinese translation of the original Sanskrit term (“*tathatā*”), we see that it means a true existence that is neither increased nor decreased by a single point or stroke.

There are two sides to “the minds of living beings”: the “*true thusness* of the mind” and the “birth and death of the mind”; both are inextricably linked to one another. The true nature of the mind—the *true thusness* of the mind—is itself pure, transcends changes in terms of the birth and death of the mind (time), and is subject to neither birth nor death (neither temporal nor preceding in time). In actuality, however, the mind becomes immersed in earthly desires and is subject to the recurrence of births and deaths as the mind of an unenlightened person. *True thusness* that has been encrusted by earthly desires in this way is referred to as *tathagatagarbha* (the potential within all living things to become a Buddha). Thus, *tathagatagarbha* may itself constitute *true thusness* that is pure but, so long as it is governed by delusory attachment, will represent *true thusness* that has yet to emerge from a state of bondage. Such tidings are conveyed in the statement, “Be in accord with a state of neither arising nor ceasing and with births and deaths and be neither the same nor different.” However, there is a duality here: arising and ceasing (*true thusness*) and births and deaths (earthly desires). This statement is not calling upon the reconciliation of this duality into one. Instead, it is saying that the mind that is itself pure without having succumbed to earthly desires even as it is covered in earthly desires is *tathagatagarbha*. Births and deaths occur even as the mind neither arises nor ceases. In terms of the analogy of water and waves as presented in the aforementioned quoted passage attributed to Enryō Inoue, water will generate waves through the action of wind, an extrinsic cause (earthly desires), but the fact remains that water remains water (moisture). It may billow as the sea runs high but the waves will dissipate when the wind stops, thereby allowing the water to return to its essential nature as something akin to a clear mirror. Yet, no matter how high the waves billow with the wind (move), the state of water as water (moisture) will not change. No matter how much the surface of the water churns, the depths of the same water will remain steadfast. In this sense,

the self-identity of water as water will be maintained no matter what form the waves take, such that water transcends all forms of waves. This unified transcendental water itself will transform into various waves and start moving. In brief, *true thusness* is sort of like absolute stillness (water itself and moisture) going beyond movements while *tathagatagarbha* constitutes stillness applied to movements (billowing water). As the stillness anticipates movements, the non-arising and non-ceasing of *tathagatagarbha* become neither one nor different in accordance with births and deaths. This is also referred to as *ālayavijñāna* or *storehouse consciousness*.

*Ālayavijñāna* takes in all of our experiences (能攝一切法) as the foundation of the existence of unenlightened persons afflicted by earthly desires, such as greed, anger, jealousy, and self-conceit, and emerges even if all of our experiences come into play (生一切法). This is what is meant by the reference to a *storehouse* in *tathagatagarbha*. If we were to elaborate, then *true thusness* or true existence that remains innate is a total inalienable state by which individual existing beings omnipresent in the entire universe are fully manifested. Originally, this was nothing more than absolute *nothingness or emptiness*—in other words, the state of an absolute storehouse. Thus, *true thusness* resides as potential in the foundation of the metaphysical substance of each existing being that causes phenomena to occur, incorporates all things into the possibility of a foundational existence, and liberates individual beings at the same time even as they remain in their innate state. To put it another way, each individual being that causes phenomena to occur exists in every respect in *true thusness* manifested thereby. Conversely, *true thusness* constituting the cause of the existence of each being is in every respect transcendently stored in the self as the original being thereof and, at the same time, inherent in all things manifested thereby.

In this way, *true thusness* is notable for ontologically having two contradicting sides in every respect. Thus, at first glance, *true thusness* is such that its polar opposite, delusory attachment, is ontologically nothing more than *true thusness*. This is captured in the following expressions: “Earthly desires are a pure aspiration to enlightenment,” “sufferings of birth and death are nirvana,” and “Form is emptiness. Emptiness is form.” The storehouse and state of manifestation of *true thusness* stand in sheer conflict with one another and are established while being mutually contradictory. Accordingly, the world of phenomena, controlled as it is by delusions, deviates away from the innateness of *true thusness*. At the same time, *true thusness* itself undergoes nothing less than self-development as seen from a different perspective. It goes without saying that *hongaku* philosophy, which advocates that “all living creatures possess Buddha-nature” and that “trees, plants, and earth possess Buddha-nature,” derives from this thinking. In short, *phenomena* are nothing more than the manifestation of true existence; in other words, this is the notion of *philosophy as reality*.

Theoretically speaking, the perspective contained in *Awakening of Faith* corresponds to the theory of substance and function as can be understood using the analogy of water and waves and, if put differently, is nothing more than the theory of immanent transcendence. In other words, substance and function is a relationship that is to be seen in contrast to the relationship between cause and effect. If an explanation is given using the analogy of water and waves, then the relationship between cause and effect is like the relationship between wind and waves; the relationship between substance and function, on the other hand, is like the relationship between water and waves. Substance is fundamental and the self while function is a derivative of substance and its actions. It is a relationship between the original being and its function and between the substance and its phenomenon. A causal relationship is regarded in terms of the separability of cause and effect, for cause and effect are like two separate things. However, the relationship between substance and function is generally characterized as the “unity of substance and function” or “substance is nothing but function, function is nothing but substance.” Thus, even as unified principles possess a transcendental structure without bounds, they develop within the self and become internalized in all things.

This idea of the systematic development of the one is tied to the concept of *natural laws* in neo-Confucianism. The idea of one unifying principle as espoused by Confucian scholar Chang Yi (程伊川 1033–1107) corresponded to the notion that “principle is one but its manifestations are many, (理一分殊)” whereby a single transcendental principle, when applied to all things, manifests according to the unique circumstances that apply in each case. The concept of substance (体) and function (用) is also used in Confucianism. In the first chapter of his *Doctrine of the Mean* (『中庸章句』), Chu His (朱子) states that “an original being shall become a being of the path while a being of the moral path shall become a function of the path.” The first article of the first volume of *Zhuzi-yulei* (『朱子語類』) states that “For yin yang (陰陽), function is in yang while substance is in yin. Motion and motionless have no beginnings; yin and yang have no starting point,” or that one’s nature is substance and one’s feelings are function. This idea was a predominant one along with *Kanhua Chan* (看話禪) during the Sung Dynasty and was connected at a fundamental level with the Hua Yan teachings (華嚴教學) of *li shi wu ai* and *shi shi wu ai* (理事無礙·事事無礙), which influenced neo-Confucianism to no small degree. To put it another way, the parts and the whole constitute nothing more than *organismic philosophy* that teleologically adheres to the logic of *ennyū sōsoku*. This forms the very core of the Oriental idea that differs from the mode of thinking corresponding to the Western dualism that externally posits a transcendental absolute being.

It does not appear that we can clearly limit our inquiry to asking whether the logic of substance and function is derived from Buddhism or originates in Confucianism. According to Kenji Shimada, the logic of substance and function was exceedingly familiar to the Chinese mode of thinking, wherein no transcendental creator is assumed to exist outside of reality. It is said that Chinese thought was originally or potentially consistent with the logic of substance and function.<sup>15</sup> As Meiji-era scholars grappled with Western philosophy, they sought to give greater clarity to this uniquely Oriental way of thinking—that is to say, the logic of the *immanent transcendence* between substance and form. It would not be an exaggeration to even say that their focus was, in other words, *organismic philosophy*.

## IX.

In 1901, Tetsujirō Inoue penned a long article entitled *The relationship between awareness and reality*. In this article, *awareness* corresponded to the *birth and death of the mind* as referred to in *Awakening of Faith* while *reality* corresponded to *the true thusness of the mind or true thusness*. In other words, awareness that is formed subject to the antagonism between the primary and the subordinate corresponds to the world of phenomena but reality is an ultimate being of utter equality without discrimination, capable of transcending all linguistic segmentation. While this is ascertained based only on intellectual intuition, *Awakening of Faith* is cited in this context. For example, *true thusness* is explicated in *Awakening of Faith* as constituting true reality:

All things in their fundamental nature are not nameable or explicable. They cannot be adequately expressed in any form of language. They are without the range of apperception. [They are universals.] They [things in their fundamental nature] have no signs of distinction. [They are not particulars.] They possess absolute sameness. [They are universals.] They are subject neither to transformation, nor to destruction. They are nothing but the one soul, for which suchness is another designation. Therefore, they cannot be [fully] explained by words or exhausted by reasoning.

This should be perceived by internal intuition and cannot be explained by the sort of sorting effect that is seen with awareness in the case of special phenomena. The text in *Awakening of Faith* sets forth such semantic con-

tent and presents an exceedingly clear explication thereof.<sup>16</sup>

Incidentally, it has been pointed out that a factor that helped solidify the framework for regarding the new philosophical thought known as *philosophy as reality*, as based on the monism of the true form as explicated with *Awakening of Faith* by Inoue, as a uniquely Japanese philosophy was exposure to the ideas of A. Schopenhauer (1788–1860) and K.R.E. von Hartmann (1842–1906) during his studies in Germany. How did the philosophies of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann cause Inoue to focus on creating a new way of philosophical thinking? According to a general view of this matter, one might tend to believe that he became interested in the philosophies of these two men because the fundamentals of their ideas exhibited little in the way of Western Christian elements and could, if anything, be seen as “Oriental.” In truth, the fact that Schopenhauer was highly interested in Indian Buddhism for its explications on the quietness and peacefulness of nirvana came to be widely known as a result of Inoue’s writing. But did Inoue believe that that was sufficient to establish that their philosophies were Oriental? On what grounds did Inoue regard their philosophies as Oriental and by what manner did he arrive at this understanding? These are the issues at hand. After returning to Japan, he actively gave lectures on the philosophy of Schopenhauer and spoke as follows:

The philosophy of Schopenhauer ultimately seeks to endorse the theory of nirvana. In this way, he was a philosopher who was delighted to have been exposed to Buddhism and who venerated the Buddha. However, the nirvana that is referred to in the theory of nirvana as addressed by Schopenhauer is no more than a solitary nirvana for which the self as explained by Hinayana Buddhism has been destroyed. Nevertheless, he was satisfied. If he had read something like *Awakening of Faith* and come to understand Mahayana Buddhism or if he had read the Nirvana Sutra of Mahayana Buddhism and come to know of the active nirvana of the four virtues of nirvana, I wonder how delighted he might have been. In any case, as he was a philosopher who had studied Oriental thinking as described above and took joy in and heartily received what he learned, I chose to give lectures on his philosophy in turn. [...] von Hartmann too has been influenced by Schopenhauer. In his key philosophical book entitled *The Philosophy of the Unconscious*, he sets out his theory of deliverance as the final stage. While it appears as if he understood Buddhism to an even greater degree than Schopenhauer, he did not go so far as to absorb the philosophy of Mahayana Buddhism.<sup>17</sup>

In brief, according to Inoue, even if Schopenhauer, a man of the West, promotes deliverance from blind will and the idea of Buddhist nirvana or salvation in his central work entitled *The World as Will and Representation*, thereby embracing the notion of touching upon Buddhist thinking, his perspective ultimately represents nothing more than Indian Theravada or Hinayana Buddhism by which nirvana is attained through the rejection of earthly desires. That he does not take the perspective of Mahayana Buddhism, which takes the view that “earthly desires are a pure aspiration to enlightenment” and the view that “sufferings of birth and death are nirvana,” was a source of great dissatisfaction. Accordingly, he lamented, “I wonder how delighted he might have been if he had read something like *Awakening of Faith* and come to understand Mahayana Buddhism or if he had read the Nirvana Sutra or other such examples of Mahayana scripture and come to know of the active nirvana of the four virtues of nirvana.”

What should be kept in mind here is that, while it is accepted that Inoue embraced the philosophical thinking of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann because they, despite being men of the West, took an exceptional interest in Oriental Buddhism, it is believed that there was another explanation for Inoue’s embrace that stood in contrast to such a superficial reason. In other words, his exposure to the philosophies of these two philosophers gave In-

oue the impetus to construct a new philosophy known as the logic of *philosophy as reality* as a unique Japanese philosophy. In this connection, we might wonder if perhaps Inoue discerned the idea contained in *Awakening of Faith* that he learned during his student days—that is, the idea of the monism of the true form—in the philosophies of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. As a matter of conjecture, it is possible that Inoue incorporated the self-originating activation and deployment of the *true thusness* of Buddhism as it relates to transcendental, storehouse consciousness—in other words, the notion that true existence will develop on its own as captured in the idea of *zhen yu sui yuan* (真如隨緣)—into the concept of Schopenhauer's *blind will*. In essence, the will as a thing-in-itself is nothing more than true existence and will spontaneously self-propagate. That is to say, perhaps *The Metaphysics of the Will* was incorporated into the philosophies of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. Is it possible that such nuances were included in the Oriental qualities Inoue saw in their philosophies? Of course, while Schopenhauer rejected the notion of *will* and held that it retained only a negative meaning to be overcome, this was overlooked and the term *will* and its image of self-originating activation was an exceedingly appealing concept for Inoue as well as others who were drawn to the lineage attached to the logic of *philosophy as reality*, including Enryō Inoue, Setsurei Miyake, and Kitarō Nishida. It is also very important to note that the thinking of Schopenhauer and von Hartmann differed completely from the teachings of Christianity—or more accurately, Western Christianity. They harbored ideas on a certain type of mystical monism—Eastern or Oriental monism of the true form—that stood in contrast to the dualistic theory of Western Christianity. I would like to briefly deviate from the subject and touch on the differences between Western and Eastern Christianity.

## X.

Western Latin-based Christianity—in other words, the true Roman Catholic version of Christianity—started during the period between the second and third centuries. Christian authors of the West differed from church fathers of the East first in terms of the language that was used. In other words, world views and states of awareness that differ fundamentally between the Latin-speaking western half of the Roman Empire and the Greek-speaking eastern half are expressed. This fundamental difference came to be exposed politically in the form of the schism that opened up between Rome and Byzantine. The Latin-Western spiritual temperament probably most clearly emerges in the Roman Empire. First, Romans, in contrast to Greeks, were thoroughly oriented towards the law, such that their communal living arrangements were comprehensively organized around a legal framework. Accordingly, Western Christianity was notable for featuring not a philosophers' god that was ontologically understood as was the case under Eastern Christianity but rather a god in the mode of a father who judges, forgives, and loves in the context of a relationship between a father and his children. This relationship between God and human beings is based on a covenant—a defining characteristic of original Judaism and Abrahamic religions—wherein the biblical God is made to confront others and constitutes an externally transcendental monotheistic God in whose image man is conceived. No breach can be formed whatsoever between God as the creator and those whom he has created. God reigns supreme from outside on an omnipresent basis and transcendently exists to create all things from a state of nothingness. Thus, compliance with the covenant is important and one's membership in a church through a declaration of faith was subject to legal binding force.<sup>18</sup>

In contrast, the church fathers of Greece to the east initially deepened their understanding of Christianity based on Greek philosophy, in particular the ideas associated with neo-Platonism. The central theological concept underpinning the Eastern Orthodox Church was deification (*θεωσις*). What this means is that something divine dwells immanently in the souls of human beings. In other words, a human being can harness such spirituality in

a process of austere self-purification to free his own soul from the confines of the body and render himself into an image by which the light of something divine can be manifested internally. This corresponds to a concept addressed by Plato himself in *Theaetetus* (176b), one of his dialogues: *ὁμοίωσις θεῷ* or “elevation of the human to the godly.” This deification of human beings became a salient feature of the Eastern Orthodox Church. Athanasius of Alexandria, a Greek Church father of the fourth century noted that “God became man so that men might become gods.”

In other words, God exists immanently as an *image* within the confines of limited human existence. In this sense, God does not exist independently on the outside while disconnected from humans. Instead, it is believed that He exists immanently on an omnipresent basis as part of a unifying oneness, a notion that redounds to monism of the true form. The philosophical orientation of Schopenhauer, who yearned to be liberated from suffering rooted in carnal desires—in other words, his notion of blind will towards life—and attain nirvana through austere self-purification, ostensibly owed much to Indian Buddhism. However, perhaps the truth is that Schopenhauer had already been oriented towards the mystical monism of the Eastern Orthodox Church of Greece rather than the doctrine of duality associated with the Western church of Latin influences.

As outlined above, the standpoint of monism of the true form is such that it universally retains a structure of *immanent transcendence* as analogized with the relationship of water and waves rather than one that involves external transcendence. To elaborate, it is explained that a single transcendental being arising from an intrinsic and not extrinsic cause moves on its own, undergoes self-development, and operates through participation within individual existing beings and that actions will be taken towards self-realization and self-elicitation of the truth in a being with a storehouse consciousness (*true thusness* and *true existence*). As seen in *Awakening of Faith*, this is the same as *zhen yu sui yuan* whereby the *true thusness* of the mind will evolve on its own into the birth and death of the mind without losing its own purified mind. Furthermore, the idea of one unifying principle as espoused by Confucian scholar Chang Yi corresponded to the notion that “principle is one but its manifestations are many,” whereby a single transcendental principle, when applied to all things, manifests according to the unique circumstances that apply in each case. This idea was a predominant one along with *Kanhua Chan* during the Sung Dynasty and was connected at a fundamental level with the Hua Yan teachings of *li shi wu ai* and *shi shi wu ai*, which influenced neo-Confucianism to no small degree. To put it another way, this is nothing more than the logic of substance and function (original being and its function) or the logic of *immanent transcendence*. This forms the very core of the Oriental idea that differs from the mode of thinking corresponding to the Western dualism.

## XI.

In 1887, Ludwig Busse (1862–1907) was invited to come from Germany to serve as a foreign instructor at the philosophy department of Tokyo Imperial University for the first time. As a philosopher taking the standpoint of critical realism traceable to Lotze, he applied Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* to texts to lecture primarily on classical German philosophy. Six years later in 1893, Raphael von Koeber (1848–1923), a Russian of German ethnicity, arrived to take up his new post as Busse's successor.

Koeber's lectures were delivered over a period of twenty-one years from September 1893 to July 1914. He was the first university instructor to apply the principle of original text and language to philosophical research in practice and taught an approach to researching ancient Greek philosophy in ancient Greek, written works by Christian thinkers from the European Middle Ages through the use of original Latin texts, and written works

related to German philosophy in their original language. However, there is almost no evidence that he developed his own original system of philosophy. Koeber was an introvert who was frequently noted for adhering to a passive, mental form of aristocratism but it cannot be forgotten that, as noted above, he was a Russian of German descent. Thus, his understanding of Christianity probably was associated not with the Latin West but with Eastern Christianity, or the Russian Orthodox Church. This likely accounts for his exceedingly strong mystical, metaphysical tendencies. He is also noted for devoting much attention to the idea of *transcendental realism* as put forth by the von Hartmann school of thought. He is said to have often told his pupils that intellectual intuition, the sort that might also be described as mysticism, must operate on a foundation of true philosophy.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, Koeber sought to also read mystical realism into the philosophy of Schopenhauer. This is clearly seen when Schopenhauer's theory as printed in his *Collection of Literary Sketches*<sup>20</sup> is read. He accepted the idea of an *intellect* within the context of *will* as referred to by Schopenhauer and thought that this idea constituted *true existence*. In other words, while the will objectifies the self as unconscious intellect, this is believed to be a rational shift from the unconscious to the conscious sphere. Needless to say, this thinking is not Western. Indeed, it is worth focusing on the fact that this thinking is also connected to the outflow theory of neo-Platonism, which influenced Eastern Christianity. *τὸ ἐν* ("A Primitive Being"), as explicated by Plotino (around 205–270), exceeds our thinking and is transcendental in the way that it surpasses discourse. However, it is encapsulated within all things and conceals the potential to cause all existing beings to emerge through the primordial, complete will that exists immanently within the self. To put it differently, *the one being* transcending existence possesses the power, strength, and ability to facilitate, among other things, an orientation towards elicitation arising from the self within the self. The one being confers wisdom on itself based on such overflowing potency and inexhaustible strength, evolves into the spirit or soul of the universe, imparts embodiments on all things, and becomes internalized as their basis for existence. For Plotino, everything from wisdom to matter flows from the one being. Moreover, spirituality (light) dissipates at each stage. The one being constitutes light-radiating goodness itself while matter, in contrast, is lacking in such goodness, such that it represents evil immersed in darkness. While goodness will be shared and will stay one step ahead of evil as long as matter retains form, matter will remain the essence of evil.

Incidentally, the workings by which the primordial one being self-elicits beyond the self like a fountain that gushes out ceaselessly represents nothing less than self-awareness by the one being, which in turn results in the successive flowing out of wisdom and the spirit or soul of the universe. Such self-awareness by the one being signifies that the one being corresponds to volitional existence. The wisdom and spirit or soul of the universe produced by the conscious will of the one being produces vestiges of the one being in the self. If this is the case, then given the volitional existence of wisdom and the spirit or soul of the universe, then it goes without saying that wisdom and the spirit or soul of the universe conversely yearns for the one being and harbors an internal longing to return to the one being.<sup>21</sup> Thus, human beings will slip free from the confines of their physical bodies, reach the world of wisdom, and suddenly coalesce with the one being (self-emancipation or *ekstasis*). This description is consistent with the *path of ascension* as endorsed by Plotino and constitutes a guide to *nirvana* as formulated by the Schopenhauer school of thought.

Meanwhile, the *will* as used in Schopenhauer's theory of the will denies the existence of a transcendental god in whose image man is conceived if the aforementioned monistic thinking is taken into proper account. In fact, the *will* as referred to by him does not refer to a transcendental being that creates all things from a place outside of the world. In other words, the entire world represents nothing more than the will as an objectified, elicited

self and the will exists immanently in the world. While the will does transcend the form of time, space, and cause and effect in the world of phenomena, it also lurks right the midst of phenomena at the same time. In other words, the philosophy of *immanent transcendence* itself might have been what Schopenhauer was targeting. Thus, within the context of emphasis placed by Koeber on the self-objectification of the *will* based on the recognition of *intellect* as the basis of *blind will*, self-realization emanating from within the self of true existence as a thing-in-itself was read into the philosophy of Schopenhauer. In other words, this is proof that Schopenhauer's philosophy retained a monistic mysticism.

## XII.

As explained in detail up to this point in this paper, Inoue attempted, by a different approach, to adapt and read into Schopenhauer's philosophy, which Inoue and Koeber understood exoterically as pessimism and as a theory of nirvana, Eastern thought as acquired through *Awakening of Faith*, or monism of the true form of Mahayana Buddhism under which a transcendental being is not assumed to exist externally. Koeber, the Russian of German descent, attempted to likewise adapt and read into Schopenhauer's philosophy a form of mysticism corresponding to the Eastern Christianity of the Russian Orthodox Church based on neo-Platonic monism under which a single god as creator in whose image man is conceived is also not assumed to exist externally. In both of these cases, it is recognized that East Asian thinking and East European mysticism, which differ from Latin-based Western dualism, are connected via monism of the true form. There is one more individual who construed Schopenhauer in the same way. He is Setsurei Miyake.<sup>22</sup> Miyake too exhibited a sense of affinity to Schopenhauer and von Hartmann. In 1889, he published *Drop of Philosophy* (『哲学涓滴』) and wrote the following therein:

Hegel's thinking was nothing more than thinking that was equivalent to wisdom and lacked inner vitality. Where vitality appeared to exist, there was in fact none. While explicating the development (of a dialectic), such development too lacked vitality. Indeed, as it is recognized that his thinking is akin to clay statues, there is no preventing the emergence of assertions that are in stark opposition thereto. In contrast, Schopenhauer's preeminent philosophy regards as inadequate Hegel's ideas and posits, with a focus on the will, that everything from the actions of dust and trash to the movements of the sun and the stars—all phenomena between heaven and earth—are set in motion from the operations of the will. The movements of the cosmos do not redound to utilized wisdom. Rather, it would not be an exaggeration to say that a truly great achievement has been secured in the construction and critiquing of the movements of the cosmos based on the will as exercised.<sup>23</sup>

That Miyake learns from Schopenhauer is also apparent based on the contents of *Gakan Shōkei* (1892) (『我觀小景』).

The movements of all things are based on force. Unbounded, force moves forward without ceasing. The actions of human beings are also based on the will. The will is truly an element of potency. Force and the will cannot be detached from one another. Schopenhauer feels that the potency between heaven and earth fully constitutes the will and believes that every type of action redounds to the will.<sup>24</sup>

At the foundation of the actions of all things and human beings in the cosmos lies *force*, which in turn is based on the will. The representative of this way of thinking was Schopenhauer. Miyake sought to receive this way of

thinking as his own philosophical standpoint. As with Inoue and Koeber above, he understood Schopenhauer in terms of monism of the true form. I urge that particular attention be paid to the fact that there is no sign of a pessimistic view of life, a noted feature of Schopenhauer's philosophy, to be found in Miyake's understanding of Schopenhauer. Incidentally, it is worth noting that Kitarō Nishida, in later years, indicated that Schopenhauer's philosophy resonated deeply with him, such that he paid utterly no heed to deliverance from earthly bondage or nirvana based on a rejection of the will. Instead, he asserted the unlimited activity of the will and persistently emphasized the *will of absolute freedom*. For Nishida, the *will of absolute freedom* transcends linguistic considerations and constitutes a *profoundness* surpassing all limits, a noesis beyond the reach of reflection. It cannot be seen, it is without form, and it is a silent abyss; it will not come to actually exist within the scope of objectification. This rule truly conforms to the *true thusness* as referred to in *Awakening of Faith* and also corresponds to Plotino's *tò év*. This *true existence* can be seen as the *will of absolute freedom*. Indeed, this will pulsates and functions vigorously in our world of historical and specific realities, thereby forming an outlook on organic nature. In this sense, there is no need to reiterate the point that *philosophy as reality*, as hailed in academic philosophy circles at government schools in the middle of the Meiji period, is included in the lineage of the logic of *substance and function* as seen in *Awakening of Faith*.

\*Please note that this paper reproduces parts of my Book *Kitarō Nishida and the Meiji Mind* (Kansai University Publishing Department, 2011) and *Meiji Philosophy—Organismic philosophy and Its Lineage*, an article that was included in *Fertile Meiji* (Kansai University Publishing Department, 2012).

Keywords:

Philosophy as reality / monism of the true form / *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana* / Tetsujirō Inoue / Enryō Inoue / Setsurei Miyake

#### <Reference List>

- Izutsu, T. (2001). *Tōyō Tetsugaku Oboegaki Ishikino Keijijogaku (Oriental Philosophy Adversaria Metaphysics of Consciousness) – Philosophy of Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*. Tokyo: Chūōkōron-Shinsha.
- Ochiai, H. (2001). *Girisha Seikyō Mugen no Kami (The Orthodox, God of Infinity)*. Tokyo: Kōdansha Sensho Métier.
- Kayano, Y. (2004). *Nihon-niokeru Schopenhauer (Schopenhauer in Japan)*. In *Schopenhauer Zenshū* (separate volume). Tokyo: Hakusuisha Publishing.
- Clément, O. (1993). *The Roots of Christian Mysticism*. (S. Hiyamuta & J. Shiraishi, Trans.). Tokyo: Hakusuisha Publishing.
- Kosaka, M. (1999). *Meiji Shisōshi (History of Thought in the Meiji Period)*. Kyoto: Tōeisha.
- Takahashi, Y. (1993). *Girisha Seikyō (Greek Orthodox)*. Tokyo: Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko.
- Torii, H. (1953). *Meiji Shisōshi (History of Thought in the Meiji Period)*. Tokyo: Kawade Shobō Shinsha Publishers.
- Hyōdō, T. (1985). *Schopenhauer-ron - Hikakukshisō no Kokoromi (Schopenhauer: An Attempt of Comparative Thought)*. Ōtsu, Shiga: kohro-sha.
- Yamazaki, M. (1977). *Kindai Nihonshisō Tsūshi (History of Modern Japanese Thought)*. Tokyo: Aoki Shoten.

#### (Endnotes)

- 1 Tokutomi Sohō & Yamaji Aizan. (1971). In *Nihon no Meicho* (Vol. 40, p. 392). Tokyo: Chūōkōron-Shinsha.
- 2 Watanabe, K. (1985). *Zōhoban Meiji Shisōshi Jukyōteki Dentō to Kindai Ninshikiron (Expanded Edition, History of Thought in the Meiji Period: Confucian Tradition and Modern Epistemology)* (p. 287). Tokyo: Perikansha Publishing.
- 3 *Tetsugaku Shisō: Gendai Nihon Shisō Taikai 24 (Philosophical Thought: Contemporary Japanese Thought)*. Shimomura, T. & H. Furuta (Eds.). Tokyo: Chikumashobō.
- 4 Kindaiteki Sekaikan no Tetsugakuteki Keisei (Phiresopical Formation of Modern World View). (1968). In H. Yoshida,

- K. Sakuta & K. Ikimatsu (Ed.), *Kindai Nihon Shakai Shisōshi* (History of Modern Japanese Social Thought). Tokyo: Yūhikaku Publishing.
- 5 Miyamoto, K., Takahashi, Y., Ueno, N., & Oguma, T. (Eds.). (1935). *Iwanami Tetsugaku Jiten* (*Iwanami Dictionary of Philosophy*) (Expanded ed.). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Publishers.
  - 6 G.W.F. Hegel. (1807). *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Lassons Auflage 3rd ed. 195ff.).
  - 7 Shisō-hen (Thought Chapter). (1967). In *Meiji Bunka Zenshū* (Entire Corpus of Meiji Culture) (Vol. 23, p. 422). Tokyo: Nippon Hyōron Sha.
  - 8 For the relationship between Hara Tanzan, Inoue Tetsujirō, and *Genshō-soku-Jitsuzairon* (*Phenomenal Realism*), the author received a great deal of suggestions from the following articles by Kiyoshi Watabe, professor of Sophia University. I hereby express my sincere appreciation.  
Watabe, K. (1998). Bukkyō Tetsugakusha toshitenō Hara Tanzan to Genshō-soku-Jitsuzairon no Kankei (Relationship between Hara Tanzan as a Buddhist Philosopher and Phenomenal Realism). *Sophia University Philosophical Studies*, 24, and Watabe, K. (1999). Inoue Tetsujirō no Tetsugaku Taikei to Bukkyō no Tetsuri (Philosophical System of Inoue Tetsujiro and Philosophy of Buddhism). *Sophia University Philosophical Studies*, 25.
  - 9 Indo Tetsugaku Kōshi Hara Tanzan Shimpō (Indian Philosophy Lecturer Hara Tanzan Shen Bao). (September 1881 and December 1882). *University of Tokyo Second Annual Report*. The quotation is from the following: Mitsunashi, T. (Ed.). (1976). *Meiji Zenki Shisōshi Bunken* (Pre-Meiji Period History of Thought) (p. 600).
  - 10 Reflection on the Past 88 Years (in Kaikyūroku). In Shimazono, S. (Ed.), *Inoue Tetsujirō Shū* (Corpus of Inoue Tetsujiro) in *Japanese Religious Persons Series 2* (Vol. 8, pp. 293-294). Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan.
  - 11 *Selected Works of Inoue Enryō* (Vol. 3). (1987). Tokyo: Toyo University. The pages cited in the text are from this book.
  - 12 Rinri Shinsetsu (New Theory of Ethics). (1883). In Shisō-hen (Thought Chapter), *Meiji Bunka Zenshū* (Entire Corpus of Meiji Culture) (1967) (Vol. 23, p. 419). Tokyo: Nippon Hyōron Sha.
  - 13 Watabe, K. (1999). Inoue Tetsujiro no Tetsugaku Taikei to Bukkyō no Tetsuri (Philosophical System of Inoue Tetsujiro and Philosophy of Buddhism). *Sophia University Philosophical Studies*, 25, 75-76.
  - 14 For *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, please refer to the following: Hirakawa, A. (1973). *Daijō Kishin Ron* (Theory of Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana) (Buddhist scriptures course 22). Tokyo: Daizō Shuppan, and Inoue, K. (Ed.). (2000). *Daijō Kishin Ron no Kenkyū* (Studies on the Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana). *Kansai University Oriental and Occidental Studies*. Osaka: Kansai University Press.
  - 15 Shimada, K. (1985). *Shushigaku to Yōmeigaku* (Neo-Confucianism and Yangmingism) (pp. 3-5). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Publishers. For the logic of substance and function, please refer to the following: Shimada, K. (2002). History of the Logic of Substance and Function. In *A Study for The History of Confucianism in China*. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.
  - 16 Inoue, T. (Ed.). (1901). *Tetsugaku Sōsho* (Vol. 1, Chap. 2, p. 362). Tokyo: Shūbunkaku.
  - 17 Inoue Tetsujirō Autobiography: Memoir of the Academic Community. (2003). In *Inoue Tetsujirō Shū* (Corpus of Inoue Tetsujiro) in *Japanese Religious Persons Series 2* (Vol. 8, p. 43). Tokyo: Kuresu Shuppan.
  - 18 Vgl. Klaus Held: Treffpunkt Platon – Philosophischer Reiseführer durch die Länder des Mittelmeers, Philipp Reclam jun. Stuttgart, 1990, XIX. Please refer to Chapter 7 in Volume 2 of the Japanese edition: *Chichūkai Tetsugaku Kikō*. (1998). (K. Inoue & E. Kunikata, Trans.). Kyoto: Kōyō Shobo.
  - 19 Commemorative Issue of Koeber, *Shisō*, 23. (1923). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Publishers.
  - 20 *Sketchbook of Koeber*. (1939). (Y. Fukada & T. Kubo, Trans.). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, Publishers.
  - 21 For example, please refer to the following: Kojima, J. (1992). *Seiyō Shisōshijō no Kirisuto-kyō* (Christianity in the History of Western Thought) (pp. 28-29). Tokyo: Tōsui Shobo, Publishers.
  - 22 For Miyake Seturei, I obtained a great deal of suggestions from the following articles by Kiyoshi Watabe:  
Watabe, K. (2001). Studies on Miyake Setsurei (1): Centering on changes in his view of philosophy. *Sophia University Philosophical Studies*, 26.
  - 23 Corpus of Miyake Setsurei. (1967). In the *Meiji Bungaku Zenshū* (Corpus of Literature in the Meiji Period) (Vol. 33, p. 198 and p. 245). Tokyo: Chikumashobō.
  - 24 *Ibid.*, p. 245.