

INOUE ENRYO WITH HIS MYSTIC NATIONALISM

NAKAJIMA Keisuke 中島敬介

1. The Hidden Meaning of the Rescript

In 1902, INOUE Enryō 井上円了 published *The Hidden Meaning of the Rescript* 『勅語玄義』 (below, cited in-text as HMR), presenting his mystical interpretation of the Imperial Rescript on Education 教育勅語 (「教育ニ関スル勅語」, 1890) to the world.

In this work, Enryō discusses "why loyalty and filial piety [忠孝] come together to be one, in other words, the unity of loyalty and filial piety." He states, "Insofar as we imperial subjects [臣民] are descendants of the Imperial Household [皇室], some loyalty to it is in our families," and, adopting a more disquieting tone, continues by noting,

⁰ NAKAJIMA Keisuke 中島敬介, Nara-Eurasia Institute, Nara Prefectural University. The Japanese included for some quotations has generally been changed to commonly used Chinese characters 常用漢字 and *kana* usage. *Katakana* were changed to *hiragana* as appropriate in texts besides the Imperial Rescript. Publication dates are based on texts' imprints. Translated by Dylan Luers TODA.

"Since the Imperial Household is the ancestral household of us imperial subjects, the path of devoting oneself to it is also filial piety." He finally enters dangerous territory, proclaiming, "Since the Japanese Empire is a group organized as one family [...] it is clear that its parent is the Emperor [...]. Filial piety towards him is truly the greatest filial piety." Enryō then concludes, "we can call 'absolute loyalty' 'absolute filial piety'" (HMR: 14–16). Let us go to the beginning of *The Hidden Meaning* and go over Enryō's curious assertions.

- (1) The aim of the Imperial Rescript on Education's promulgation was to explain the "morality particular to Japan" (HMR: 5). There's no way that a universal morality shared by other countries would be imperially promulgated.
- (2) The morality particular to Japan is the "absolute loyalty" that appeared amidst the country's unique "founding conditions" 建国の事跡 (HMR: 11). It is particular to Japan because it arises from loyalty to the Imperial Household—which only exists in Japan.
- (3) Japan's particular founding conditions were its "a priori" or "primeval" 先天的 Imperial Household and "family-like organization" 家族的団体 (HMR: 11). Japan is a country comprised of a family with the same bloodline: before imperial subjects appeared there was the Imperial Household, and the subjects are its descendants. If one goes back to their source, one would find that they are the children of the parent that is the Imperial Household.
- (4) "Filial piety" also includes devoting oneself to ancestors, and "loyalty" is to serve the Imperial Household and line, as well as, of course, the current Emperor. Imperial subjects' loyalty to the Emperor and the Imperial Line is the same as their filial piety towards the Emperor's ancestors (who are also their own ancestors). This is what Enryō means by the "unity of loyalty and filial piety."
- (5) Absolute loyalty becomes absolute filial piety via this unity of loyalty and filial piety. "Absolute loyalty and filial piety" 絶対的忠孝 (HMR: 16) is *the* true / fundamental aim of the Imperial Rescript.

While kicking away other commentators' understandings, Enryō proudly declares that this "absolute interpretation" of the "deep meaning" (i.e., "absolute loyalty and filial piety," HMR: 16) of the Imperial Rescript's "sacred teachings" 聖論 is "proclaimed by me alone" (HMR: 22).

2. An Eccentric Text: The Hidden Meaning

2.1 Absolute Interpretation

Enryō justifies his "absolute interpretation" of the Imperial Rescript as follows: He argues that the relative, "common understanding" 通義 of the Imperial Rescript is ridiculous. It holds that since the text starts with the character for "virtue" 德, loyalty and filial piety are the "two paths" that branch off from it, and that "relative loyalty and filial piety runs throughout the Imperial Rescript as a whole" (HMR: 22). The (from Enryō's perspective, laughable) basis for this is the Imperial Rescript's paragraph that follows "Ye, Our subjects" 爾臣民.¹ He says there is no doubt that "guard and maintain" 扶翼 in the Imperial Rescript's concluding words "guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth" refers to imperial subjects' loyalty. The word 以テ ("and thus") appear before this statement, which in this context indicate that the preceding text describes the means by which this helping and protecting is to be done. Enryō believes that while these means are generally understood to be described only in the text that follows "should emergency arise" 一旦緩急, such an interpretation is impossible because it refers to the incredibly rare occurrence of the state's survival being threatened. He rhetorically asks if "the loyal path of helping and protecting the Imperial Fortune [皇運]" can really be ignored in "normal times," and proceeds to assert that since "we imperial subjects" must always "guard and maintain the prosperity of the Imperial Throne in everything through day and night," there "is not a shred of doubt that the words 'and thus' [以テ] refer to each item that appears below 'Our subjects' " (HMR: 24–25).

While at first this appears to be a rather ordinary opinion, in *The Hidden Meaning of the Rescript*, Enryō arrives at the following conclusion. He declares that absolute loyalty that guards and maintains the prosperity of Imperial Throne "includes within it the path of filial piety," and thus "all of Japan's morality in the end is contained just within the path of loyalty" (HMR: 26). In this way, in one move Japanese morality is reduced to "absolute loyalty" via the unity of loyalty and filial piety. However, Enryō's discussion is not an Imperial Household (national polity) fundamentalism that sees all of Japanese morality as in the end returning to the loyalty of guarding and maintaining the prosperity of the Imperial Throne. Quite the opposite is the case: absolute filial

¹ The Education Rescript is cited according to the official English translation issued by Monbushō 文部省. 『〈漢英仏独〉教育勅語訳纂』[Collection of Chinese, English, French, and German translations of the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 文部省, 1909).

piety and absolute loyalty come into existence via the identification of loyalty and filial piety. In this moment, both are transformed into "absolute loyalty and filial piety." Thereby, loyalty loses not only its absoluteness, but also any concrete meaning. The same goes for filial piety. The same goes for filial piety. In the first place, the niches of loyalty and filial piety had been secure because they were two relative paths, with loyalty pertaining to the Emperor and the public realm and filial piety one's parents and the private realm. Due to Enryō's absolutization of loyalty and his maneuvering to make loyalty and filial piety a single entity, the two concepts became no longer separate and lost their identities, and the "morality particular to Japan" of "absolute loyalty and filial piety"—which is neither loyalty nor filial piety—appeared.

In order for something to be recognized as filial piety, it must have corresponding words and actions. Filial piety is not a concept or idea, but refers to actual actions carried out in accordance with individual cases. The same goes for loyalty. However, even if there is the spirit to guard and maintain the Imperial Fortune within absolute loyalty and filial piety (the "Japanese spirit," HMR: 8), in the framework of Enryō's thought there are no substantial words or actions that correspond to it. This is because all social ethics—filial piety 孝, affection 友, harmony 和, truthfulness 信, fairness 義, bravery 勇, service 奉, impartiality 公, and so on—are just relative loyalty and filial piety. In the first place, "absolute words and actions" is just an oxymoron.

Absolute loyalty and filial piety cuts the actual bonds of social ethics that tied people to people and people to society. It directly links the Emperor (Imperial Line) with atomized individuals (imperial subjects) on the level of ideas. Furthermore, this means that the Emperors and the Imperial Household (absolute beings) which are part of an unbroken Imperial Line that stretches back to the gods drop down to the same level as the parents of the imperial subjects (relative beings).

Enryō persistently pushes away "relative loyalty and filial piety," stating that even the "ever" 克ク of the Imperial Rescript's "Our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety" 克ク忠ニ克ク孝ニ億兆心ヲ一ニシテ "properly expresses the absolute meaning" (HMR: 33). The Imperial Rescript's next statement "true in the all places 中外ニ施シテ悖ラス" stands in the way of Enryō's steady (strange) advance. This means, "this is applicable both domestically and internationally"; there is no way to adopt a position that boasts about an absolute loyalty and filial piety unique to Japan. However, Enryō does not flinch. He says that 施シテ means "to fit," and boasts that this passage "states that Japan's absolute loyalty can be fit without any problem to any overseas country" (HMR: 39).

However, in the first place, Enryō himself is the one who jumped to the conclusion that the Imperial Rescript is Japan's particular morality, that its true meaning lies in that which is "unique to Japan and not shared by other countries" (HMR: 6), and that "the relative is shared by other countries, and the absolute is that which is particular to Japan" (HMR: 35). Here, though, Enryō speaks more and more forcefully about the universality of this morality: "No matter what the country, there is no way this path could be opposed as impossible; there is no doubt that everyone would respect it," and "regardless of the country, it is the path of the greatest good and greatest beauty that everyone should equally and uniformly praise and respect" (HMR: 39). Immediately after this, he goes back on his words, stating that in both loyalty and filial piety "there are the two poles of the relative and absolute, and also in the essences and at the sources [of these poles] there are the two poles of the relative and absolute." He continues by stating, "The relative is shared by other countries and the absolute limited to Japan" (HMR: 43). This is rather hard to understand.

2.2 The Particular and Universal

Enryō poses the question of what should be used to spread amongst imperial subjects absolute loyalty and filial piety ("our country's [...] unique Great Path," HMR: 7). Answering his own question, he states that of course Shinto and even the two paths of Confucianism and Buddhism "do not misunderstand this hidden meaning" (HMR: 44). Naturally, from Confucianism he points to the *Treatise on Loyalty* 『忠經』 and the *Treatise on Filial Piety* 『孝經』 . From Buddhism, he chooses the rather unfamiliar *Nir-grantha Sūtra* 『尼乾子經』 (HMR: 44). Without any supplementary explanation, he quotes its statement, "The sovereign is the people's father and mother" 君者民之父母, and declares that this can be "interpreted in terms of the two categories of phenomena and principle [事理の二種]" (HMR: 44–45). Based on just these six characters, he explains that when understood in terms of phenomena it refers to one's actual parents, and that when understood in terms of principle it refers to parents in a "metaphorical" sense. He asserts without any basis that since the former "is common to all countries" and the latter is "limited to Japan [...] only in Japan are we imperial subjects the descendants of the Imperial Throne" (HMR: 45).

The following is Enryō's explanation for why this is the case. Since Japan's unique absolute loyalty and filial piety is based on Japan's unique oneness of the sovereign (Emperor / Imperial Line) and parents (mother / father), it is naturally "not shared by other countries and is unique to Japan" (HMR: 7). However, on a conceptual level, the

relationship between sovereign and imperial subject based upon "absolute loyalty and filial piety" is universal as an ideal form of governance or an ideal-type "metaphor." In other words, there is no universality in the *actual* eternal Imperial Throne (Japan's Imperial Household institution). Rather, the *principle* (advocated by Enryō) of "absolute loyalty and filial piety" is valid in all countries. This is the reason that "Japan is proud towards other countries and other countries are envious of Japan with regard to absolute loyalty" (HMR: 46). However, even if countries are jealous, there's nothing they can do: this "Great Path" of absolute loyalty and filial piety arose out of Japan's particular "founding conditions," that is, the "a priori Imperial Household" and a "family-like organization." The "cause" 因 of the unity of loyalty and filial piety, the "effect" 果 of the eternal Imperial Throne and Japan's particular (subtle) national polity that is composed of this cause and effect all cannot exist outside of Japan. In this way, Enryō easily overcomes the hurdle of the Imperial Rescript's aforementioned "true in the all places" 中外ニ施シテ悖ラス while using the *Nirgrantha Sūtra* as his footing.

Near the end of *The Hidden Meaning*, Enryō exhorts readers to "firmly observe this Great Path yourself day and night," and repeats that they should know that above all Japan's unique morality of absolute loyalty and filial piety is the very thing that "develops the Imperial Household and national polity [皇室国躰] that is unparalleled in all countries and coeval with heaven and earth" (HMR: 46). This provides us a glimpse of the real intention behind *The Hidden Meaning*. What does it mean for absolute loyalty (filial piety) to "develop" 開発する the Imperial Household and national polity? At the time, it was common sense in Japan that Amaterasu's "divine decree" 神勅 was what ensured the eternal and unbroken Imperial Line. It was certainly not something that could be "developed" based on anything like imperial subjects' loyalty, even if it was absolute loyalty. What is the true intention of Enryō, who held that this "developing" is nothing other than the Imperial Rescript's "profound and subtle" (HMR: 6) "underside deep meaning" (HMR: 2)?

2.3 Absolute Loyalty and Filial Piety via the Unity of Loyalty and Filial Piety

Let us go over how Japan's particular (subtle) national polity comes into existence according to *The Hidden Meaning*.

- (1) As a premise, there are Japan's particular "founding conditions" (the "a priori Imperial Household" and its "family-like organization").

- (2) Out of these founding conditions an absolute loyalty and filial piety arises based on Japan's unique unity of loyalty and filial piety.
- (3) This "absolute loyalty (filial piety)" (the cause) gives rise to Japan's particular eternal Imperial Fortune (the result).
- (4) The above cause and effect relationship that is unique to Japan constructs the "nationality polity that is unique to Japan."

Enryō changed the national polity's guarantee from Amaterasu's divine decree to absolute loyalty and filial piety. This was not simply a terminology switch. Via this overwriting, the foundation that guarantees the Imperial Throne (the national polity based on the unbroken Imperial Line) was changed from an up-down divine decree-based relationship between divine Imperial Ancestors (Amaterasu, etc.) and Emperors to a down-up absolute loyalty-based relationship between imperial subjects and Emperors. He reversed the ruling / being ruled relationship. Insofar as there is Amaterasu's divine decree, Japan's ruler is set as the Emperor, and imperial subjects as subordinates who are ruled. However, if the national polity is "developed" by imperial subjects, they become agential subjects who dictate that the Emperor is the ruler, and the positions of subjects and the Emperor are reversed.

If Japan's ruler is dictated or chosen by someone (imperial subjects), then this ruler (the Emperor) only represents a relative particularity (that is, how he is chosen), not any absolute particularity (the Emperor himself). The people decide who is the ruler, which is no different than choosing a politician in an election, or leaving things up to an able bureaucrat. It is certainly true that if one recognizes his overwriting of Amaterasu's divine decree with absolute loyalty and filial piety, then, as he states, "Japan's absolute loyalty can be fit without any problem to any overseas country" (HMR: 39).

When one reads *The Hidden Meaning* in this way—which is the only way it can be understood—this small booklet that is less than fifty pages appears to be on the verge of a Copernican-like revolution in Imperial Rescript interpretations. It was a rebellion against nationally-established moral (ethical) education that used the Emperor's own words against him. During this time Enryō was appointed a Member of the Examination Board of Moral Cultivation Textbooks 修身教科書調査委員 by the Ministry of Education (in 1900), and held an important position as a private schools representative in the Higher Education Committee 高等教育会議 (appointed in 1901), which was under the direct supervision of the national government's cabinet. He must have felt pressure to be cautious—to the same extent as Copernicus—in revealing his own theory. However,

in his "An Address Greeting 1902" 「明治三十五年を迎ふるの辞」 he shows extraordinary determination, stating, "the Japan that has been island country-like until 1901" must "from this year of 1902 progress further to become a global Japan,"² and declares, "now will not come again, and I will never be born again" (p. 5). Unless this was Enryō's standard way of greeting a new year, 1902 must have been a year for which he had high expectations.

2.4 The Common and Hidden Meaning

At the beginning of *The Hidden Meaning* Enryō makes clear his motivation for writing it. He says that the meaning contained in the Imperial Rescript "is very subtle and profound, and cannot be easily known. Thus, I will reveal it, informing people of the wonderfully rare and precious of [these] sacred teachings." He continues by noting that while he has read many commentaries, none "fully explain the Imperial Rescript's deep meaning," and despite this meaning "existing far outside that which is explained in various experts' interpretations [...] prevailing interpretations are limited to understanding simply its surface meaning." They are nothing more than "the common meaning of the Imperial Rescript" that "have still not reached its underside deep meaning." On the other hand, Enryō states that "while I am not the brightest, I have understood its underside true meaning," and thus "wish to from here onwards describe what I call the Imperial Rescript's hidden meaning" (HMR: 1–3).

However, in the first place, Enryō's view that the Imperial Rescript has a common and hidden meaning is itself rather suspicious. Enryō's idea goes beyond the level of curious to that of the strange: he proposes that there is a common (surface) meaning and hidden (underside) meaning to the Imperial Rescript—it is like he is saying that the Emperor system established by the Meiji Restoration government has exoteric and esoteric aspects. As is often the case with such claims, Enryō asserts that the hidden meaning is the true one. While the idea of hiding with fine (exoteric) words the true (esoteric) meaning of the principle of ruling over the people is understandable, can one really say that it is necessary to construct it so that even "knowledgeable, well-read individuals" (HMR: 4) and "experts" (HMR: 2) who publish works explaining the Imperial Rescript—a document that is meaningless to promulgate if its gist is not widely shared with the people—do not understand its true, profound meaning?

2 INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『甬水論集』 [Collection of (Inoue Enryō) Hosui's writings] (Tōkyō: 博文館, 1902), 2.

The decisive point that divides *The Hidden Meaning* from common understandings is its treatment of loyalty and filial piety. The latter hold that they were two separate paths. However, Enryō's fundamental stance is that since such is a morality not particular to Japan but found throughout the East, there is no point in discussing it in the Imperial Rescript. The idea that they are two separate paths would, from Enryō's perspective, threaten its *raison d'être*. He then comes up with the interpretation that the means by which guarding and maintaining "the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne" is to be done are found in everything written between "Ye, Our subjects, be filial to your parents" and "and thus" 以テ. Based on this claim, he criticizes "two paths" interpretations: they "are the normal explanation of the Imperial Rescript, and I hold them to be relative surface interpretations" (HMR: 21). He asserts that loyalty and filial piety based on the "profound and subtle absolute interpretation" (HMR: 22) is the absolute loyalty and filial piety of the unity of loyalty and filial piety. Below, I will consider how and the extent to which Enryō's understanding in *The Hidden Meaning* differs from common ones.

3. The Curious Idea of Absolute Loyalty and Filial Piety

3.1 A Lonely Interpretation

The Hidden Meaning was published a whole twelve years after the promulgation of the Imperial Rescript. It just so happens—this cannot be a coincidence—to have been on October 31st, the same day that the Imperial Rescript was published in the *Government Gazette* 『官報』 in 1890. However, he did not wait to write on the topic—he released three other commentaries, found in (1) *Proposal in Japanese Ethics* 『日本倫理学案』 (first pub. in 1893), (2) *Middle School Ethics* 『中等倫理書』 (vol. 1, 1898), and (3) *A Brief Explanation of the Imperial Rescript* 『勅語略解』 (1900).³

In *Proposal in Japanese Ethics*, Enryō writes in the introduction that in October 1890, with the "sacred teachings" 聖論 (the Imperial Rescript) having been promulgated, he "hoped to systematize a Japanese ethics," and therefore created a "course in the Philosophy Academy's Ethics Department," the lectures of which were compiled into this book and published with the aim of "letting the world know what the ideology of ethics taught at the Philosophy Academy is based on" (pp. 1–2). "Its spirit is thor-

3 INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『日本倫理学案』 [Proposal in Japanese ethics] (Tōkyō: 哲学書院, 1896 [First Edition 1893; Revised Yearly]; 『中等倫理書』 [Middle school ethics], vol. 1 (Tōkyō: 集英堂, 1898); 『勅語略解』 [A brief explanation of the Imperial Rescript] (Tōkyō: 三育社, 1900).

oughly based on the intent of the Imperial Rescript; its entirety is structured by the Imperial Rescript [...]. Since its ideology is [...] state polity-ism [国体主義], therefore at the beginning of the volume I have respectfully presented a commentary on the Imperial Rescript." He then notes, "This work aims to establish Japanese ethics, not demonstrate an ethics shared by the world" (pp. 2–4). Insofar as I am aware, updated versions of this text were published yearly until 1896, and in the 1894 "revised printing" 訂正印刷, one finds a major change to the commentary on the Imperial Rescript: the "Emperor and his subjects as one family" and the "unity of loyalty and filial piety" are both brought more to the foreground.

In the preface to the first volume of his *Middle School Ethics*, Enryō states, is "about the actuality of ethics," and takes entirely as its "essence the sacred ideas of the Imperial Rescript and as its gist the Great Path of loyalty and filial piety. [...] It is compiled into a format entirely" based on "that specified by the "Ethics Department's teaching items" (p. 2) and "the first volume, with its commentary on the Imperial Rescript," makes clear "the sacred views of the Emperor" (pp. 5–6). The second volume is on the applications of the Imperial Rescript, and the third volume brings together the previous two volumes to discuss individual morality. The fourth volume covers national morality, and the fifth theories of ethics.

A Brief Explanation of the Imperial Rescript is a re-edited version of the commentary on the Imperial Rescript found at the beginning of *Proposal in Japanese Ethics*—apparently from its fourth (March 1896) and subsequent editions—with an added section explaining the individual meanings of characters in the Rescript.

How is the family-like organization that is Japan—which in *The Hidden Meaning* forms the "founding conditions" unique to the country that gave rise to "absolute loyalty and filial piety"—treated in these texts by Enryō? In *A Brief Explanation*, he writes, "The people of our country are originally from one family. There is no one who is not an imperial subject of the Imperial Household" (pp. 5–6). Here, it is unclear whether both the Emperor and imperial subjects descend from the same family, or if this is the case only for the latter. Thus his discussion is somewhat diffuse: while stating, "Therefore, the likes of relationships of loyalty and filial piety [...] in our country, there is the custom of them being united," he also says, "Our national polity is composed of this Great Path of loyalty and filial piety" (pp. 6–7).

He is rather inarticulate regarding the unity of loyalty and filial piety as well: "'Guarding and maintaining the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth' is a custom of the greatest good and greatest beauty passed down to us by our ancestors," and protecting it is to "above, serve His Majesty the Emperor [...]" and

below, transmit this ancient custom to descendants, making its virtue shine for eternity. By doing so one can fulfill the path of filial piety towards one's ancestors. Know that therefore the two paths of loyalty and filial piety are one" (p. 21). Thus, he says, "Filial piety, affection, harmony, truthfulness and the like"—the "essence of our country's ethics" that are the "Great Path of loyalty and filial piety"—are, "in short, nothing other than the two paths of loyalty and filial piety [...]. The unity of these two paths [...] is the Great Path that has existed since the time that the Imperial Ancestors created the country" (p. 23). He thereby brings the unity of loyalty and filial piety—his core idea—back to the mythical point in time of the founding of Japan discussed at the beginning of the Imperial Rescript. According to Enryō, when the ancestors of the Imperial Household created Japan, they also created the country's morality that holds supreme guarding and maintaining the Imperial Fortune. And the imperial subjects have through the generations harmoniously practiced this morality. This, he says, is the quintessence of the national polity, and to protect this practice and transmit it as a beautiful tradition of Japan to descendants is to both guard and maintain the Imperial Fortune as well as to honor the virtue of the ancestors. Here, the two paths of loyalty and filial piety are one. Thus is the mild interpretation arrived at by Enryō. Even if loyalty to the Emperor (or, Imperial Household) goes in the direction of filial piety towards ancestors, filial piety towards one's parents will not become one with loyalty towards the Emperor; it is not an absolute unity but a happenstance relative one. It is not a destructive unity of loyalty and filial piety that gives rise to an absolute loyalty and filial piety, thereby erasing loyalty and filial piety.

While Enryō does state in his *Middle School Ethics*, "The Imperial Household is the head of the family that is the nation; between the country's sovereign and imperial subjects naturally the relationship of a single family exists," he then loses his drive, stating that it has been "since ancient times the practice of our ancestors to devote themselves to the two paths of loyalty and filial piety" (pp. 12–13). Therefore, he offers a moderate interpretation of "ever united in loyalty and filial piety," stating, "The Emperor is ordering our nation to serve him, exhaustive in their loyalty, as well as to serve their mother and father, thorough in their filial piety" (pp. 14–15).

Putting aside wording and some expressions, in terms of content *The Hidden Meaning* and the Imperial Rescript commentaries that Enryō wrote beforehand are completely different. In particular, the dimension in which the unity of loyalty and filial piety—which establishes *The Hidden Meaning*'s essential concept of "absolute loyalty and filial piety"—is approached differs. Enryō's absolute interpretation in *The Hid-*

den Meaning rejects the interpretations he had previously offered (the common understanding of the Imperial Rescript). It is completely different.⁴

Commentaries on the Rescript, including these by Enryō, totaled almost one hundred by 1902.⁵ There are no others like *The Hidden Meaning*. In *A Brief Explanation*, Enryō states, "Shallow in my learning, I worry that I am misunderstanding its [the Imperial Rescript's] essential meaning, and have thus consulted the following works." He lists nine, including INOUE Testujirō's 井上哲次郎 *Imperial Rescript Commentary* 『勅語衍義』 (p. 3). Judging from Enryō's tone in *The Hidden Meaning*, it appears that he considers all of them "common understandings." To be such, they must discuss loyalty and filial piety as two paths, and interpret "and thus" 以テ as referring to the text after "should emergency rise." In fact, there are two examples for each interpretation, but no text that exhibits both (see Appendix). None of them gives the typical relative interpretation that Enryō laughed at. In other words, the treatments of loyalty and filial piety and the understanding of the Rescript's "and thus" do not decisively distinguish the common interpretation and Enryō's hidden meaning as much as he would suggest.

The biggest and clearest difference between *The Hidden Meaning* and other commentaries was that it lacked a word-by-word explanation of the first line: "Our Imperial Ancestors have founded Our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue" 朕惟フニ我皇祖皇宗国ヲ肇ムルコト宏遠ニ徳を樹ソルコト深厚ナリ. A straightforward interpretation of this can be found in Enryō's aforementioned work *A Brief Explanation*: "The Imperial Ancestor Amaterasu Ōkami gave three sacred treasures [三種の神器] to her grandchild Ninigi-no-Mikoto, and made him the ruler of this country. Thus the unbroken Imperial Line and the endless Imperial Throne was established [...]" (p. 3). However, in *The Hidden Meaning*, with his interpretive forcefulness he offers a rather twisted interpretation: since the founding of Japan and the planting of virtue by the Imperial Ancestors does not apply to other countries, is particular

4 INOUE Enryō. 『忠孝活論』 [A living discourse on loyalty and filial piety] (Tōkyō: 哲学書院, 1893), 1–5, 61–81, etc. This text is a record of Enryō's lectures in the Philosophy Academy's Department of Japanese Ethics during the 1891 academic year. While it is primarily a criticism of Christianity based on a comparison of the Western doctrine of divine creation and the ("superior") Eastern idea of development, it does touch upon the a priori Imperial Household, the family nation doctrine, and the unity of loyalty and filial piety as special characteristics of Japanese morality. In this paper, I want to highlight how these various elements of absolute loyalty and filial piety—the core concept of *The Hidden Meaning*—are different from other interpretations of the Imperial Rescript during this time period.

5 WATARI Shōsaburō 互理章三郎. 『教育勅語釈義全書』 [Complete collection of Imperial Rescript Interpretations] (Tōkyō: 中文館書店, 1934), 569–575. While this book includes some duplicates entries for reprints and is not a complete list (it, for example, does not include *The Hidden Meaning*), it is useful for getting a sense of the number of commentaries published.

to Japan, and was proclaimed by the Meiji Emperor to be "far more vast and profound than other countries," "it is clear" that the Emperor was expressing "absolute loyalty and filial piety" (HMR: 34–35). Furthermore, he then ignores the order of the Rescript's text, jumping to its sixth item out of eight. This makes all of the text from "Know, Ye Subjects" to "thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth" be a single thought. This is clear editorial manipulation. If one straightforwardly understands the beginning of the Imperial Line and the founding of Japan like his work *Middle School Ethics* does at its beginning—"The Imperial Ancestor Amaterasu Kōdaijin [皇大神] sent her heavenly grandson Hikohono Ninigi-no-Mikoto to this land and made him its ruler" (p. 6)—then Japan's founding conditions could be nothing like imperial subjects' absolute loyalty and filial piety. The existence of an "a priori Imperial Household" that, according to *The Hidden Meaning*, gave birth to this absolute loyalty and filial piety would normally make Enryō's logic—the "cause" of absolute loyalty and filial piety giving rise to the "result" of the eternal Imperial Throne —invalid.

3.2 Overwriting Amaterasu's Divine Decree

The Hidden Meaning is not just a commentary on the Imperial Rescript: it is more a book presenting Enryō's own thought that borrows the authority of the Imperial Rescript.

In *The Hidden Meaning*, Enryō begins all of his interpretations after having taken as a premise that imperial subjects' absolute loyalty and filial piety guards and maintains the prosperity of the "Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth" (the continuity and flourishing of the Imperial Household and national polity). On the other hand, in the case of normal understandings of the Rescript, this imperial destiny is guaranteed a priori by Amaterasu's divine decree, which came before the promulgation of the Rescript. Therefore, the "unity" and "two paths" of loyalty and filial piety do not go out of the realm of rhetoric. In INOUE Tetsujirō's—state-authorized—commentary on the text, which Enryō consulted for *Proposal in Japanese Ethics* and was adopted as a textbook for teacher's schools, normal middle schools, and women's high schools, there is a statement similar to Enryō's views, albeit one in which the unity of filial piety and loyalty is arrived at from a different direction (the former is seen as leading to the latter).

There is no difference in the relationships found in the household of a family head, and in the country of a country's sovereign [...] in other words, filial piety should be directly expanded into loyalty. Loyalty and filial piety have different names but the same essence. Therefore, this is called "loyalty and filial piety being one substance" [忠孝一本]. This principle makes our country of Japan continually flourish forever.⁶

However, what starkly separates this text from Enryō is its view that loyalty and filial piety morality is Japan's tradition yet at the same time "unchanging from ancient times to the present and consistent in the East and West" 古今不變東西一貫 (pp. 121–22). Testujirō sees it as a universal virtue shared by all countries—"no matter what the country, there is a morality that should be praised in the same way; this is not something limited to our country" (pp. 128–29)—and concludes, "truly, obedience is a virtue of imperial subjects; if imperial subjects do not have the virtue of submission, society's order cannot be maintained and the country's welfare sought" (p. 104). This is a typical example of the "relative loyalty and filial piety" interpretation of which Enryō speaks. Since the eternal nature of the Imperial Fortune and Japan's uniqueness are ensured by Amaterasu's divine decree that requires no interpretation, the commentator can confidently assert the universality of the unity of loyalty and filial piety, and position it as an ethics for imperial subjects (subordinates). In the context of the international relations of the time, it would have been too much—and possibly have led to conflict with other countries—to overly assert Japan's uniqueness in Imperial Rescript-based national school education that used this commentary. As Testujirō points out in the introduction, his commentary was for "widely presenting to students" (p. 5) a Rescript interpretation that holds that "true patriotism does not set back global humanitarianism [...]. [A] patriotic spirit and global humanitarianism should co-exist, and we should not throw one of them out" (pp. 8–9).

A straightforward understanding would hold that the basis of the eternal Imperial Throne found in the Imperial Rescript is Amaterasu's divine decree. The source of Japanese morality was held to be the Imperial Ancestors "planting virtue" when the country was founded. Imperial subjects helping and protecting the Imperial Throne is their self-evident duty and a premise that was not up for discussion. There is no need for this eternal Imperial Throne that is guaranteed by a divine decree to rely on anything like absolute loyalty and filial piety. Regardless of whether loyalty and filial piety are one

⁶ INOUE Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎『増訂版 勅語衍義』[Imperial Rescript commentary: Expanded and revised edition], ed by NAKAMURA Masanao 中村正直 (Tōkyō: 文盛堂, 1899), vol. 2, pp. 108–109.

or two paths, the national polity that is particular to Japan is unaffected. This is because—as Enryō himself emphasizes in *The Hidden Meaning*—there is an a priori Imperial Household. In other words, the eternal and immortal nature of the Imperial Household is promised by Amaterasu's divine decree *before* the appearance of the imperial subjects that are being asked to guard and maintain it.

However, in *The Hidden Meaning*, Enryō does not stop his discussion here with the submission of imperial subjects. If the immortality of the Imperial Fortune is guaranteed by divine revelation, the issue arises as to why the Imperial Rescript on Education was promulgated at all and even goes as far to kindly call out to "Ye, Our subjects" for guarding and maintenance this fortune? Enryō's answer—although he does not clearly state this—is that the Imperial Rescript asks imperial subjects to guard and maintain the prosperity of the Imperial Throne in not only emergencies but also normal times because the Imperial Fortune is unsteady without their constant aid. If this is the case, the true foundation for the Imperial Throne being eternal is the help and protection of imperial subjects, and absolute loyalty and filial piety must be that which ensures that they will do so. From Enryō's perspective, regardless of what is said at the beginning of the Imperial Rescript, at the moment that the Emperor himself said "thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth." The absoluteness of Amaterasu's decree disappears, and the responsibility for maintaining the national polity that is particular to Japan was put in the hands of the agential imperial subjects who do this helping and protecting.

Enryō did not ignore the Imperial Rescript's opening statement only because it was inconvenient for his own argument. Insofar as the Imperial Rescript was the honorable "sacred teachings" of the Emperor and included "Ye, Our subjects [...] guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth," the interpretation found in *The Hidden Meaning* (that it is absolute loyalty and filial piety that guards and maintains the prosperity of the Imperial Household) remains unshaken—regardless if the moment that characterized Japan's founding was the divine decree. Enryō batted down any criticisms by arguing that with the appearance of absolute loyalty and filial piety, there is no need to discuss the likes of Amaterasu's divine decree, which is only based upon a myth.

It appears that the target of *The Hidden Meaning* was this divine decree, which even the greatest ideologue of the Bakumatsu period YOSHIDA Shōin 吉田松陰 recognized as dubious.⁷

7 Yamaguchi-ken Kyōikukai 山口県教育会, 『吉田松陰全集』 [Complete works of Yoshida Shōin], vol. 3

3.3 A "Human-Induced Disaster" and Betraying the "Great Path"

However, ultimately Enryō did not finish exterminating Amaterasu's divine decree via absolute loyalty and filial piety, which he had been getting ready to do from the beginning of *The Hidden Meaning*. Instead of developing this understanding further, he actually extinguished it, by replacing it with the common understanding of the Imperial Rescript.

A book published in 1905 includes a talk by Enryō entitled "On the Imperial Rescript" 「勅語の話」.⁸ Again, Enryō starts his discussion with his a priori Imperial Household / family-like organization theory. He states, "Reading the Imperial Rescript, the morality that our nation should follow" is the "two paths of loyalty and filial piety." He says that an ethics "based on the two paths of loyalty and filial piety, these two paths" (p. 2), is *the* Great Path established by the Imperial Ancestors. He continues by arguing that since the Imperial Rescript "begins with the word 'virtue' and ends with the word 'virtue' [...] it shows that the two branch paths of loyalty and filial piety split off from the tree of virtue." (pp. 4–5). However, this is the relative interpretation that he had spoken negatively of in *The Hidden Meaning*. In conclusion, he touches on absolute loyalty and filial piety, and quotes the phrase "ever united in loyalty and filial piety." Yet, in stark contrast to *The Hidden Meaning*, he sees this as the basis for "the idea that the two branch paths of loyalty and filial piety split off" from the tree of virtue. Since they are all the same tree of virtue, he says that he "called them absolute loyalty," and claims that the details of this "are explained in my book titled *The Hidden Meaning of the Imperial Rescript*" (p. 6).

Here, "absolute loyalty (and filial piety)" is nothing more than a general term for the two paths of loyalty and filial piety. It is hence just another name for "virtue" and comprised of relative loyalty and filial piety, which Enryō had previously dismissed as an ethics shared by other countries. In 1905, Enryō himself is rejecting the idea that the purpose of the Imperial Rescript's promulgation was "to articulate the morality that is

(Tōkyō: 岩波書店, 1939), 552. YOSHIDA Shōin, in a debate with YAMAGATA Taika 山県太華, ends his discussion (a reply to Taika's assessment of *Lectures on Confucius and Mencius* 『孔孟割記 (余話)』) while asserting that the "path of the imperial country" is dubious: "Considering the texts of the era of the gods [...] they are just questionable. One should not debate them. One should certainly not doubt them. The path of the imperial country is entirely based on the era of the gods. In other words, these texts should be followed by imperial subjects. Not discussing suspicious things is the height of modesty."

⁸ HAYAKAWA Kyōtarō 早川恭太郎, ed. 『軍人読本：遠征の慰籍』 [A reader for members of the military: comfort on an expedition] (Tōkyō: 同文館, 1905).

particular to Japan" (HMR: 5), for which he argued in *In The Hidden Meaning*. Why did Enryō change his interpretation so dramatically?

Immediately after *The Hidden Meaning* was published, the Philosophy Academy Incident 哲学館事件 occurred. There is no doubt that this exerted a decisive influence on Enryō's subsequent words and actions.

While it is very unlikely that it occurred due to a certain individual or group's plot or conspiracy, it also does not appear that it was a pure accident. Put plainly, the Philosophy Academy Incident arose because his words and actions were being closely watched by the authorities (Ministry of Education, etc.) that were involved in it, and these included *The Hidden Meaning*.

At the end of *The Hidden Meaning* one finds the following statement: "The above is my draft for the lecture at this academic year's summertime workshop" (HMR: 47). In other words, he had prepared it as a text for teaching. Before its publication, he used it to lecture on the Imperial Rescript for the general public.⁹ Insofar as he was using this commentary, it was possible that he would shake the foundation of Imperial Rescript-based ethics education. There was a good chance that he would present this same interpretation in lectures again after his book's publication. It's hard to believe that the authorities would have all overlooked this situation, or that they found his interpretation acceptable. During this time, there was a complicated political and social situation surrounding the Imperial Rescript on Education, as is apparent for example by the issue concerning the Second Imperial Rescript on Education 第二教育勅語. The Ministry of Education's Director General 総務長官 (and director of the Bureau of Common Educational Affairs 普通学務局) was OKADA Ryōhei 岡田良平, who was a lecturer at the Philosophy Academy when it was founded and also later became the president of Toyo University. The official advice to postpone the Philosophy Academy's ethics graduation exam—which is said to have been issued all of a sudden by the Ministry of Education—appears to not have been a case of oppression by state power but rather a personal suggestion or warning. Enryō described the Philosophy Academy Incident as a "human-induced disaster." Perhaps this was his own self-admonishment.

⁹ Tōyō Daigaku Sōritsu Hyakunenshi Hensan Inkaikai 東洋大学創立百年史編纂委員会 and Tōyō Daigaku Inoue Enryō Kinen Gakujutsu Sentā 東洋大学井上円了記念学術センター. 『東洋大学百年史：通史編1』 [100 year history of Toyo University: Diachronic history] (Tōkyō: 東洋大学, 1993), vol. 1, 311–314. The Philosophy Academic's summer lecture series was held a total of four times (1901, 1902, 1903, and 1907). There is a record of Enryō lecturing on the *The Hidden Meaning* only during the second series in 1902. Sixty-nine members of the general public came for four days of lectures between August 11th and 14th.

Today it is impossible to prove what it was that Enryō was aiming to do through *The Hidden Meaning*. We can only make inferences based on his many works. Our primary aid in doing so is his project to exterminate "mysteries" 妖怪, which he did not accomplish during his lifetime.

4. Exterminating Mysteries: A Novel Strategy

4.1 Imperial Household / National Polity = Substance of the Ideal = Essence of the True Mystery

In 1893, when Enryō published his first commentary on the Imperial Rescript in *Proposal in Japanese Ethics*, he published *Introduction to Lectures on Mystery Studies* 『妖怪学講義緒言』. Therein, he states that "starting research on mysteries [...] and the present public release of [my] mystery studies lectures has two major aims: to protect the country and love the truth."¹⁰ He declares that "vulgar mysteries are not the True Mystery [真怪] but alleged ones; truly, the aim of mystery studies is to do away with alleged mysteries [假怪] and reveal the True Mystery" (p. 6). He proceeds to explain the True Mystery as follows:

I believe that it is the ideal being [理想の實在] [...]. In terms of this human world, I believe that the Imperial Household and national polity is the lustrous brilliance of the ideal [理想の精彩光華なる] [...]. In terms of the country, the pureness of the Imperial Household's sacredness and the vitality of our loyalty and filial piety mutually reflect upon each other, and one sees the national polity glistening in a completely spiritual divine light. I believe that if the results of my research on mysteries fully do away with alleged mysteries and reveal the True Mystery, people will thoroughly realize this truth. (p. 33)

He then continues as follows:

In recent years [...] with the national polity decreasing in sacredness and loyalty and filial piety losing their vigor, revealing this truth is not only needed for the True Mystery but is truly a matter of great urgency for the country. (p. 34)

In this world, there is the "ideal" of the "Imperial Household and national polity." It reflects the Imperial Household's sacred purity and the vigor of imperial subject's loyalty

¹⁰ INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『妖怪学講義緒言』 [Introduction to Lectures on Mystery Studies] (Tōkyō: 哲学館, 1893), 33.

and filial piety. However, in recent years, the sacredness of the Imperial Household has been decreasing, and the vigor of loyalty and filial piety is being lost. This was the reason that Enryō started the field of mystery studies. Enryō forcefully states that the revival of these two elements—heightening the sacredness of the Imperial Household and invigorating subjects' loyalty and filial piety—is an urgent task not only for the academic pursuit of truth but also the country. This is what Enryō meant by "protecting the country and loving the truth." He explains that in order to do so, one must eliminate alleged mysteries and reveal the True Mystery. In other words, Enryō saw "alleged mysteries" as that which are decreasing the sacredness of the Imperial Household and leading to a loss of imperial subjects' loyalty and filial piety.

Enryō continues his explanation, stating that the True Mystery—which is also called the Ideal Mystery 理怪—is the "Real Essence [...] that is from the beginning of the beginningless to the end of the endless within the limit of the limitless, the boundary of the boundless" 無始の始より無終の終に至る迄無限の限無涯の涯の間 [...] の真体, and "called god in our country" (pp. 8–9). Being in Japan, it is clear what Enryō is referring to, and we can also begin to see the identity of alleged mysteries. Enryō continues, "The ideal essence [理想の本体] is the infinite and absolute ruler [無限絶対の帝王] that controls the entirety of the universe. When ruling this world, it makes us subordinate to the two ministers of matter and mind [物心二大臣]" (p. 10). Here, we should note that imperial subjects are made subordinate not to the "infinite and absolute ruler" but the "two ministers of matter and mind."

4.2 Absolute Subjects: The Unity of Agency and Subordination

The word *shinmin* 臣民 or "(imperial) subjects" first appeared in the Constitution of the Empire of Japan (the minister of matter) and were addressed in the Imperial Rescript on Education (the minister of the mind): "Know ye, Our subjects." Members of a fledgling nation thereby came to know themselves as (subordinate) imperial subjects. However, here there is only room for the Emperor that addresses his imperial subjects and the imperial subjects that are being addressed. Yet, from Enryō's perspective, "ministers" come between them, making us subordinate to the government, which is the cause of the decline of the Imperial Household and national polity. The fundamental idea of Enryō's mystery studies—announced in his 1893 *Introduction to Lectures on Mystery Studies* and directly inherited nine years later in *The Hidden Meaning*—was that, by eliminating these ministers and directly connecting the Emperor and his imperial sub-

jects, the purity of the Imperial Household and the vitality of imperial subjects could be restored.

The Hidden Meaning was not part of Enryō's educational endeavors but directly arose out of mystery (studies). He obediently lectured upon the—relative—common understanding of the Imperial Rescript in his "surface-oriented" education while secretly giving precedence to its "underside" absolute interpretation (its "hidden meaning") in his mystery studies. He states the following in *Introduction to Lectures on Mystery Studies*:

Mystery studies [...] is the stage prior to carrying out education. [...] Education's so-called knowledge-cultivation and virtue-cultivation should be developed after the bright moon of the True Mystery has been revealed by mystery studies. (pp. 34–35)

In 1892—at the beginning of which Enryō had shown extraordinary determination—the Rescript's "hidden meaning" appeared all of a sudden in his educational endeavors.

The aim of Enryō's extermination of mysteries was to change the position (identity) of imperial subjects from *subordinate subjects* 従属者 to *agential subjects* 主体者. The absolute and unknowable mystery that Enryō speaks of is the eternal Imperial Throne, in other words, Japan's national polity. The alleged mysteries that he tried to eliminate were Amaterasu's divine decree that was based—only—on myth, and the government of the time that was subduing the imperial subjects by using as a cover the "Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth"—held to have been—guaranteed by this divine decree. The True Mystery that he would reveal was "absolute subjects," which were comprised inseparably of imperial subjects as the agents of absolute loyalty and filial piety and of the Emperor (Imperial Household / Imperial Line) as a vessel leading imperial subjects to awaken to their nature as such. This was the Imperial Household and national polity—unparalleled in all countries and coeval with heaven and earth—which Enryō was trying to "develop" with *The Hidden Meaning*, and which was to be revealed in his mystery studies as the essence of the True Mystery.

4.3 In Lieu of a Conclusion: Enryō's Mystic Nationalism "The Sovereignty of Imperial Subjects"

As previously mentioned, while the Imperial Rescript's "true in all places" 中外ニ施シテ悖ラス is normally understood to mean "this is true both domestically and internationally," Enryō saw this passage as saying that "Japan's absolute loyalty (filial piety) can

be fit without any problem to any overseas country." Structurally this assertion touches on the ambiguity of particularity and universality with regard to Japan's "Great Path" (absolute loyalty / filial piety).

This is homologous with NISHIDA Kitarō's 西田幾多郎 discussion of the contradictory identity of the many and the one. Nishida's worked on the philosophical and intellectual issue of how to manage Japan's particularity, that is, the Imperial Lineage / Emperor system (especially as it related to Japan's unique national polity) in order to have Japan not be buried in the world and, while not being self-righteous, continue being Japan. Enryō's *The Hidden Meaning* preceded Nishida's tackling of this issue and tried to go beyond it on the level of action.

Enryō saw that which Nishida called the "place of absolute nothingness" (*zettaimu no basho* 絶対無の場所) and located within the depths of oneself as an absolute site at which one can be aware of oneself as an imperial subject. He called this the True Mystery. He located this in the external national polity that transcended oneself, or the a priori Imperial Household (the Emperor / Imperial Line; elements comprising this national polity). By intuiting the pronouncements of the a priori Imperial Household (not relying on the orders of the likes of a mediating government or even the Emperor's words after the Imperial Rescript's promulgation) as its subordinate imperial subjects, they act as agential imperial subjects. When this happens, just like Nishida's place of absolute nothingness, the a priori Imperial Household is the absolute as well as nothingness that has no content of its own; as discussed above, it is a vessel that reflects imperial subjects. In order for this absolute Imperial Fortune of nothingness to exist, a complete individualism or egalitarianism that rejects anything that intervenes (the "two ministers of matter and mind" / the government) is necessary. Here one can also get a glimpse of the Amida Buddhist universal salvation thought that served as Enryō's religious foundation and in which Nishida would also take a strong interest in his later years.

Enryō's nationalism in *The Hidden Meaning* could be described as a non-state-centric ideology of the Japanese national polity that is based on absolute subjects formed out of the unity of subordinate subjects and agential subjects. In other words, it emphasizes the *sovereignty of imperial subjects* 臣民主権. This nationalism can only exist by imperial subjects having an active awareness of themselves as the country's sovereigns. It rejects Amaterasu's divine decree as an "alleged mystery" that makes agential imperial subjects see themselves as subordinate subjects. Enryō must have foreseen what lay ahead after turning people into a Japanese nation without them having seen themselves as imperial subjects in the above-described sense. The instant that in

Japan's particularity (its Emperor system) the realization of a universal ideal was found became wrapped up in survival of the fittest thought from overseas and resulted in seeing Japan—this "actually existent" and "best" system in the world—as superior to other countries. Even without our present historical hindsight it is clear that its logical conclusion was the view that Japan is a divine country. In the nationalism that Enryō was aiming for in his *The Hidden Meaning*, which was based on people becoming aware and intuiting themselves as imperial subjects, Japan's particularity is a vessel (device) that both reflects individuals and is unique to it as a family-like country. No matter how much it surpasses the rest of the world it cannot be applied to anyone but the family that is Japan; it remains unique to Japan. Enryō conceived of a mystical nationalism that was completely unrelated to an aggressive expansionism.

In other words, he used the two major elements that normally support the Emperor system state / national polity discourse (the idea that Japan was a single family comprised of the sovereign and his subjects, and guarding and maintaining the Imperial Line via loyalty and filial piety) against it. Using the Imperial Rescript (an Emperor system ideology textbook)—especially its status as the Emperor's words—to his own aims, he tried to develop the idea of the sovereignty of imperial subjects. This appears to have been the true nature of Enryō's nationalism. However, to use this for one's own purposes without obviously going against authority / power is a double-edged sword, and one must be always aware of the pitfalls that await. Imperial subjects awakening to and intuiting themselves as agential subjects is the indispensable basis of Enryō's ideology of the sovereignty of imperial subjects. For Enryō, the pitfall was just this lack of awareness as sovereign subjects.

In the end, Enryō's nationalism and extermination of mysteries did not become a reality. It is rare for a single outstanding individual to make history. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the people of Japan were not inclined to have Enryō play the leading role of their era. In the end, the "alleged mysteries" that escaped extermination due to Enryō's failure ran rampant throughout Japan. What kind of country did they give rise to a half century later? With this in mind, *The Hidden Meaning* and the core of Enryō's thought seem to present a choice to us today: will we remain subordinate subjects or become agential ones?

Supplement: Inoue Enryō, The Mystic Nationalist

Two years before publishing *The Hidden Meaning*, Enryō presented ideas that are completely the opposite of it in an article in *Journal of Mystery Studies* 『妖怪学雑誌』 8 (July 25, 1900) entitled "On War" 「戦争論」.¹¹

Generally speaking there are three types of war: wars of heaven, wars of people, and wars of the mind. [...] If one wishes for a country to flourish, one definitely must hope that it achieve victory in the three types of wars. [...] The greatest obstacle in the three types of wars is people's illusions [迷い]. [...] There are three things that do away with illusions. (pp. 1–2)

He then lists education, religion, and mystery studies. Stating that all Eastern countries besides Japan are wandering in the clouds of illusion, he concludes,

If there is anything that defends the basis of illusion, the three allied armies of education, religion, and mystery must join together to attack all at once. China was attacked by the European and American allied armies. If this is not followed by the allied army of education, religion, and mysteries, then we will be unable to see the sunlight of civilization in the East for a long time. (p. 3)

It is difficult to describe Enryō's nationalism using just one of his works. The nationalism found in *The Hidden Meaning* might be only a little fragment of the actual mystical nationalist he was. Perhaps Enryō himself was the True Mystery that needed to be revealed—by he himself. Or, maybe for Enryō nationalism and the like was just a single means for protecting Japan, an expedient means that he freely used according to his needs in accordance with the context.

There are many issues that still remain to be examined regarding Enryō's thought, such as its formation, similarities and differences with contemporaneous thought, and influence on later generations. This paper only outlined one part of the—mystic—nationalism that appeared in *The Hidden Meaning*.

¹¹ INOUE Enryō 井上田了. 『哲学館講義録：妖怪学講義附録』 [Transcripts of Philosophy Academy Lectures: Mystery Studies Lectures supplement] 8 (Tōkyō: 哲学館). Date of publication and publisher unclear. According to National Diet Library, 1916.

Appendix

Below I have listed the texts that Enryō gives as references in *A Brief Explanation of the Imperial Rescript* in the order that they appear.

- (1) Kokka Kyōikusha 国家教育社, ed. 『聖諭大全』 [Complete collection of sacred teachings] (Tōkyō: 大日本国書株式会社, 1891).
- (2) SHIGENO Tasutsugu 重野安繹. 『教育勅諭衍義』 [Commentary on the imperial teachings on education] (Tōkyō: 小林喜右衛門, 1892).
- (3) NAKA Michiyo 那珂通世 and AKIYAMA Shirō 秋山四郎. 『教育勅諭衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 共益商社書店, 1890)
- (4) INOUE Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 『勅諭衍義』 [Imperial Rescript commentary], ed. by NAKAMURA Masanao 中村正直 (Tōkyō: 井上蘇士・井上弘太郎, 1891).
- (5) NAITŌ Chisō 内藤耻叟. 『勅諭解釋』 [Interpretation of the imperial Rescript] (Tōkyō: 青山清吉, 1890).
- (6) SUEMATSU Kenchō 末松謙澄. 『勅諭修身經詳解』 [Detailed explanation of the scripture on the imperial teachings regarding self-cultivation] (Tōkyō: 金港堂, 1891). Abbr. by Enryō as 『勅諭詳解』.
- (7) KURITA Hiroshi 栗田寛. 『勅諭講義』 [Imperial Rescript lecture] (Tōkyō: 博文館, 1892).
- (8) WATANABE Busuke 渡邊武助. 『勅諭註解日本教育之基礎』 [Commentary on the imperial Rescript, the foundation of Japanese education], ed. by NISHIMURA Shigeki 西村茂樹 (Tōkyō: 中村與右衛門, 1891).
- (9) IMAIZUMI Teisuke 今泉定介. 『教育勅諭衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 普及舎, 1891).

For reference I have indicated in the below table how the above texts treat "loyalty" and "filial piety," as well as their understanding of the means by which the "Imperial Throne" is guarded and maintained. The highlighted portions indicate what Enryō would consider the "common understanding" of the Rescript.

Text	Treatment of "Loyalty and Filial Piety"	Scope of "Guard and Maintain"
1.	"Loyalty and filial piety both complete" 忠孝両全: Loyalty → filial piety; filial piety → loyalty	"Like described in the above items [...]"
2.	"Loyalty and filial piety are not two" 忠孝二致なく: Loyalty to the sovereign → filial piety towards parents	"Refers to all of the items stated above."
3.	"Loyalty and filial piety [...] are in essence the same" 忠と孝とは [...] 実は同じ: Loyalty = filial piety	"From 'be filial to your parents' to 'offer yourselves courageously to the State.'"
4.	"Loyalty and filial piety are one" 忠孝一本: Loyalty = filial piety	No explanation (Judging from the text: from "be filial to your parents")
5.	"Be filial to your father, be loyal to the sovereign" 父に孝に、君に忠: Loyalty ≠ filial piety	"Do good deeds [...]." From "be filial to your parents"
6.	"Loyalty [...] sovereign, filial piety [...] parents" 忠 [...] 君、孝 [...] 父母: Loyalty ≠ filial piety	" 'Respect the Constitution' above [...]"
7.	"Loyalty and filial piety [...] originally are one" 忠孝 [...] もと一つ: Loyalty = filial piety	Interpreted as referring to everything below "should emergency arise"
8.	"So-called loyalty and filial piety are one" 所謂忠孝一致なり: Loyalty = filial piety	Interpreted as referring to everything below "should emergency arise"
9.	"Have both loyalty and filial piety" 忠と孝を兼ね具へ: Loyalty to sovereign = loyalty + filial piety	"Study [学問ヲ修メ] [...] and make the Imperial Throne prosper"

Bibliography

- HAYAKAWA Kyōtarō 早川恭太郎, ed. 『軍人読本：遠征の慰籍』 [A reader for members of the military: Comfort on an expedition] (Tōkyō: 同文館, 1905).
- IMAIZUMI Teisuke 今泉定介. 『教育勅語衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 普及舎, 1891).
- INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『中等倫理書』 [Middle school ethics], vol. 1 (Tōkyō: 集英堂, 1898).
———. 『勅語略解』 [A brief explanation of the Imperial Rescript] (Tōkyō: 三育社, 1900).
———. 『妖怪学講義緒言』 [Introduction to Lectures on Mystery Studies] (Tōkyō: 哲学館, 1893).
———. 『日本倫理学案』 [Proposal in Japanese ethics] (Tōkyō: 哲学書院, 1896) (1st ed. 1893; rev. yearly).
———. 『雨水論集』 [Collection of (Inoue Enryō) Hosui's writings] (Tōkyō: 博文館, 1902).
———. 『哲学館講義録：妖怪学講義附録』 [Transcripts of Philosophy Academy Lectures, Mystery Studies Lectures supplement] 8 (Tōkyō: 哲学館) (Date of publication and publisher unclear. According to National Diet Library, 1916).
———. 『忠孝活論』 [A living discourse on loyalty and filial piety] (Tōkyō: 哲学書院, 1893).
- INOUE Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎 『勅語衍義』 [Imperial Rescript commentary], ed. by NAKAMURA Masanao 中村正直 (Tōkyō: 井上蘇士・井上弘太郎, 1891).
———. 『増訂版 勅語衍義』 [Imperial Rescript commentary: Expanded and revised edition], ed. by NAKAMURA Masanao 中村正直 (Tōkyō: 文盛堂, 1899).
- Kokka Kyōikusha 国家教育社, ed. 『聖諭大全』 [Complete collection of sacred teachings] (Tōkyō: 大日本国書株式会社, 1891).
- KURITA Hiroshi 栗田寛. 『勅語講義』 [Imperial Rescript lecture] (Tōkyō: 博文館, 1892).
- Monbushō 文部省. 『〈漢英仏独〉教育勅語訳纂』 [Collection of Chinese, English, French, and German translations of the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 文部省, 1909).
- NAITŌ Chisō 内藤耻叟. 『勅語解釋』 [Interpretation of the Imperial Rescript] (Tōkyō: 青山清吉, 1890).
- NAKA Michiyo 那珂通世 and AKIYAMA Shirō 秋山四郎. 『教育勅語衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript on Education] (Tōkyō: 共益商社書店, 1890).
- NAKA Michiyo 那珂通世. 『教育勅語衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript], ed. by AKIYAMA Shirō 秋山四郎 (Tōkyō: 共益商社書店, 1891).

- SHIGENO Tasutsugu 重野安釋. 『教育勅諭衍義』 [Commentary on the Imperial teachings on education] (Tōkyō: 小林喜右衛門, 1892).
- SUEMATSU Kenchō 末松謙澄. 『勅諭修身経詳解』 [Detailed explanation of the scripture on the Imperial teachings regarding self-cultivation] (Tōkyō: 金港堂, 1891).
- Tōyō Daigaku Sōritsu Hyakunenshi Hensan linkai 東洋大学創立百年史編纂委員会 and Tōyō Daigaku Inoue Enryō Kinen Gakujutsu Sentā 東洋大学井上円了記念学術センター. 『東洋大学百年史：通史編』 [100 year history of Toyo University: Diachronic history], vol. 1 (Tōkyō: 東洋大学, 1993).
- Tōyō Daigaku 東洋大学. 「井上円了選集テキストデータ」 [Inoue Enryō selected writings text data] vols. 11, 16, 20, 21, 25. http://www.toyo.ac.jp/text-db/enryo_text.htm
- WATANABE Busuke 渡邊武助. 『勅語註解日本教育之基礎』 [Commentary on the Imperial Rescript, the foundation of Japanese education], ed. by NISHIMURA Shigeki 西村茂樹 (Tōkyō: 中村與右衛門, 1891).
- WATARI Shōsaburō 亘理章三郎. 『教育勅語釈義全書』 [Complete collection of Imperial Rescript interpretations] (Tōkyō: 中文館書店, 1934).
- Yamaguchi-ken Kyōikukai 山口県教育会. 『吉田松陰全集』 [Complete works of Yoshida Shōin], vol. 3 (Tōkyō: 岩波書店, 1939).