

AN EVENING CONVERSATION ABOUT PHILOSOPHY

INOUE Enryō 井上円了

Translated by Ralf MÜLLER

- I. Discussing the Relation of the Worlds of Matter and Mind
- II. Discussing the Original Substance of God
- III. Discussing the Nature of Truth

⁰ The translator, Ralf MÜLLER (Universität Hildesheim, Germany), wishes to thank Adam LOUGHNANE (University College Cork) for English proofreading and stylistic and linguistic advice and Rainer SCHULZER for his INOUE Enryō expertise, suggestions for careful revisions, and efforts to edit the translated text for publication.

PROLOGUE

One day while taking a round trip on a small steamboat in a certain area, five or six passengers were sitting next to me. [Their] conversation turned towards philosophy [哲学].

The first [of them] said: A while ago a new sort of study [学問] called philosophy came from the West, but just what kind of a study is it?

The second said: I have heard that philosophy is the study that investigates principles [究理].

The third said: The study [学; or, learning] that investigates principles is, in other words, the study of the principles of matter [物理学; i.e., physics] and is not philosophy. In my view, since the character for *tetsu* [哲] is the character of *kentetsu* [賢哲; i.e., wise person], philosophy is the study of the saints and sages, such as the study of Confucius and Mencius.

The fourth said: Philosophy is not such a shallow thing as the study of Confucius and Mencius. Once I read *A New Theory of Ethics* [倫理新説] by Mr. Inoue Tetsujirō [井上 哲次郎] and I was surprised how lofty philosophy is.

The fifth said: Back then Professor Nishi Amane [西周] was said to do philosophy. I have read a book about the principles of mind [心理] that he translated, and so have learned that philosophy is the study of the principles of the mind [心理学; i.e., psychology].

The sixth said: I have heard that Master Hara Tanzan [原坦山], the Buddhist scholar, has become professor at the philosophy department of [Tokyo] University. So, looking at it this way, the teachings of the Buddha [仏教] must be philosophy.

The seventh said: All your views [説] are different. So then, what really is this thing called philosophy? It seems that we still do not know.

The first laughed and said: That which we cannot know, probably this is philosophy!

The crowd joined in laughter: So it is, so it is!

Sitting close by, I overheard this [conversation] and could not help but laugh. In short, all these views differed because they really did not know what philosophy is. To begin with, among the things that appear [現存] in the universe there are those that have [a concrete] form and those that do not. The sun, moon and stars, the earth, mountains and plants, birds or beasts, fish, or worms have form. Sensations [感覺], ideas, society [社会], gods, and Buddhas [神仏] do not have form. The studies that experiment with [or,

experience; 実験する] that which has form are called the sciences [理学]. The studies that thoroughly investigate [or, discuss; 論究] those things without form are called philosophy. This is one point in which the sciences and philosophy differ. Or, to put this another way, that which experiments with one part of [all] things is called the sciences; and that which thoroughly investigates the entirety of things is what is called philosophy. Or sciences learn by experimenting, and philosophy learns by [investigating] ideas [思想の学]. In short, sciences are the studies that have to do with matter [物質], which has form, and philosophy is the study that has to do with the mind, which has no form. And so, among the studies that have to do with the mind there are various disciplines [諸科] such as psychology, logic, ethics, and pure philosophy [or, metaphysics; 純正哲学]. Among these, people know more or less about psychology or logic, but when it comes to pure philosophy, people do not know in the least what kind of study it is. To put it briefly, one must say that pure philosophy is the study that thoroughly discusses the axioms of truth [真理の原則] and the foundation of all studies, since it is the study of pure principles [純理] within philosophy. If one discusses [these principles] thoroughly, questions will arise such as these: What is the real substance [実体] of mind? What is the real substance of matter, what is the original source [本源] of matter and mind? And what is the relation of matter and mind? Pure philosophy, therefore, takes the interpretation [解釈] and explanation of these [matters] as its objective. Now, since I want to show these matters of pure philosophy and their interpretations to those people who are not acquainted with philosophy at all, I came to compose *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy* in several parts. The first part discusses the relation of matter and mind and demonstrates what the world is made of; the second part discusses the original substance [本体] of god and sets out where matter and mind arise from; the third part discusses the nature [性質] of truth and what the different studies are founded upon. I would be extraordinarily happy if in the end a few readers of this little book are able to grasp some insight into what pure philosophy is.

7th Month of 1886

The Author

PART ONE

DISCUSSING THE RELATION OF THE WORLDS OF MATTER AND MIND

Introduction

Many people who discuss the principles of philosophy [哲理] in this world do not attain the impartiality of logic [論理の中正], since each is biased in one respect. I have immersed myself in this vice and draw up my account to demonstrate the middle path [中道] with respect to the philosophical principles, in particular, by preparing a dialogue, and thereby, to inform people in this world about philosophy. Roughly speaking, the questions that are discussed in philosophy come down to nothing other than the following: What is mind? What is matter? What is the world? To maintain that the world is merely matter, not mind, is what is called materialism [唯物論]. To maintain that the world exists within the mind and that there is nothing outside of it is what is called idealism [唯心論]. Idealism is biased towards mind, materialism towards matter, and it is obvious that neither are impartial positions. If we desire to maintain such impartiality, we must unite [統合] both matter and mind and take the principles of neither matter nor mind [非物非心の理] as the origin [本]. When one maintains that there is neither matter nor mind outside of these principles [理], this is called principlism [唯理論]. However, since principlism is biased towards principles, it is, still, not an impartial position. Furthermore, to say that matter and mind exist apart from principles is also not an impartial position. Therefore, principles embrace matter and mind, and matter and mind are furnished with principles, and both sides are distinct but are not separate from each other. Even though they cannot be separated, it is not that they are non-distinct. This is the middle path of the principles of philosophy. I trust that the reader of this work will learn about the relation of this middle path more or less. This small piece constitutes the introduction.

In the school of Master Full Perfection [*enryō* 円了] there were two philosophers, Mr. Full Mountain [円山] and Mr. Perfect Water [了水], and they were the best disciples. One night they met in the moonlight and [sitting] in the front yard they praised the moon. The conversation turned to the principles of philosophy.

Perfect Water said: The full moon [明月] moves me deeply. All people are acquainted with the moon shining brightly, but nobody knows why it hangs up in the sky. They know it appears, rises and falls every night, but they do not know how it came to be in the beginning nor how it will perish in the end. When one extends these [questions] and thinks about personal matters or broadens them and ponders the world, what kind of mind really does not retain at least some doubts when no one knows about these matters? Therefore, I wish to discuss what the world is. Would you not like to discuss this?

Full Mountain said: The world is much like fabric. Time is the warp and space is the weft, and the patterns of the thousand modes and ten thousand states [千態万状], which are interwoven throughout the warp and weft are the transformations [變化] of the ten thousand things [万物; or, all beings]. That which occupies the smallest and shortest part of this transformation is our human life. Even though one says that man possesses a body of five *shaku* [尺; ca. 30 cm] and a lifespan of 50 years, if one compares it to endless time and space, one's body is no more than a millet of corn in the blue ocean, and its longevity does not last for a wink or a breath. Given such a tiny and short life, I cannot help to say that it is mere confusion to want to know what this world is that is built from vast time and enormous space.

Perfect Water said: This is not the confusion [惑い] of man, it is your confusion. Since space and time are images [影像] that man projects through his mind, the entire world appears within that mind, and among the ten thousand things there is not a single piece that is not [the mind's] representation [表象].

Full Mountain asked: How do you prove this principle [理]?

[Perfect Water] said: What we call the ten thousand things is composed of the five realms [境], i.e., color, sound, smell, taste, and touch, and those five realms are the [entities'] nature that arises when we feel [感触] with our five senses of the eyes, the ears, the nose, the tongue, and the body [身]. Who knows color fully without eyes, sound fully without ears, and taste, smell, or form fully without tongue, nose, or body? And so, since there is no principle according to which we can know that there is distinct matter apart from that nature, it is obvious that the ten thousand things are phenomena [現象] that arise within the field of our sensations.

Full Mountain asked: Even if it is true that the ten thousand things exist within our sensations, how can you maintain that space and time are within sensation?

[Perfect Water] said: We know there is space because things are big or small, distant or close, and we know that things are big or small, distant or close because of the sensations of our hands and feet. It is the same with time. When hands and feet

work and move, we are able to know the duration of time because of that sensation.

Full Mountain said: Even if it is true, as you say, that time and space and the ten thousand things are within [our] sensations, one may still not say that they exist within our minds. Even if one can call sensations the outer realm [外部] of the mind, since they take their place [位する] in between the world of mind and the world of matter, the [mind's] inner realm [内部] itself is different [from the outer realm]. So, how can you, nevertheless, say that what exists within sensation exists within the mind?

[Perfect Water] said: What exists in sensations is precisely what exists in the mind. Although sensations are acts [作用] arising in the outer realm of the mind and are not acts of conscious perception [意識知覚] arising in the inner realm of the mind, knowing that sound is sound and color is color and that sensation is sensation are, clearly, acts of perception that arise in the inner realm of the mind. If this was not perception and was limited to simple sensation, there would be no principle according to which we could know what things are. If we know this at all, it relates to consciousness and is an act within the mind.

Full Mountain said: I will give an example and I would like to ask what you think. As a test, let us have a look at the moon presently hanging up in the sky. That we know it, is not that we know the substance [体] directly that exists ten thousand *ri* [里; ca. 3,9 km] from here, but is to know that the moon appears only after the light that radiates from its substance enters our eyeballs and forms an image on the retina that passes through the optic nerve into the brain. For this reason, the moon that we know is the moon inside of the brain and not the one that is hanging up in the sky. That is valid not only for the moon. All things become things only after entering our brain. Based on this principle, is the interpretation not appropriate that the ten thousand things exist within the mind?

[Full Mountain went on and] said: It is not impossible to make such an interpretation. If you were really to do so, I would wish to reprimand you. Even if we assume that the moon that we know exists within the mind, the original substance whose image appears within the mind must exist outside of the mind. If it were the case that it did not exist, there would be no principle according to which its image could appear within the mind. To use an analogy, it is like seeing the light of the moon in a mirror. Its image appears on the surface of the mirror because its real substance is outside of the mirror.

Perfect Water said: This is mere speculation [推想]. What I know directly is the moon within the mind, not the moon outside of the mind. And so, to say that its real substance can exist outside of the mind, does not entail that I know that it truly exists. This is nothing more than to hypothesize [憶定する] that it must exist based on speculation. Therefore, you cannot take this principle as though it proves the assumption that the real substance of the ten thousand things truly exists outside of the mind.

Full Mountain said: Although it is nothing but speculation to assume that material substance [物体] exists outside of the mind, it is likewise nothing but speculation to assume that it does not. When one asks which of these speculations is the most plausible, then [it seems to me that] to decide [断定] that the former is correct is what the principle originally dictates.

Perfect Water said: I assume that the whole world and the ten thousand things exist inside the mind, but that does not mean that their real substance is not outside of the mind. All I claim is that the ten thousand things are the ten thousand things I know within the mind. And speculations about material substance outside of the mind are ideas that arise from the mind, since they are, in other words, acts of consciousness. Both to assume that they exist [outside of the mind] and to assume that they do not is the energy of thinking [思想の力]. If one sees it from this point of view, one can say that not a single thing exists outside of the mind.

Full Mountain said: If it were the case that there really is not a single thing outside of the mind, there is no principle that dictates that something I do not know within my mind can exist in the world. But how then could the unthinkable or unknowable exist?

[Perfect Water] said: Both the unthinkable and the unknowable are ideas within our minds. We think that we cannot think the unthinkable, and we know that we cannot know the unknowable. Both knowing and not knowing are acts of thinking. Both to think something exists or to think it does not are acts of consciousness. Both me arguing like this and you rebuking me are likewise the energy [力] of the mind.

Full Mountain said: If one follows your argument, one must say that there is simply one mind in the world. However, since the things we know exist in correlative dependence with each other [互いに相対待して存する], there is no principle that maintains that there is only one thing alone without another. In particular, since the mind is the name for what emerges correlative to matter, the principle dictates that

no mind exists without matter. How could it be that there is only mind, but not matter?

Perfect Water said: Assuming that mind and matter co-exist is an act of the mind and to say there is mind or to say there is no mind are likewise acts of the mind.

Full Mountain said: What is the real substance of the mind, where does it come from and who created it?

[Perfect Water] said: All discussions like these are also the mind. To say one cannot know the real substance of the mind is mind. And to argue that its substance is the heavenly deity [天神] is mind, too.

Full Mountain said: At this point, I know for the first time what you mean. Above all, you mean to say there is no difference: both I and he, West and East, past and present, gods and Buddhas all exist in one mind, right?

[Perfect Water] said: Yes.

[Full Mountain said:] But if this were ultimately the case, then I have to ask one question: How can we be different in the one mind of non-differentiation? Both you and I are in one mind, but you are not me, and I am not you. The principle is that even if I die you do not perish, even if you perish, the ten thousand things appear as before. There is no principle that dictates that there are past and present, but there are past and present and there is no principle that dictates that there are East and West, but there are East and West.

Perfect Water kept quiet and spoke after a brief pause: I have not, yet, investigated this thoroughly.

Full Mountain said: Although your argumentation is perhaps plausible, having arrived at this point I am not able to grasp it. Therefore, I assume that man is one part of the ten thousand things between heaven and earth, and mind is one part of this part. You are an individual human being, I am also an individual human being. Your mind is an individual mind, my mind is also an individual mind. Speaking of man, he and I are, of course, distinct, and speaking of the mind, self and other are, of course, distinct. Time has past and present, space has East and West.

Perfect Water said: Well, in this case would you maintain that there is a difference between matter and mind?

[Full Mountain] said: Yes!

[Perfect Water said:] And regarding what is this difference maintained?

[Full Mountain] said: Although in matter there is the property [形] of big and small or the quality [質] of soft and hard, these forms [形質] do not exist in the mind. Thereby one distinguishes the two.

Perfect Water said: Even if one can know the nature of matter because of the energy of the mind, how does one know the nature of the mind?

[Full Mountain] said: One knows the mind because of matter.

Perfect Water said: How on earth could matter possess the energy to know the mind?

[Full Mountain] said: Although it is not the case that matter knows the mind directly, it is because there is matter that one can know that there is mind.

Perfect Water said: Then, to know matter by mind is mind, too. To know the mind by matter is mind, too. The difference of matter and mind is within the mind, is it not?

Full Mountain kept silent.

Perfect Water asked another question: Even if one assumes that for ages there has been a difference between matter and mind, was there really a difference when one thinks about this upon tracing it back to its origin?

[Full Mountain] said: There was.

[Perfect Water said]: If so, I do not know how many tens of thousands of these things exist today across heaven and earth: the sun, moon and stars, mountains, rivers and plants, birds, beasts, and worms. Were these all differentiated in ancient times?

[Full Mountain] said: Regarding these many ten thousand species [種類], it is doubtless that there was first one, then there were two species and these differentiated and became more and more specific, but the difference between matter and mind must have been in place from the beginning.

Perfect Water said: When one knows that it was apparently not the case that the ten thousand things were originally differentiated, one can likewise know by inference [推して知る] that matter and mind were not different in the beginning.

Full Mountain said: Although the ten thousand things possessed a more or less similar nature, since matter and mind have an entirely opposite nature, the two must have been different from the beginning.

Perfect Water said: Then let me raise another question. Is it only man who possesses mind and animals and plants do not have it at all?

[Full Mountain] said: What I call the mind is only possessed by man not animals.

Perfect Water said: When one compares the lowest man with the highest animal, then one hardly sees any psychological gap between the two. In fact, at times man is not even at the level of an animal. Next, when one compares animals and plants, it is not possible to maintain a strict distinction between their two worlds. And it is

the same if one compares plants and inorganic matter. Thus, there is the principle that dictates that since mankind apparently possesses mind, animals must also partake in it, and since animals apparently possess mind, plants must also partake in it, and since plants apparently possess mind, inorganic matter must also partake in it. When one draws such an inference [推究], one can know why the difference of matter and mind did not exist from the beginning. When one examines the history of the earth by tracing it back to primeval times, then the primeval beginning was the time when there was only inorganic matter and organisms had not yet appeared. Stepping gradually further away from the primeval, there was a time when animals and plants appeared, but human kind was still unseen. And, this alone suffices to prove that the mind of difference [差別の心] you are talking about did not exist from the beginning.

Full Mountain kept silent.

Perfect Water continued: Although you and I co-exist and now talk with each other, your mind does not exist forever. My mind, too, passes away sooner or later. When the body decays and the mind vanishes, then the difference between you and I turns into non-differentiation in an instant. Speaking of the time we do not yet appear in the world, there is, of course, no difference between you and I, and there is no difference once we have vanished. We appear from so-called non-differentiation and we disappear into it. And thus, the difference between he and I, or self and other only comes into being while we occupy a very short 50-year time span and a space of as little as five *shaku*. When one compares this with boundless time and boundless space, then there is even less difference between he and I to speak of, is there not?

Full Mountain said: Although my mind perishes, there is certainly a place where it rests after perishing. Your mind perishes, but there is certainly a place where it comes from. When it is still unborn, the difference between I and you already exists and even if it dies, the difference between he and I never disappears. Only the difference is not visible before the eyes.

Perfect Water said: This is merely your speculation. Although we come to be, we do not know where we come from. Even if we vanish, we do not know where we go and we do not know if the difference between he and I exists before life or after death.

Full Mountain said: Although there is no difference between I and you when I am not born and no difference arises between you and I when you die, there is a differ-

ence between you and the other, even without my being born. And there is still the difference between I and the other even if you die, and there is still the difference among other people even if both I and you die. Even if the entire human species becomes extinct, in principle the relation of self and other must exist among the animals and plants.

Perfect Water said: Even if one assumes that because there are animals and plants there can be the difference of self and other among them, if one reaches the day when all of the ten thousand things between heaven and earth were to perish and not a single thing were to remain in the universe, there would be no place in which to uphold the difference of self and other, of he and I. The universe apparently evolved little by little from the time of non-differentiation of matter and mind until today when the ten thousand states [the whole creation] have appeared. Therefore, if the universe one day slowly dissolved and the ten thousand states of today perished, one could, once again, enter the state of non-differentiation such as in the ancient beginning.

Full Mountain could not respond to this and said: I have not yet investigated this thoroughly.

Perfect Water said: Although I know that the mind of non-differentiation exists, I am not able to account for how, within the mind, there is difference between matter and mind [差別の物心]. Although you know there is the difference between matter and mind, you do not know how this difference turns and becomes non-differentiation. Let us ask our Master to resolve all these doubts.

Full Mountain said: Ideend, let us.

Then they entered [the school house], came to the study of Master Full Perfection and each of them asked the Master for a comment on their arguments.

The Master said: In your debate, each of you sees the [philosophical] principles from one [particular] side, but you do not know all sides. Perfect Water sees the side of non-differentiation, but does not know difference, and Full Mountain sees the side of difference, but does not know non-differentiation, and none can avoid biased argumentation. And so, the doubts between the both of you arise because you believe that difference and non-differentiation are completely distinct in their substance. Perfect Water's so-called mind of non-differentiation is, in other words, Full Mountain's so-called mind of difference, and Full Mountain's so-called mind of difference is Perfect Water's so-called mind of non-differentiation; both are in their substance identical. [You] know the mind of non-differentiation based on the

mind of difference, the mind of difference emerges from the mind of non-differentiation. To take an example, it is like there is the difference of the front and the back of one thing [一物]. Since there is the difference of front and back, one knows there is a thing, since there is a thing, the difference of front and back arises. If one sees the front side and examines it closely, one knows that there is the back side; if one sees the back side and examines it closely, then one knows there is a front side; if one sees the front and back and examines all sides, then one knows they are in substance one thing; and when one takes this one thing and looks at its surface, then one can also know that the front and the back are different. And so, the substance of front and back is from the beginning one thing; [front and back] do not have different substances. The front side as it is [belongs to] one object [一物体] and the back side as it is [belongs to] one object. The difference of front and back only appears as the result of the difference that [you] see. Now, the difference of matter and mind that Full Mountain is talking about possesses the relation of front and back. When one looks at the mind from the point of view of matter, one can know that mind is not matter; and if one looks at matter from the perspective of mind, one can know that matter is not mind; and although the difference between self and other, him and I arises, their original substance is one thing and there was no difference at the beginning. When one discusses and examines matter thoroughly, it becomes mind; when one discusses and examines mind thoroughly, it becomes matter; when one discusses and examines matter and mind, they become non-differentiation; if one discusses and examines non-differentiation, it becomes difference; difference as such is non-differentiation, the non-differentiation as such is difference, difference and non-differentiation are one substance with no difference. When there is no difference, there is difference, when there is difference, there is no difference. I consider this point to be the ultimate principle of philosophy. What Full Mountain proposes is an argument based on difference, [because] in his world past and present are divided, among men [the contraries of] he and I are established, and regarding direction, East and West are fixed. For Perfect Water there is no East or West, among men there is no he and I, and in the world, there is no past or present; to discuss all of these in the one mind is the discussion of non-differentiation. And when Full Mountain scolds Perfect Water, then he explains that there is no difference in non-differentiation, but at the very edge of non-differentiation difference arises. Therein Perfect Water rebukes Full Mountain; he shows that difference is on the contrary in non-differentiation; difference turns finally into non-differentiation. For this reason, difference and

non-differentiation stand forever parallel and not separate from each other. Even if one starts the discussion at some point of difference, one arrives on the other end at non-differentiation; if the discussion starts at some point of non-differentiation, it arrives at difference; after all, there is a logical circle without end [論理回転して際涯なき]. In other words, difference and non-differentiation are substantially identical [その体同一なる]. Thus, there is both one principle in Perfect Water's theory and one principle in Full Mountain's explanation, but you can first see the whole path of Full Perfection by uniting the two. The path of Full Perfection is the following: Difference encompasses non-differentiation, non-differentiation encompasses difference, difference is in other words non-differentiation, non-differentiation is difference. It denotes the relation of being identical and different, different and identical [同体にして異体、同体にして異体なる関係]. This path is where various views and theories converge [回帰] and principles [道理] function according to full perfection [円満完了する], and for this reason I call this the path of Full Perfection. You have learned only one part of it and do not know the whole.

Full Mountain asked: Looking at this directly, I cannot get to the point of knowing the principle of non-differentiation by looking at the difference of he and I, or matter and mind. How can it be that there is this order in which one reaches the principle of non-differentiation only after studying the principle deeply? I ask you to teach us.

The Master said: This order is in place because difference is [akin to] the front side and the non-differentiation is [akin to] the backside.

[Full Mountain] dared to ask: How is it possible that there is no difference in the primeval past, but in the present day, there is difference?

The Master said: Since difference and non-differentiation are always correlative and coexistent, there is no principle that dictates that difference exists today, if there has never been a difference. Rather, what is different about primeval past and the present day is that initially in the past non-differentiation appeared on the front side, while today difference appears on the front side. Although in the primeval past when matter and mind were not yet separate there was non-differentiation among the ten thousand things, since there was difference inherent in the non-differentiation among these ten thousand things, their substance developed and today we have gotten so far that in all realms the difference appears. Yet, since there is still non-differentiation on the backside of today's difference, if one day the order reverses and the world perishes, then it will be non-differentiation which reappears on the front side. Non-differentiation unfolds and becomes difference, [and]

difference merges [within itself] and becomes non-differentiation. This is called the great transformation [大化] of the world. During the transformation, you see the past and present of time and watch the beginning and end of the world. Birth, age, illness, and the death of us men just as much as the becoming and perishing of our society are nothing but small movements of waves during [this great transformation]. When we get to this foundational logic [原理], it is not the case that there is a final end, because there is neither beginning nor end, neither becoming nor perishing. The logical substance [理体] of this non-beginning and non-ending, i.e., the non-becoming and the non-perishing, is what I call the substance of Full Perfection. In one direction this substance encompasses non-differentiation, in another it carries the difference; by its own energy [自体の力] it revolves to display the side of difference or to display the side of non-differentiation. We do not know when this transformation begins or when it ends. I call this act [of transformation] the energy of Full Perfection. Combined, I refer to its substance, its energy, and its path as the three essences [三性] of Full Perfection. The substance is the real nature that is furnished from inside; the energy is the act that emerges outside; and that which makes visible the relation between substance and energy is the path. For this reason, substance, energy, and path are indeed one. This is the wonderful principle of the oneness of the three essences.

Perfect Water asked: The substance of Full Perfection is lofty and immeasurable, the energy of Full Perfection is great and unknowable, the path of Full Perfection is profound and unquestionable. How can people like us, nevertheless, actually savor the wonderful principle in which the three essences are one?

The Master said: You should not be so surprised. Your substance is, in other words, the substance of Full Perfection; your energy is the energy of Full Perfection, and your path is the path of Full Perfection. Aside from you, there is no additional Full Perfection.

Perfect Water was still unable to grasp this principle.

The Master said: When you look at it from [the point of view of] difference, you become one part of Full Perfection, but when you look at it from the point of non-differentiation, both you and Full Perfection are identical in substance. Though your mind is one part of [the things that exist] across heaven and earth, it is as though mind contains heaven, earth, and the ten thousand things, and world and mind are identical in substance.

Perfect Water was able to resolve some of his doubt.

Full Mountain still with a sense of skepticism asked: If all of us are different but identical with Full Perfection and its substance, then all the different animals, plants, mountains, rivers and lands are likewise identical with Full Perfection. If this is really so, must plants, animals, and the inorganic also actually be capable of knowing the wonderful principle in which the three essences are one?

The Master said: When we speak from the point of non-differentiation, then the principle [dictates] that all the animals, plants and the inorganic [world] are able to know the wonderful taste of the oneness of the three essences. Yet when we speak from the point of differentiation, then, as there are naturally differences between animals, plants, and the inorganic, it is not possible that they know the principle in exactly the same way. Also, as there is difference among those of mankind who are wise or foolish, dull or sharp, it is not possible to understand this principle in the same way. However, since their substance is identical to Full Perfection, if people actually make use of the energy of mind, they are able to arrive at the wonderful realm of the oneness of the three essences. Regarding beasts and plants, since today they rank in the lower position of Full Perfection, they may not have the energy to know its entirety. But one day if it happens that the energy of Full Perfection changes and they are positioned on a higher level, then they may be able to savor its wonderful taste just as mankind does. If man also arrives at possessing a higher position another day, he should be able to naturally savor its taste without the workings of the energy of mind.

Perfect Water said: If this is the case, does the substance of Full Perfection never stop rotating?

[The Master] said: As I noted before, with the help of the energy it possesses within its own self it keeps on turning and moving eternally, not for a single moment does it rest. In other words, it is one great living being [一大活物]. As one great living being, there is nothing separate from it to wait upon whereafter it would begin to move. It is originally spontaneous and self-reliant [自発自存], autonomous and self-moved [独立独行], naturally evolving [自然にして進化し], and naturally selecting [自然にして淘汰し]. As much as it perishes, it does not; just as much as it is born, it is not born; it vanishes, and it does not; it comes and it does not; it fills itself and it is empty; it is empty as much as it fills itself; it is becoming and it is not. When you think it is in the front, it is in the back; when you think it is in the back, it is left or right, when you think it is left or right, it is up or down; just as much as man cannot know what it is, you must know it indeed. And the other way around: As much as it is mysterious, it is not. Just as there is an outside to matter and mind, so there

is no outside; as the absolute exists, so does the relative exist and as there is difference, there is non-differentiation, as there is the unchanging, there certainly is the changing, and as it should not be named, it certainly has a name. What is the name?

[The Master] said: Full perfection is the name.

Now Full Mountain and Perfect Water called out together: All this profound complexity certainly cannot be understood in one night. Please explain it to us further another night.

So, they got up from their chairs and went back to their rooms. It was already 11pm.

PART TWO

DISCUSSING THE ORIGINAL SUBSTANCE OF GOD

Prologue

I previously composed Part One of *An Evening Conversation* and have already made it public to the world.

There was someone who came and told me: When I read your essay, its aim seemed very exciting, but to use the name Full Perfection [円了] for the path's original substance is like stepping too far into arrogance. Please replace it by a name that people used in the past.

I said: I really have to thank you for your advice, but I cannot replace [my name] by an expression people used in the past, since I find myself in a situation in which I cannot help but use my own name [for the path]. Regarding its logic, my intention is to establish the middle path of the philosophical principles by integrating all views and arguments from past and present, East and West. If I used a name that was employed by past men, it would be inevitable that people would criticize this and assume that it is biased towards the views of past men. If I used "Supreme Ultimate" [太極] in order to give a name to [the path], then one could take it for the view of the Book of Changes; if I used the name "Thusness" [真如], one could call it the view of the Buddha; if I used the expression "True Ruler without Name" [無名真宰], then one could call it the study of Mencius and Confucius; if I used the term "Substance" [本質], then one would expect an apology from Spinoza; if I used the term "Self-Consciousness" [自覺], then one would assume it to be the school of Kant; if I called it "Absolute Ideal" [絶対理想], then one would accept the view of Hegel; if I used the term "the Unknowable" [不可知的], then one would express the argument of Spencer. If I were to invoke such criticisms, it would be impossible to allow people to learn about logical impartiality. This is the reason why I do not use the terms of past men. Others say one should coin a new word and established it as the [path's] name, but since it is clear that there is no word that expresses this intention fully, it would be, on the contrary, unavoidable to harm the true meaning. And so, the word that best indicates the meaning of the path's substance is the name "Full Perfection" [円了]. The expression "Full Perfection" is an abbreviation of "Harmonious [円満] Perfection [完了]", and means the harmonious perfection of

the path. We ought to understand this term as referring to the philosophical principles of past and present, East and West. This is why I have utilized my own name. Even if people criticize me and assume that I am arrogant, I disregard this. Here, I have written down the reasons [for my choice] and this constitutes the preface to Part Two.

10th Month of 1886

The Author

Introduction

In general, when one traces back to the original sources of matter and mind and thinks about the reasons why they arise, then it is inevitable to envision the existence of some sort of primal substance [原体]. This substance is called a god [神] or heavenly deity [天神]. To claim that this divine substance [神体] really exists is what is called theism, whereas advancing the claim that this substance does not really exist is what is called atheism. Theism is biased towards the existence of a god, atheism is biased towards the non-existence of god, and it is clear that neither is an impartial position. Furthermore, among the interlocutors who advance the claim that god exists, there are both those who assume that [the god's] substance exists outside of matter and mind, and those who assume that it does not exist separate from matter and mind; the former is biased towards the outside of matter and mind, while the latter is biased towards the inside of matter and mind, and therefore one cannot maintain that either attains impartiality. Regardless of whether one states that [the divine substance] is something one cannot know or that it is something one can know, neither are fair positions. Therefore, if we wish to maintain the logical impartiality between these two [positions], then it must be as though the heavenly deity exists outside of matter and mind, even while this is in fact not possible by any means. It must be as though matter and mind are at the same time the heavenly deity, even while this is not possible at all. It is as if there is difference, but, on the contrary, there is no difference, and it is as if there is no difference, but, on the contrary, there is difference. It is as if one cannot know, while, on the contrary, one can, and it is as if one can know, while, on the contrary, one cannot. One must construe [the substance] as though it exists, but, on the contrary, it does not exist and just as it does not exist, nevertheless, it does, on the contrary, exist. This is the middle path of the philosophical principles. I believe that those who read this chapter will, to a certain degree, learn about the subtle charm of this middle path.

One night when the autumn chill had just arrived the sky was dark and the rain was tremendous. The neighborhood was quiet and one could only hear the noise of the wind and the rain. Master Full Perfection arrived in the lecture hall early and taught the principles of philosophy. Four of his students were sitting before him: Full East [円東], Perfect West [了西], Full South [円南], and Perfect North [了北].

The Master said: Today's quiet night is good for talking about the principles of philosophy. Why are you keeping silent?

Full East stood up and said: Last night I saw the full moon hanging in the sky and this evening I heard the wind and the rain banging at the window. Barely one day later, how is such a stark contrast of rain and sun, of light and dark possible? Since I am deeply confused, I now want to consider this principle. This is the reason why I have kept quiet. Furthermore, when I look at the time changing to four o'clock, the sun and the moon take turns and make it day and night, cold and hot alternate and make it spring and autumn. And when, within these conditions, natural disasters occur such as floods and droughts or storms and showers, who ultimately causes these? When I take a step back and consider personal matters, poverty and wealth are not permanent, old age and youth are not fixed, good and bad periods of life are difficult to foresee, and sickness is difficult to avoid and so I shall not chase after what passes and not hinder what arrives. In the morning man welcomes life, at night he sends off death and he cannot pause for a second for his entire life. The rise and fall of society, the life and death of a nation, these usually go around in circles and do not stop for a single day. Ultimately, why does it happen like this? When I reflect deeply within my mind, I see that various ideas arise and vanish, come and go and none of them is permanent. This is due to what kind of principle? Once I heard this: There is something that exists outside of matter and mind separately called heavenly deity which carries out the transformations of this inner and outer world. But I cannot believe in this view, as long as I do not know what this heavenly deity is.

Perfect West stood up and said: Of course, I also do not believe in the reality [實在] of a heavenly deity.

Full South and Perfect North stood up together and said: We believe that the heavenly deity truly exists.

Perfect West again said: I hope the Master teaches us how to dissolve these doubts.

The Master said: Each of you should clearly stated what you think, so that we can discuss the existence and non-existence of the heavenly deity.

Full East continued: According to my thinking, the idea of a heavenly deity is utterly the result of empty thoughts [空想] of people of the past. But in light of today's experiments [実験], it is clear that you cannot prove the reality [of god]. Since you can apparently not know its reality, to claim that its energy actually constituted the universe, created the ten thousand things, and orchestrated the transformations of matter and mind, is nothing but nonsense that, of course, cannot be proven. There-

fore, I would say that the ten thousand things in the world are composed of the same matter and their transformations arise from the energy that is inherent in matter [物質内に含有せる]. To set forth this principle clearly: it has obviously been attested to by physics and chemistry that when there is matter there is certainly energy, when there is energy there is certainly matter. Separated from matter there is no energy, and separated from energy there is no matter. Moreover, matter becomes gaseous or it becomes solid or becomes fluid and so it appears outwardly in the shape of a thousand distinctions and ten thousand differences [i.e., infinite variety of differences]. However, when it comes to its real nature [実質] not the least increases or decreases, arises or vanishes. Likewise, this energy can become kinetic energy or thermal energy or electric energy and so it shows the functions [作用] outwardly of a thousand changes and ten thousand transformations. Yet, when it comes to its quantity, not the least [amount] increases or decreases, arises or passes away, [all of] which has obviously been proven by scientists. The first [phenomenon] is called the Law of Indestructibility of Matter [物質不滅の規則], the second is called the Principle of Conservation of Energy [勢力恒存の理法]. Today's various disciplines all establish their axioms grounded in these principles. Seeing this in such a way, from the beginning, the world had constant matter and constant energy and it was constituted from the immeasurable transformations that are carried out in between [matter and energy]. It is not the case that the ten thousand things arose because there is otherwise something that created [the world]. Also, it is likewise apparently clear that there is nothing which orchestrates and generates the transformations. If there were really something that created and orchestrated it, then we would have to know what kind of nature it possessed and where it existed. However, whether you think it through logically or illuminate it experimentally, you cannot investigate its nature or existence [性質存在]. To suppose that there is a creator [造物者] outside of matter and an orchestrator [経営者] outside of energy appears entirely within empty thoughts. If you look at it scientifically, there is originally no more than matter and energy, which are unborn and undying, neither accumulating nor dissipating. And so, even though there are immeasurable transformations between the two, there is clearly neither a starting point nor an end point. It is as one says: without beginning and without end. For this reason, even though the world begins, it is not the case that matter arises at this time and, even if the world vanishes, it is not the case that energy is entirely exhausted at that time. The co-creation of material substance [物体] of identical nature and the appearance of material phenomena [物象] of different shapes is what is called the beginning of

the world. What is called the extinction of the world is the merging of material phenomena of different shapes, whereby they return to a material substance of identical nature. [Phenomena of] different shapes merge and become identical in nature, [matter of] identical nature evolves and takes on different shapes. This is what is called the great transformation of the world. One evolving, one merging, this is boundless because before and after go in circles; this is, indeed, the definite law of the great transformation of the world. However, not only has the great transformation of the world one constant law, but additionally, everything that appears within it has its law, i.e., the movement of the sun and the moon, the change of the four seasons, the growth of plants, the life cycle of man and animals, and the rise and fall of societies and states. Not a single cloud disperses by chance, and not a single grain of dust appears by chance. Their appearance depends on a cause that [makes] them necessarily appear, and their dispersing depends on circumstances that [make] them necessarily disperse. After all, that there is a constant law in such a transformation of things is nothing other than to say that there is constant matter and constant energy, and between the two, transformation occurs. Seen in this way, the universe has simply constant matter and constant energy. How could there be something outside of matter and energy that creates the ten thousand things and orchestrates their transformations? This is the reason why I do not believe in the reality of the heavenly deity.

Perfect North raised doubts and said: In between constant matter and constant energy, how could there occur immeasurable transformations? Is this not also a sort of empty thought?

Full East said: Matter is the real substance of transformations, energy is the cause of transformations. Matter exhibits these transformations, [this is] because there is energy. And energy carries out these transformations, indeed, because there is matter. Therefore, the transformations that are apparently given are the reason that there is matter, the matter that is apparently given is the reason that there is energy, and the energy that is apparently given is the reason that there are transformations. And so, there are immeasurable types [種類] in these transformations, because there are immeasurable molecules in matter. Generally speaking, the microscopic parts of matter are called particles and the smallest parts of the particles are called molecules, and the smallest parts of molecules are called atoms. Atoms are, in other words, chemical elements. Although there is a constant quantity in matter, when one arrives at the number of atoms, they are immeasurable. Since the molecules are clearly immeasurable, the energy that inherits their substance is immeasurable.

surable, too. Since energy is clearly immeasurable, its transformations must be immeasurable, too. When we get to the enormity of energy's transformations, one must know from experimentation what kind of relation there is between matter and energy and what brought about these transformations. But when we get to the tiniest pieces, from sensation, it is impossible to have a clear vision of all [of them] in every detail. This is the case even though if you compare [them] to [matter's] enormity you can, of course, infer [推知] that the smallest transformations also arise from the relation of matter and energy. How could there be a principle according to which [matter and energy] are identical to the empty thought of a heavenly deity?

Full South brought forth another question: Although it seems that there is a principle that somehow asserts that constant matter becomes gaseous, liquid, or solid depending on the movement of energy, it is not yet clear according to what principle the same matter evolves and becomes water and earth, grass and trees, animals and humankind. Water and earth are inorganic and do not possess life and therefore they are called non-living. Grass and trees possess life, but no sensation, therefore they belong to the inanimate, and although animals possess sensation, they do not have intellectual energy, therefore they belong to the non-intellectual. Only humankind possesses life, possesses sensation, and possesses intellectual energy, has both the thought [念] to strive for the truth, the desire [情] to pursue well-being, and the heart [心] to love morality. How can this highest species evolve from simple matter?

Full East said: When one considers this in regard to the history of the earth, one sees that in the early phase only simple inorganic matter existed. Even though there was a gradual transition, and different species [種屬] appeared that possessed life, one still did not see that there were animals that were sentient. There were more and more transitions and kinds which appeared that were sentient, but one still did not see humankind, which possesses knowledge. From this point of view, when you see humankind in today's world, which possesses knowledge, you can know that they exist as a result of the process whereby simple inorganic matter gradually evolved and developed. Next, in contemplating this problem regarding the division of animals and plants, note that among animals there are some which have almost no movement, while among plants there are some that possess sensation. Furthermore, there are cases where one cannot decide if a certain living thing ultimately is an animal or a plant. And, given the lowest kinds of animals and plants, there are some which are extremely close to inorganic matter. In short, since

there is no clear division between all the kinds of animals and plants, one can logically conclude that the various kinds of living beings derive recurrently from one and the same thing. Next, if you think this through regarding the nature of man and animals, when you compare the lowest of humankind with the highest of animals, you can see that there is almost no gap of intellectual energy between the two. In fact, there are even times where mankind is inferior to animals. Seen in this way, you can understand how it is that intellect arises from non-intellect. Again, one step further, when you investigate the structure of nerves or their main constituents, then this also suffices to further one's belief in the evolution of humankind. Generally speaking, it is natural for matter to display simple functions when it is simple, and to display complex functions when it is complex. Now, the human nervous system has an utmost complex structure. The infinite versatility of its function is, of course, also due to the fact that its main constituents are composed of those chemical elements whose nature most easily brings about transformation. So, in the beginning [of history] there was identical matter, and then in a gradual process the organic arose from the inorganic, and from animals and plants human kind arose; this is what is called the evolution of nature. The evolution of nature arises from the energy that is inherent in the substance of matter. Apart from this, there is no heavenly deity creating it. And since both matter and energy always exist in parallel, if on the one hand matter evolves, then on the other hand energy must evolve. In other words, that animals, plants and the human race are structurally distinct depends on the evolution of matter. The functional [作用上に] difference between sentient and non-sentient as well as intellectual and non-intellectual depends on the evolution of energy [勢力の進化]. Life energy [生活力], sensual energy, and intellectual energy are nothing but different states of the same energy [勢力]. The distinctness of mind and body in man depends on substance being composed of both matter and energy. Its flesh is matter, its mind is energy. When the structure of matter takes on its proper state completely and the manifestation of energy takes on its wonderful function [妙用] completely, one says that a person is alive. And when the structure loses its proper state and the energy is unable to display its wonderful function, one says that a person is dying. In other words, even when [a person] is dying it is not the case that only energy vanishes and only matter persists. It is only that energy's wonderful function cannot appear. This is why I maintain very clearly that outside of matter there is no heavenly deity and outside energy there is no mind.

Perfect West heard these assertions, showed great signs of doubt and said: Although I am also of the opinion that there is no heavenly deity outside of the world, when it comes to saying that outside of matter and energy there is no mind, I have the greatest difficulties in understanding this. Do you claim, after all, that the matter you are talking about consists of chemical elements?

[Full East] said: Yes.

[Perfect West said:] And when this is really the case, are the chemical elements not matter, do they not have the feature [形] of big and small and the quality [質] of soft and hard? If they did not have these [features and qualities], however much their substance aggregates, there would be no principle of organizing [結成する] matter that has form [形質]. If they have these [features and qualities], then their chemical elements are one [kind of] matter and so one must investigate what these things are composed of. And if one assumed that they are composed from other tiny elements, one must also know what kind of elements there are. Which of these [options] do you ultimately choose?

[Full East] said: I have not yet investigated the matter this far.

Perfect West said: Does the energy you are talking about exist in matter?

[Full East] said: So it does!

[Perfect West said:] But how do you know that?

[Full East] said: If there is matter, one will certainly see energy, but when separated from matter one does not see energy. Therefore, I say there is energy and it exists in matter.

[Perfect West] said: If this is really so, with what kind of equipment do you know there is energy in matter?

[Full East] said: This I still do not know.

Perfect West said: The world we dwell in does not consist only of matter. Time and space coexist and one sees the transformation of matter within them. If time and space did not exist, it would certainly be impossible for both matter and energy to coexist. That matter has its form depends on the existence of space, that energy has its functions depends on the existence of time. According to which principle [道理] do you know that there is no time and space outside of matter and energy?

Full East said: This is likewise something that I have not yet penetrated. However, I have some sort of a hypothesis [憶説]. It is not [the case] that there is space and only afterward matter, and it is not [the case] that there is time and only afterward energy, but one sees there is space because there is matter, and one knows there is

time because there is energy. Therefore, once it comes to the vanishing of matter and energy, then both time and space must vanish, too.

Perfect West said: Although this may be so, you cannot avoid admitting that your view is also some sort of hypothesis, can you?

[Full East] said: Although my view, of course, originates very much in speculation [推想], if you compare it to the empty thought of a heavenly it is far more worthy to trust.

Perfect West said: Something like my view entirely avoids empty thoughts.

Full East said: Please, can we hear your view?

[Perfect West] said: My view can prove something regarding your view. You said there is no world outside of matter. But since the matter that we are talking about is nothing but the composite of color, sound, smell, taste, and form, I maintain that there is no world outside of color, sound, smell, taste, and form. And this color, sound, and so on do not belong to matter, but one can easily prove the principle that they belong to the mind. In other words, color is what arises from the eyes, sound is what arises from the ears. One learns about smell and taste because there are nose and tongue, and one learns about form because there are hands and feet. When one really learns why it is like that, it becomes clear that matter belongs to the five types of sensation: of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, and touching. Sensation is the act [作用] of the mind and, again, it is not necessary to provide further proof that it is not the nature of matter. Therefore, I am inclined to say that there is no world outside of the mind and no heavenly deity outside of thought. Please, see for yourself how arguing that matter consists of elements, and that energy exists inside matter, is itself an act of the mind. Even if I proclaim that there is no world outside of matter, and no mind outside of energy, it is still an act of thinking. To hold that time and space arise from matter and energy is also thinking. Similarly, to believe that a heavenly deity is nothing but an empty thought is thinking. Both to take empty thought for empty thought as well as to take something that is not an empty thought as something that is not an empty thought is thinking. We must instead reason thusly: Because there is thought there are principles; because there are principles there is experimentation; because there is experimentation there is the world and the ten thousand things; because there is the world and the ten thousand things there is a heavenly deity. You certainly cannot doubt, therefore, that thinking actually exists. Thus, my view that proclaims that there is no world, no ten thousand things, and no heavenly deity outside of the mind's thinking is not only a hypothesis or an empty thought.

Full East said: Of course, I know there is no heavenly deity outside of thinking and I can more or less grasp the principle that there are no ten thousand things outside of sensation. But I cannot yet quite grasp the principle that time and space exist within thought. Please, demonstrate this principle.

[Perfect West] said: The existence of time and space, we also know based on our sensation. When touching the earth with one's feet, one can indeed know the distance of space through the energy [力] of sensation; when holding a thing with one's hands, one can indeed know about the duration of time through the energy of sensation. Even though it is, of course, only one part of time and space, by inference one arrives at seeing that there is limitless space and limitless time. And in the case of time, one can even know it by looking at the duration of thought in the mind. Again, if we observe this based on the act of thinking, then to think the coexistence of time and space is also thinking. To imagine space being outside of matter and time being outside of mind is also thinking. For this reason, one can know that time and space exist entirely within thinking.

Full South raised another question and said: If we follow what you say, then heaven, earth, and the ten thousand things remain appearances in the realm of mind and thought. In other words, the phenomena of the world are merely floating on the ocean of thought, and the reflections of the ten thousand things are just gleaming on the mirror surface of the mind. This is like the vision of the moon on the water or the appearance of a human silhouette on the [surface of a] mirror.¹ Therefore, one cannot assert that there is no heaven, earth, or the ten thousand things outside of mind and thought. When I question in this way, you will certainly reply and say: "Heaven, earth, and the ten thousand things that we know are naturally images on the mirror's surface and we do not know their real substance, but since it is not the case that we know their real substance directly, we still cannot know whether [their real substance] really exists or not. And to argue that the real substance is outside of the images of the mind's surface is likewise an act of thinking and who can really imagine its existence apart from the mind? That is, in the end, the reason why heaven and earth and the ten thousand things are within thought." But this point in question is not what I wish to consider. Although the mind has the energy to represent the transformations that appear before [the mind], it does not by itself have energy to orchestrate them. To orchestrate and to represent are certainly not identical. Even if one assumes that heaven, earth, and all the ten

¹ Corrigendum 鏡裏.

thousand things are within thought, and that the transformations of the ten thousand things which occur within thought are what the energy of thinking orchestrates, but is not thinking [itself] nothing more than representation of these transformations? To give an analogy, it is like seeing the transformations of waves on the water's surface. Even though one says that the transformations do not exist apart from the water, it is clear that the water on its own does not have the energy to make them arise; this depends entirely on the energy of the wind. Seeing this as such, if thinking on its own really does not have the energy to orchestrate the transformations, there must be something else that orchestrates them.

Perfect West kept quiet and after a time said: These [transformations] are perhaps due to the energy that is inherent to the matter Full East is talking about.

Full South said: If one reduces [energy] to the energy of matter, then one cannot assert that there is no matter or energy outside of the mind. Since matter indeed carries out the transformations and the mind represents the transformations, it is clear that both exist by opposing each other. In other words, it is the mind that knows matter and it is matter that has an influence on the acts of the mind. One cannot really speak of mind without matter. Similarly, if there is no mind, it is not possible that matter becomes matter. Mind is the substance of active knowing and active seeing [能知能觀], therefore one calls it the subject [主觀]. Matter is the substance of what is seen and of what is known [所知所觀], therefore one calls it the object [客觀]. The principle is that subject and object are the names of what takes place entirely in mutual opposition: without subject there is no object, without object, there is no subject. One can thereby know the reason why matter and mind exist in opposition. If one already knows the reason why matter and mind exist in opposition, it is only evident that there is no principle that dictates that there is only mind without matter or only matter without mind. It is also clear that it is impossible for the energy of matter to really generate mind, or for the energy of mind to really generate matter. It is fully logical that the generation of transformations between matter and mind through their integration must be a result of the energy of both, because matter and mind have the nature of being completely opposed. If this is ultimately so, then matter cannot arise from a transformation of mind, and mind cannot develop from matter. You must know by inference that, as far as the transformation and combination of both the inner and outer worlds are concerned, the energy of both substances of matter and mind cannot actually orchestrate them. These are the reasons why I know that there is something else which oversees the changes of

the two worlds of matter and mind, and brings about the creation of these two primal types.

Perfect West said: If so, what do you posit as the creator outside of matter and mind?

[Full South] said: Yes. This is the heavenly deity.

Perfect West was surprised and said: Oh, this is the most extreme of empty thought!

Full South: No, it is not. This is entirely the result of logic and experimentation. No matter whether one sees it in the light of experimentation or one thinks it through logically, one realizes that matters are in the way they must be assumed. If you did not assume it to be this way, it would certainly be impossible to attain impartiality of logic and fulfillment of the thought. Thus, I am unswerving in my belief in this theory.

Perfect North expressed his agreement and said: From the beginning, I knew the reason why a heavenly deity has to exist in the universe. And now I hear your discussion and I come to believe in its reality all the more deeply.

Full South said: Then do you hold entirely the same view as I do?

Perfect North said: Although we have the same view regarding the belief in the reality of a heavenly deity, when it comes to the question what the substance of the heavenly deity is, it is difficult to estimate whether your opinion might differ [from mine]. Therefore, I wish to hear your understanding of divine substance.

Full South said: Even though I argue that the heavenly deity exists, I would not say that regarding its substance [その体] that it has hands and feet, ears and eyes, language and a face. And although I proclaim that its energy really creates matter and mind and indeed realizes its transformations, I would not say that it is like a carpenter building furniture or the head of a family running a household. I do not know which way the heavenly deity creates matter and what aim it allots to mind. However, I believe in the reality of a heavenly deity and I say that there must evidently be something which creates and orchestrates matter and mind because they exist.

Perfect North said: If so, then does your heavenly deity exist entirely apart from matter and mind?

[Full South] said: Rightly so. Since the heavenly deity creates matter and mind, it must exist outside of matter and mind.

Perfect North said: Then in which place does it exist? Does it exist outside the universe or within the universe?

[Full South] said: Clearly, I do not know in which place it exists, but probably it exists outside the universe, does it not?

Perfect North said: Since the universe emerges with time and space, all of time and space are the universe and outside of the universe there cannot be any time or space. Can you really imagine that such a place exists?

[Full South] said: Of course, I cannot.

Perfect North asked: When one assumes that matter is created by the heavenly deity and that mind is endowed by the heavenly deity, does the substance of matter and mind emanate from the heavenly deity's own substance [天神の自体]? Or does the heavenly deity take material from somewhere else? Or does the heavenly deity engage in new creation? If one concludes that the material was taken from somewhere else, then one cannot avoid questions concerning what kind of material it is and where this material for the material [資料の資料] comes from. If one concludes that the heavenly deity engaged in a new creation, then it will be difficult to grasp the principle that things emerged when there was nothing. Which of these views do you prefer?

Full South said: I have not thoroughly investigated this, yet. Based only on what I imagine, the heavenly deity exhausted and annihilated its substance and created the world and the ten thousand things.

Perfect North said: If this is really as you imagine, then matter and mind must be one part of the heavenly deity, if the heavenly deity created the material world by exhausting and annihilating its own substance and established the world of mind by bestowing spirit. To put this differently, matter and mind must be this divine substance. Men, beasts, fish, and birds are self-evidently like grass, trees, corn, dust, or hair, but regarding their substance, they must be the heavenly deity. Thus, I would say that the substance of matter and mind is, in other words, the heavenly deity.

Full South said: Then what you call the heavenly deity does not exist apart from matter and mind?

[Perfect North] said: What I call the heavenly deity is the inside and outside of matter and mind. Since matter and mind are one part of the heavenly deity, their substance is the heavenly deity; and since matter and mind are not the entirety of the heavenly deity, the deity must be external to matter and mind. Conjoining that which exists inside and outside of matter and mind, this is the entirety of the heavenly deity.

Full South said: Then, does the heavenly deity exist inside or outside of the universe?

[Perfect North] said: Since matter and mind are, in other words, divine substance, one part of the heavenly deity dwells within the realm of the universe and, since mat-

ter and mind are created by the heavenly deity, the other part must be outside of the universe. That is to say, one half of the heavenly deity dwells within the universe, the other half outside of it.

At this point Full East had doubts, and articulated a question: How do you know that one half of the heavenly deity is outside of matter and mind and the other outside of the universe?

Perfect North said: This is, of course, based on logical inference, and one does not know what kind [the heavenly deity's] reality actually is. Ordinarily, the heavenly deity that I know is limited to the heavenly deity which remains within the universe. In other words, regarding their substance, the heavenly deity within the universe is knowable, while the heavenly deity outside of the universe is unknowable. The complementarity of the two sides of the knowable and the unknowable constitutes the totality of the heavenly deity.

Full East said, again: If this is so, could you for a moment envision as to the reality of this unknowable deity, on the basis of knowable matter and mind?

[Perfect North] said: Yes.

[Full East said:] Actually, I wish to criticize you in this regard. Since in their substance matter and mind are apparently a part of the heavenly deity, each realizes transformations according to its constant law: sun and moon move according to their own laws, water and earth change according to their own nature, birds and beasts die and are born, grass and trees grow and decay, society blooms and perishes, personal affairs go rightly and wrongly. All these things move in cycles and have never lost their order. How then do you erroneously envision the existence of a persistent universe outside this universe, and why is it necessary to maintain an unknowable deity external to the knowable deity? Even if you suppose [想立] such a heavenly deity, not only does this simply belong to empty thought, but it also would not have any relation at all with things immediately in front of our eyes.

Perfect North kept silent and after a while said: I was wrong, I was wrong. This was a point that I had not yet investigated. I know now for the first time that matter and mind are but the totality of the heavenly deity, and its substance does not exist separate from this world.

Full East said: Arriving at this point, I see that your view and mine are similar. I say that there is no heavenly deity outside the world and the ten thousand things, and you also admit that there is no heavenly deity outside this world. But where you and I differ is in intentionally using or not using the name of the heavenly deity. You say the substance of matter and mind is the heavenly deity and I say that there

is no mind apart from matter. However, it is not that I say there is no difference between matter and mind at all. The form of the one great material substance [一大物体] gives birth to the matter of different phenomena by mutually combining various types, and the energy of the one great material substance lets the versatile mind appear by reciprocally creating without end. In other words, I see that in the back and front of the one great material substance the difference of mind and matter exists. This material substance might be called "original nature" [本質], or it might be called "material substance of non-differentiation". Therefore, I call your heavenly deity the "material substance of non-differentiation". If you replace the name of the heavenly deity with this material substance, my view immediately becomes your view.

Perfect West said: And my view should also become identical with yours. I argued that the ten thousand things are not outside of mind, and outside of thinking there is no heavenly deity. And when I argued that the whole world is only one mind, this does not mean that the difference between matter and mind does not exist in the vast ocean of that one mind. This one great mind of circumference-less size is called the mind of equality [平等] or the mind of self-awakening [自覺]. Contrary to this, matter and mind that coexist within [that vast] ocean are called the matter and mind of difference. If you replaced the name of the heavenly deity with the great mind of equality and self-awakening, then my view would change immediately and become the view of Perfect North. If I replaced it by the name of material substance of non-differentiation, my view would, again, change and become the view of Full East.

Full South said: Not only does each of your three views complement the others, I see that my view also complements yours. Because Full East apparently admits that there is the matter and mind of difference within the material substance of non-differentiation, and Perfect West admits there is the matter and mind of he and I within the mind of equality and self-awakening, it is clear that the matter and mind of difference is not identical to the matter and mind of equality. And since they are apparently not identical, in principle it is also not impossible to say that outside of the matter and mind of difference there are the matter and mind of equality and non-differentiation. This is the reason why I assume that outside of matter and mind there is the heavenly deity. If you replaced the heavenly deity by the matter and mind of equality, my view would be exactly your view.

Perfect North said: I have argued in the beginning that one half of the heavenly deity is within matter and mind and one half is outside. Later, it was proven that this view

was mistaken, but as I see it now I know that the previous view was not wrong. I realize that, since there apparently is the difference between the matter and mind of difference and the matter and mind of equality, the matter and mind of difference is outside of equality and non-differentiation. Further, I realize that, because the matter and mind of difference is in its substance equal, the matter and mind of equality exists within the matter and mind of difference. At this moment, it seems that the argument that the existence of the heavenly deity cuts across the inside and outside of matter and mind also has its principle. If one replaces the heavenly deity with the matter and mind of equality, this view in turn becomes the view of Full East and Perfect West.

All said: Rightly so. Then, in the end we cannot know which view is the most appropriate. Please Master, we are waiting for you to judge what is right and what is wrong.

The Master said: Your discussion has obviously exhausted the principles. I have nothing left to say. If I add only one word, what I wish to draw your attention to is to know that each of [your views] is untrue, because each of you has his own viewpoint. The pure and whole truth is revealed only by bringing together your four views. Full East was proclaiming an atheism by means of materialism. Perfect West proclaimed an atheism by means of idealism. Full South proclaimed a theism by maintaining that the heavenly deity is outside of matter and mind. And Perfect North proclaimed a [theism]² by construing the heavenly deity inside and outside of matter and mind. Each one on your own takes what he proclaimed as truth: Full East is biased towards by assuming only matter, Perfect West is biased towards by assuming only mind, and Full South and Perfect North would certainly not avoid the criticism of being biased by assuming the existence of a heavenly deity. For this reason, if you wished to hold to the middle point of the philosophical principles, you would need to take the middle of your four views. The middle point that is reached by combining these different views is what I call the path of Full Perfection [円了]. After all, the Harmonious [円満] Perfection [完了] of the principle [道理], which is the meaning of Full Perfection, is nothing but the harmony [中和] reached in the convergence of each of your various views and theories converge. Your views each form one part of the whole path of Full Perfection and this whole is not yet exhausted. It is rather like the difference of East, West, South, and North across the globe. The one who walks East sees the one who walks West and

2 Corrigendum: Originally 有心論 instead of 有神論.

says that he and I are entirely opposite. The one who is headed South points to the one who is headed North and says that he and I are entirely incompatible. But there is one globe and there will be a time one day when we will meet. It is merely that the place where you dwell is different and so you see only the difference between self and other and between he and I among the various views. If we left this aside and went beyond the globe, there would not be any difference between East, West, South, and North. If this is ultimately so, then to think that in all points in the universe the difference of the four positions exists is only the confusion of the debaters. Now, seen from the whole path of Full Perfection, your discussion is just like a fight over East and West on the globe. After one morning has passed and you return to the whole path, you must learn that yesterday's fight was like one night's illusory dream. However, it is not necessarily the case that this path has no difference between East and West. If the path ends in one corner within this realm, then it leads to the difference of he and I. If the path dwells in one corner of the globe, it would lead to the difference of East and West. Thus, even if there is this difference, the path is the path of Full Perfection, and even if there is not this difference, the path is the path of Full Perfection. You must know that it is the complete path of Full Perfection only after uniting difference and non-differentiation. Therefore, the heavenly deity that I am talking about unites with your heavenly deity and attains the middle. Regarding its substance, it is the heavenly deity and it is not; it is material substance and it is not; it is self-awakening and it is not. If you see it from the East, it is the material substance of non-differentiation; if you see it from the West, it is the great mind of equality; if you see it from the South, it is the heavenly deity outside the universe; seen from the North, it is knowable divine substance. As a result of seeing that things are different you also change their names, but regarding their substance, there is, of course, one and not two. If you call it material substance, then people will criticize it and call it materialism; if you give it the name "mental substance", then people will criticize it and call it idealism; if you give it the name "divine substance" then people will criticize it and call it theism. Therefore, I will give it a name and call it the substance of Full Perfection. Its substance is unborn, neither vanishing, nor increasing or decreasing, in all ten directions it is without borders and it extends in ten thousand worlds and cannot be exhausted. Since this substance is apparently without borders and frontiers, then the transformations that arise from it are again immeasurable and countless. These immeasurable and countless transformations arise from the energy that is inherent to Full Perfection itself [円了の自体], and again, this energy tra-

verses the ten directions and the ten thousand times and does not increase or decrease. I call this the energy of Full Perfection. Through this energy their substance either unfolds and shows the ten thousand realms of difference or it joins and converges in the one principle of non-differentiation. This is the great transformation of Full Perfection. Within this great transformation we witness the past and present of time and the East and West of space. It is a constant law [一定の規則] and everything follows it: one root of grass, one spot of a cloud, one bit of dust, one moment of thought; and there is certainly no chance that it increases or decreases; it is the coming and going of warmth and heat, spring and autumn, the death and birth of animals, plants and the human race, the arising and vanishing of feeling and thought. I call this the law [理法] of Full Perfection. This law is the one which arises from the relation of substance and energy and that which demonstrates this principle is nothing but the path of Full Perfection. Yes, we clarify this path, obey this law, and follow this great transformation. The energy that is neither increasing nor decreasing returns to the substance without beginning or end. Hence this must be the objective of life. If, one day, we really arrive at the completion of this objective, then our substance would become the substance of Full Perfection, our energy would be the energy of Full Perfection, [and] our body could become the heavenly deity. Is this not what you must work toward?

It was already time to sleep, and everyone went back to their rooms. They opened the door, the rain had stopped and they all could see the full moon standing at its zenith [天心].

PART THREE

DISCUSSING THE NATURE OF TRUTH

Introduction

The various discussions of philosophy are in the end nothing other than investigations into the nature and relation of the three substances, i.e. matter, mind and god. But when one investigates these, one says, for example, that there is no material world outside of the world of mind, or one says there is no heavenly deity outside of matter and mind. And, since the various views do not become one, it is extremely difficult to judge which of these views is true and which is not. If you wish to judge them, you must first of all bring forth a criterion of truth [真理の標準]. In other words, that which meets this criterion is truth, that which does not is untruth. Now, what do scholars put forth as this criterion? There are those who take the outer world, i.e., the experience [経験] of the material world as the foundation. And there are those who take the inner world, i.e., the thinking of the world of mind as the foundation. And there are those who take the correspondence of the inner and outer world as the foundation. And there are those who take the heavenly deity, i.e., the outside of matter and outside of mind as the foundation. But as I see it, they cannot avoid the difficulties of, first, being biased towards the outer world, second, being biased towards the inner world, third, being biased towards the between of both worlds of matter and mind, and fourth, being biased towards the outside of both worlds of matter and mind. Therefore, if you wish to put forth a criterion that is pure, complete and impartial [純全中正], then you have to take the middle path [中道] inside and outside of matter and mind. This chapter exposes the criterion of the so-called middle path. Therefore, if you read this, I believe you will understand the pure, complete, and impartial truth.

Those who spent their time at the school of Master Full Perfection counted the great number of three thousand. Among them, there were thirty people who had ascended the hall, and a further ten people who had ascended to the rooms. These ten were Full Mountain, Perfect Water, Full East, Perfect West, Full South, Perfect North, Full Sky [円天], Perfect Earth [了地], Full Light [円陽] and Perfect Shadow [了陰]. These were

called the ten philosophers of that school. One day, the air became cold and snow was falling. When the night came, it became colder and colder. The neighborhood was serene on all sides, no chatter or noise on the streets disrupted their deep thoughts and in the silence of the firelight there was only the barking of a poor dog to hear from afar. At this time, Full Sky, Perfect Earth, Full Light, and Perfect Shadow met in a room and began to debate about the philosophical principles.

Full Light said: I once heard the Master [saying] this: "The world is very much like one big ocean. What is showing on the surface, what bobs and floats in the waves, that is us. The teachings are a lot like a big ferry boat and philosophy sets its course and points the way. However, once we lose the middle position of the philosophical principle and mistake the direction of the truth, then all is covered in darkness, the light of the sun and the moon is concealed, and we sink together with the ship down to the ocean floor of untruth. Therefore, if you seek peace from human restlessness and strive for wholesome teachings, you must determine the pure and entire truth of philosophy. As it is, in our society people fight and try to outdo each other, because without knowing the pure and entire truth whatsoever they hold as right what they think is right and they hold as true what they believe is true, but take as wrong what all other people think or believe. Therefore, if people arrived at the pure and entire truth by thinking, how could there be any fighting regarding right or wrong between this and that, between self and other? Such strife is similar to fighting about the direction of East and West in the dark of the night. Once the sun rises you will know that the fighting was like a labyrinth at night. Now, when at some point the pure and entire truth that is determined philosophically radiates and illuminates the world of principles [道理界], then you will know that the debate over right and wrong that you fought about before, is really nothing other than a temporarily mistaken view." But I searched for the principles in many ways: I walked in the world of philosophy for many years and strove to discover the rising sun of truth during this time. I traced it back to the original sources of Eastern Philosophy, I thoroughly studied the grounds of ancient Greek philosophy, and I traversed the entire realm of modern philosophy. Yet I could not determine whether one of the truths that people put forth was really the pure and entire truth since each view held by scholars from past and present or East and West was different. When one proposition is the pure and entire truth, then the other proposition cannot be the truth. When the other position is the pure and entire truth, then it cannot be that a third proposition is the truth. Since it is clearly impossible that all three

views are the truth at the same time, it is, of course, not easy to decide which of the three is the pure and whole truth. Therefore, I am in the greatest of pains to decide regarding truth and untruth. Furthermore, before judging this we need a criterion of truth and untruth. It is similar to the way we need a standard of money to determine the value of things. However, when we get to the question of what we can use as a criterion of truth, is it not this that we still do not know? That is what confuses me.

Full Sky said: The truth that scholars traditionally put forth appears not to be fixed because there are hundreds of different views, but within these one can see on one's own that there is something constant. And so, since man's intellectual energy is not able to discover this fixed point, such disputes arise between people.

Full Light said: What is it that you call the truth?

[Full Sky] said: [Truth is] a principle that is lucid and clearly distinguishes between right and wrong, it is what one does not doubt or fight about. It is all like this: For example, mountains are mountains, man is man, red is red. Two plus two is four and one *shaku* [尺; ca. 30 cm] is longer than one *sun* [寸; ca. 3 cm]. It is of this kind. If someone possesses only one bit of intellectual energy, then he knows that man is man and not a mountain and he knows that two plus two is neither three nor five. Regarding such principles, all men, both past and present, East and West have comprehended them since they were born and there is no need to demonstrate them. Therefore, they are called self-evident laws [自明の規則]. Since self-evident laws do not change by any means throughout all times and generations I take these to be the axioms of truth.

Full Light said: Although we take these simple laws as axioms of truth, this does not yet constitute them as general laws [通則]. Now, one *shaku* is longer than one *sun*, two plus two is four; these relations are known insofar as people have grown up to a certain degree. If a child has not yet grown up, the sum of two plus two and the length of one *shaku* and one *sun* is not anything it knows. Also with regard to the lowest of the barbarians, we say that they do not have all these manifold ideas. If this is really so, then it is clear that these self-evident laws do not suffice to be commonly accepted laws of truth.

Full Sky said: When it comes to people who have not yet developed their intellectual energy, there can be people who do not know these axioms, such as babies or barbarians. However, once they take control of the intellectual energy nurtured within, they will immediately come to understand these laws. And even if one or two in a million do not understand these laws, one or two exceptions will not un-

determine the general laws. Hence, it is not impossible to conclude that laws such as "two plus two is four" and "one *shaku* is longer than one *sun*" are constant and unchanging truths throughout the past and present, East and West.

Full Light said: If this is really so, it seems there is one principle that [dictates] taking these laws as the criterion of today's truth, but it is not a principle that extends into the future and establishes an immutable truth. So, even if one sees that the criterion has not changed according to previous experiences, one cannot know whether based on future experiences some kind of circumstances will transpire that change these laws.

Full Sky said: To know the future depends entirely on previous experiences. When one compares previous experiences and one knows that they really become a general law, then one can extrapolate [based on those experiences] towards the future and establish an unchanging law. Please take a look, twenty-four hours make one day and 365 days make one year. One determines this based on previous experiences. However, if one extrapolates [based on those experiences] towards the future, is it not possible to determine a law that is immutable for ten thousand generations?

Full Light said: As for the laws of day and night or spring and autumn can, if one great change [一大變動] in the solar system occurs one day then even these could change a little. And even if today's solar system lasts beyond ten million generations, one may not know whether at some point the one great change would occur based on [the laws] of day and night, spring and autumn, since it is difficult to assert that this will never change. Now, this is also the case for the laws of truth. It is difficult to judge as to how, a later point, some kind of change might arise on the basis of man's thinking, such that what is truth today will become entirely untruth tomorrow. Similarly, if one thinks about the evolution of man's intellect, one does not know to what degree the truths of the past have now become what is evidently entirely untrue today. Based on this you can infer that today's truth can become another day's untruth. What we have experienced in the past does not transcend the time of 5 or 6,000 years or the sphere of [this] one globe. And the period of 5 or 6,000 years is the shortest period of time and the globe is the smallest part of space. One must say that it is the purest delusion [to think one can], with the help of experience, determine the laws of the universe and the ten thousand generations within this shortest time and smallest space.

At this point Full Sky did not know how to respond and said: I have not yet investigated this thoroughly.

Full Light then asked: In general, people do not fight about what is easy to grasp, but about those things that are difficult to know. Now, one sees the color red and says "this is the color red." Another sees the color yellow and says "this is the color yellow". All people accept this apparently, and nobody would doubt this or say that this is not true. But when one sees not the color red or the color yellow but rather some composite color, then one person indicates this to be the color red, another indicates this to be the color yellow, and then one has to argue about what is wrong or right between the two. Again, since it is easy to learn that two plus two is four, nobody assumes that this is untrue, but when it comes to saying what one gets by adding 79 and 97, one will not be able to give the answer right away. Or when it comes to complex questions such as if one asks, for example, who lives longer, Westerners or Japanese, or who has the greater intellectual energy, the English or the Germans, it should certainly not be easy to judge who is right or wrong. Even more so if one asks what is the substance of mind or of matter and what are time and space. When one arrives at other questions such as what is the heavenly deity or the universe, it is a particular complex issue even among complex issues [複雑中の複雑なるもの], and who can decide these questions with certainty? Now, if someone explains the reason that both mental and material substances exist, someone else explains they do not exist, another person says that the heavenly deity is outside of matter and mind, and another one says he is not; when people are fighting about this, based on which criterion can you decide these questions? When I say that two and two is, of course, four or that the color red is the color red, but not the color yellow, I know that all people will admit that this is the truth. However, when one gets to the most difficult questions regarding the three substances of matter, mind, and god, then one cannot avoid a spirited debate, where someone takes this to be true, while someone else takes the same as untrue. In this situation, what do we take as the criterion to judge truth or falsity?

Full Sky said: What I call the criterion of truth is really something that can be understood with the utmost of ease, such as two plus two is four and this color is red, not yellow. It is not such a complex question such as "who lives longer, the Westerners or the Japanese?" or "what is the original substance of matter, mind, and god?" And since these complex matters arise from the aggregation of simple things, one must first decompose them into simple things if one wishes to know whether they are true or untrue. If one does not do this, one cannot gradually infer from a simple criterion and move on to complex matters. It is similar to, for example, knowing that 79 plus 97 is 176 by inferring from the principle of two plus two

is four. And regarding such complex matters, the reason why it is difficult to judge their truth or falsity, is merely because mistakes in inferences occur since our intellectual energy is not yet strong enough.

Full Light said: Even if we assent that to know 79 plus 97 is 176 can be inferred from the principle that two and two is four, but when it comes to the existence or non-existence of the heavenly deity and the reality of matter and mind, there is nothing to infer with the help of mathematics or physics. The reason is that [these matters] are entirely outside of physics. It is like this: One can, for example, measure the size of a thing by *shaku* but not the size of the mind. Thereby one can learn the reason why one cannot take the law of something simple that has form as the criterion to investigate the truth of something complex without form. To divide all things into simple and complex entities [事物], to only make the simple things the criterion of truth and to maintain that the complex cannot be the criterion of truth is in the end nothing more than an empty thought. What point of view do you take in the end? Do you posit domains divided into the simple and the complex? For example, when one assumes that two plus two is four is a simple law and 79 plus 97 is 176 is a complex law, by which number can one determine the division of the domains into simple and complex? If one supposes that the domains are divided at 50, then 49 must be a simple number and 51 must be a complex number. However, whoever knows that [the addition of] 49 and 49 results in 98, can know that 51 and 51 is, of course, 102. If this is ultimately the case, it is evident that there are no domains that are clearly simple or complex. One should know that the numerical difference between the simple and complex is therefore nothing but a hypothesis based on imagination [想像]. Besides this, I wish to criticize you. You have apparently agreed that in order to judge the truth and untruth of things, it is necessary to have a fixed criterion. Therefore, you determine the simple law as the criterion of truth, but, as I see it, in order to determine whether there is really a criterion of truth or not, it is necessary to have another criterion. For example, to determine the size of one *to* [斗; ca. 1 litre] the criterion of one *shō* [升; ca. 1,8 liter] is necessary, to determine the size of one *shō* the criterion of one *gō* [合; ca. 0,18 liter] is necessary. However, if you establish a criterion for the so-called truth, what kind of a criterion is really appropriate? There must certainly be another criterion. When you assume there is another criterion, there must be, again, a criterion of that criterion. How are you going to determine the criterion of the criterion?

Full Sky kept silent and after a while said: I have not yet investigated this thoroughly.

Perfect Earth said: In my opinion, such a criterion for a criterion cannot be as something in the external world. For example, the criterion to determine one *to* is one *shō*, and the criterion to determine one *shō* is one *gō*, but even when one goes further and draws the inference little by little regarding the criterion of one *gō*, and the criterion of one *shaku*, [the inference] ends in any case only by arriving at the point where nothing can form the root criterion. Therefore, I want to say that the criterion of the criterion is established nowhere else than within conscious thinking of the inner world. Let me demonstrate this principle to you. Now, if we know what our criterion is, is this not an act of consciousness? Us knowing that the criterion of the criterion really exists, is this not, again, an act of consciousness? The criterion to establish the criterion of the criterion as well as to know that it must exist is nothing other than conscious thinking. And, likewise, the discussion that such a criterion does not exist in the outer world is also thinking. Further, the investigation that there is no criterion outside of the thinking of the inner world is thinking. Apart from thinking there is no truth, outside of consciousness there is no criterion. Therefore I take consciousness to be the truth and thinking to be the criterion of truth.

Full Sky asked: When there is ultimately no criterion of truth outside of conscious thought, then everything I think or imagine in my mind must be true. But then how is it possible [according to your theory] that these thoughts are not true?

Perfect Earth said: If one takes what one thinks to be true and if one takes what one imagines to be untrue, then, because [both] entirely originate in the act of conscious thinking, my criterion of truth is nothing else but conscious thinking. In other words, the truth and untruth of things must be judged based on thinking.

Full Sky said: My point is, how can there be anything that originates in thinking that is untrue. Now, even if we believe what is untrue to be the truth, or dismiss what is true to be the untruth, do both of these not originate in acts of thinking? But if, as you say, thinking is really truth, then it is logical that everything imagined must likewise be the truth. How then can anything imagined, nevertheless, not be true?

[Perfect Earth] said: I have not considered this sufficiently, but as I see it, there are, of course, the so-called foundational axioms [原理原則] within the world of thinking. I assume that when our imagination accord with these axioms [原則], they become truth and when they do not meet them, they become untruth, is that not right?

Full Sky said: What are these axioms?

[Perfect Earth] said: The axioms of logic are the following. They are called the norms [法規] of thinking. There are three kinds among these norms. They are the Law of

Identity [均同法], the Law of Non-Contradiction [背反法] and the Law of the Excluded Middle [無間法]. First of all, the Law of Identity is the law that a thing is identical with that thing itself [事物自体]. For example, man is but man, something red is but something red. And, next, the Law of Non-Contradiction is the principle that states that it is impossible that one thing possesses two kinds of natures that are mutually opposing. For example, it is not possible that something is at the same time white and black or at the same time hot water and cold water. Next, the Law of the Excluded Middle is the law that it is impossible that something exists in the middle of two kinds of natures. For example, the heavenly deity exists or does not exist, it must be one of the two [cases]. The truth and falseness of things can be judged based on these laws, because the three norms are the axioms of the foundational logic of thought.

Full Sky said: What you really say is nothing but this: The criterion of truth is what is determined based on the experience of the outer world. The reason for this is [the following]: No matter whether you say that the things are identical with these things themselves [事物自体] or that mutually contradicting things are mutually contradicting, it is the case that we know the reasons in respect to things of the outer world, is it not? In short, the axioms of thinking arise from experience of the outer world. To put this in other words, the criterion of truth lies in the outer world.

Having reached this point, Perfect Earth was not able to reply.

Perfect Shadow saw the damage [caused by] the extreme bias of Full Sky's and Perfect Earth's views on matter and mind, and so he said: I want to declare that the criterion of truth exists in the middle of the inner and the outer worlds. To explain what I mean is not that only the things of the outer world are truth or only the ideas of the inner world are truth. The ideas of the inner world become truth only once they carry experience of the outer world, and the things of the outer world become truth only once they are discussed in relation to the inner world. In other words, what integrates experience and theory is truth and what does not integrate is untruth. For example, to speculate that the globe is a sphere and that it must rotate is theory. To go around it and to observe that it is curved is experience. The fact that today we apparently know it to be true that the globe is a sphere is due to the perfect correspondence of theory and experience. If, instead, one knows based on thinking that the globe is a sphere, but one has empirically not yet seen why; or if one has empirically seen why, but one has not understood the reason based on

thinking; then, one cannot yet take this view to be the truth. Seeing it in this way, the criterion of truth is nothing other than the correspondence of inside and outside.

Perfect Earth said: If you make the correspondence of the inner and outer world the criterion of truth, how do you determine [what is] truth and untruth, when you take imagination as being in the inner world and experience as being in the outer world? For example, something like the form of atoms, we cannot know by means of our ears and eyes. Something like the conditions between the various fixed stars, we cannot know based on sensation. One must say that it is impossible to judge the truth or untruth of something like this.

[Perfect Shadow] said: Although we cannot know by way of our eyes and ears directly as to how things stand with the form of atoms or interstellar matters we can infer indirectly based on different means. By the laws of inference [推究法], we are able to properly judge the truth and untruth of the so-called unknowable which we cannot see with our eyes or hear with our ears.

Perfect Earth said: If this is really so, can we also determine the true and the false regarding the status of mental and material substance, time and space, the universe and the heavenly deity?

[Perfect Shadow] said: Yes. Even if we have experiences while [only] occupying short periods of time, reigning over small parts of space, and occupying the lower ranks in the universe, we can still properly infer the status of the whole. Now, what we know—even if it is not the real substance but the phenomena of matter, mind, and god—allows us to discuss and infer what the real substance is from experimenting with phenomena. Based on the laws of inference we can turn from the knowable to the unknowable, from what has form to the formless.

Perfect Earth said: Regarding the laws of inference, I know that they are not the experience of the outer world, but the ideas of the inner world. That is to say, this principle for which I wish to judge the truth and untruth of the ideas of the inner world, is nothing other than what makes the ideas of the inner world the criterion of truth. In other words, have you not put forth the ideas of the inner world as the criterion of truth?

Perfect Shadow: What I call the experience of the outer world is what the study of logic calls inductive method [演繹法], the investigation of the inner world is the so-called deductive method [歸納法]. The law of induction is called the logical method [論法] which examines all distinct things each on their own based on a general law. The deductive law is called the logical method which determines a general law

based on all distinct things each on their own. And within the inductive method there are two kinds, the complete induction and the incomplete induction. Incomplete induction reaches from the already known to the not yet known. Now, what is called [complete] induction³ determines a law about the phenomena of matter and mind already known, and thereby reaches to the still unknown status of the real substance. And to decide true or false by thinking based on a law that has already been determined is the deductive method. When these two laws integrate and there is no contradiction, this produces, for the first time, the pure and whole truth.

Full Sky said: When one determines it this way, one must say that the criterion of truth exists in the external world. That the inductive method relates to the experience of the outer world is a matter of course. You also know that the law of deduction arises from the experience of the outer world. If so, are the so-called general laws not determined by inductive experience?

Perfect Shadow said: Within the law of deduction there are two types, that which comes from induction and that which does not. The so-called axiom of axioms does not come from inductive experience. This is called an a priori law. As opposed to that which comes from experience, which is called an a posteriori law. Now, since truth arises for the first time through the consistency between both a priori and a posteriori laws, I assume that the criterion of truth lies in the middle of the inner and the outer world.

Full Sky said: Can you indicate what kind of law this so-called a priori law is?

[Perfect Shadow] said: It is something like the principle of causality. The law of causality means that if there is a cause there will be an effect, if there is an effect there must be a cause. This is something that men know from birth, it is not something that they know based on experience.

Full Sky said: If so, it must be admitted that the law of causality, too, is the result attained by touching different things in the process of growing up. Please, consider a baby, if it saw a cause without an effect or an effect without a cause, would it not find this strange? But until it comes to understand the law of causality in the process of growing up, experience of the outer world is necessary. Thereby we can know the reason why the a priori laws await the a posteriori laws and the law of deduction awaits induction. In other words, the thinking of the inner world judges truth and untruth only after pondering the things of the outer world.

3 Corrigendum: [完全] 帰納

Perfect Earth said: According to the discussion of Full Sky, the truth exists entirely in the outer world and the things of the outer world are, in other words, the criterion of truth. However, as I see it, is it not the case that the things of the outer world become truth based on the thinking of the inner world? After all, to know that our outer world exists, and to know that there is truth in the outer world, is this not as such thinking of the inner world? Now, your proclamations of what each of you believes as well as my rebuttal of these [proclamations] are all thinking. This is the reason why I determine that the truth exists fully in the inner world and that the thinking of the inner world is the only criterion for truth.

Full Light then said: Based on what Full Sky argues, we must say that the truth has to be assumed as being external. On the other hand, based on what Perfect Earth argues, one must assume that the truth is in the inner world. Finally, if we follow what Perfect Shadow argues, we must say that truth exists in the middle of the inner and outer worlds. Although these different arguments each have their principles, each is also biased. In other words, if you establish [the truth] with respect to the outer world, one cannot avoid the difficulty of being biased towards the outer world. If you establish it with respect to the inner world, it is not possible to avoid the difficulty of being biased towards the inner world. If you establish it in the middle of the inner and outer worlds, one cannot avoid the difficulty of being biased towards the middle. All three theories have a logical deficit. Therefore, if one wishes for a consistent logic, one must say that the criterion of truth exists outside [both] matter and mind.

Perfect Shadow said: What kind of a criterion of truth exists outside of matter and mind?

[Full Light] said: This is the heavenly deity.

Perfect Shadow said: How can the heavenly deity that exists outside of matter and mind determine the truth of matter and mind and what kind of thing is this so-called heavenly deity?

[Full Light] said: I do not say that what I call the heavenly deity possesses a will [意志] or [issues] commands [命令] or [uses] language [言語]. [The heavenly deity's] substance is really something strange and mysterious; it is neither matter nor mind, it is not the integration of matter and mind, it is what is called a kind of logical substance [理体]. For this reason, I assume that [the heavenly deity] exists outside of matter and mind. And to properly determine the truth of matter and mind, there is the law pertaining to this substance. If people think about existing [entities] be-

tween matter and mind based on this law, they immediately will be able to know the truth of matter and mind.

Perfect Shadow said: Is this not likewise being biased towards the outside of matter and mind? And because the truth ultimately exists between matter and mind, one should say that the criterion of truth exists within the world of matter and mind. Why it is necessary to suppose it outside of matter and mind, which we cannot know?

Full Light replied and said what he thought, Full Sky rebuked this and proclaimed his own standpoint. Supporting this and denying that, they did not know how to exhaust the logic of this debate. After a time, the fire turned to ashes and the cold came. Nobody had energy left to proceed. The four looked at each other and said: "This discussion cannot be resolved in one night. Therefore, let us ask for our Master's judgment the next morning." So, they stood up from their seats and went to bed. The next morning it had cleared up, the sky was blue and the ground white, what was above and what was below were reflecting each other offering an abundant vista of atmospheric splendor. The sublimity was truly remarkable. When the bell struck ten, Master Full Perfection entered the lecture hall. Full Mountain, Perfect Water, and all the ten philosophers were sitting in front of him. The four disciples Full Sky, Perfect Earth, Full Sun and Perfect Shadow each came forth and presented what they had discussed the previous night and asked the Master to judge.

The Master said: Your arguments are each biased in one respect and have not attained logical impartiality. Since Full Sky is biased towards the outer world, Perfect Earth is biased towards the inner world, Full Light is biased towards the outside of matter and mind, and Perfect Shadow is biased towards the in between of matter and mind, none is able to harmonize with the pure and entire truth by maintaining a criterion of truth. However, these views each possess one part of truth and do not exceed this [one part] at all. They are quite like the four sides on a Go [碁] board. Your theories are like knowing only one side and not knowing all sides. If we go further—when Full Sky knows the reason why the world of matter does not exist separate from the world of mind, Perfect Earth knows the reason why the inner world does not exist separate from the outer world, Full Light knows the reason why the original substance of the heavenly deity does not exist separate from matter and mind, and Perfect Shadow knows the reason why the correspondence of both the internal and external worlds do not exist separate from the original substance of matter and mind—we can lead each of these four theories back to a com-

mon identity. What appears in our ears and eyes of the inner and outer worlds is what is called the world of phenomena and what is beyond ears and eyes is what is called the world of non-phenomena. Therefore, the mental phenomena and the material phenomena belong to the world of phenomena and the mental substance and the material substance belong to the world of non-phenomena, and the divine substance belongs to the world of non-phenomena, too. And what explains the reason for not separating the world of phenomena from its world of non-phenomena is the path of Full Perfection. Thus, when you consider this after entering the great path of Full Perfection, the phenomenal and the non-phenomenal as well as the worlds of matter and mind are all substantially identical. Therefore, none is not the truth. Since, regarding their substance all are the truth [その体みな真理成る], it is not necessary to fight about yes and no, between this and that. Yet, since within this one pure truth naturally the difference of truth and untruth also exists, the inevitable competition of one with the other is also the path of Full Perfection. The first constitutes the gateway of equality, the second constitutes the gateway of difference. In other words, one can distinguish the two gateways of the absolute and the relative. Seeing this from the gateway of the absolute as equally one principle, all events and things [事々物々] must be the truth. Seeing this from the gateway of the relative, the one logical substance [理体] appears as the waveforms of a thousand differences and there first arises the difference of truth and untruth. As a test, let us illustrate this relation with regard to the snow in the front yard. Although the forms of the snowflakes are not identical, in their substance they are equally water. To regard these [snowflakes] as one and the same substance of water is the view of absolute equality and to regard them as multifaceted snowflakes is the view of relation and difference. And apart from the substance of water, there are no snowflakes, and the snowflakes are but the substance of water; both the view of equality and the view of difference can be reduced to become identical. The one and only path, past and present, East and West in which there exists difference within equality and where one sees the absolute within the relative, is the path of Full Perfection. You should therefore know that to treat both the worlds of matter and mind and both the phenomenal and the non-phenomenal as truth is the gateway of equality of Full Perfection. The appearance of the waveforms of truth and untruth on the surface of the ocean of principles is the gateway of difference of Full Perfection. And to show that the two gateways are the identical substance and are not separate, this is the complete path of Full Perfection. If you enter this gateway of equality and consider the matter now, how could there be any need to

theorize about a criterion, since a root of grass or a drop of water are all substantially the truth? Yet, if you enter the gateway of difference and consider it [this way], you see that a distinction between truth and untruth exists. Now it becomes necessary to establish a criterion of truth. For example, looking at snow, to say it is white is only possible by taking something not white as criterion. To say the sky is blue, takes something not blue as criterion. If we do not discuss the blue and the white of sky and snow, but only speak about color [in general], then it is not necessary to determine a criterion of blue and white. Then, we would rather have to discuss the criterion of color. But its criterion is not necessarily fixed. Sometimes the color of the sky is taken as criterion, sometimes the color of the snow, and in discussions about the quality of action, justice and humanity are taken as criteria, and in discussions about the advantages and disadvantages of things and circumstances, happiness is taken as criterion; [so] the criteria change with the times and necessarily differ according to people. However, moving on and arriving at the criterion among the criteria we easily see that there is something unchanging. This is to say, we see the principle of equality within the gateway of difference. That which changes is the criterion of the relative and that which does not change is the criterion of the absolute. We move on from the relative to enter into the absolute. This is what is called the evolution of the criterion. That is, we progress from the relations of material and mental phenomena to converge in the logical substance of the absolute, which germinates in these various phenomena. If all humans evolve to converge in this substance, they will all only see the one identical truth; and so how could strife once more occur regarding the right and wrong among them? We call this the world of Full Perfection. In other words, that is what people call the Golden World. This is where all teachings and studies first reach their ends, this is the one path that all explanations and theories converge upon. And today there is a fight between science and philosophy and strife between religion and law, because the progress of human knowledge has not yet reached the realm of truth. When one day this realm is finally reached, then alone the full moon of the singular logical substance will be floating on the ocean of Full Perfection. And to see the difference of before and after, of high and low on the surface of its ocean when waves form and connect in an infinite variety of patterns, reveals the criterion of the relative beneath the moon of the one principle of equality. Therefore, one night when the sky darkens and we meet when the cloud of delusion hinders the moonlight, then here and there will be mutually negating, yes and no will be mutually fighting. But when the cloud of delusion disperses and the full moon

shines on the surface of the ocean, you will see that the before and after or high and low of the forms of the waves are all equally the substance of water. The criteria you all have put forth, are all relative criteria not the absolute criterion. Although the absolute criterion is something you do not yet know, if you investigate the relative criteria and they finally coincide in one principle then this principle is precisely the absolute criterion. You should understand, therefore, that the absolute criterion does not exist separate from the relative criteria. To believe that they are substantially separate indicates the dark night of delusion and to know that they cannot be separated means the full moon of awakening. Oh, if you do not penetrate the great path of Full Perfection, how will anybody actually be able to distinguish the separate realms of delusion and enlightenment. You must [penetrate] this thoroughly. This great path of Full Perfection, its vastness is like not seeing the limits of space, its depth is like inexhaustible time, and its whole substance should be compared with the one great universe. All of you are in one corner of the universe. Full Mountain, Full East, and Full Sky are biased towards the corner of the material world, Perfect Water, Perfect West, and Perfect Earth are biased towards the corner of the mental world, Full South and Full Light are biased towards the outside of matter and mind, Perfect North and Perfect Shadow are biased towards the between of matter and mind. Since this is so, you are unable to see the original substance of truth. However, the place where [you] dwell is within the realm of truth; if you follow a step further into its principle, you will return to the true momentum [真際] of Full Perfection, which is the original substance of the so-called truth. How could you not immediately do so!

At this point, Full Mountain, Perfect Water, Full East, Perfect West, Full South, Perfect North, Full Sky, Perfect Earth, Full Light, and Perfect Shadow all stood up and praised the great path of Full Perfection and said: "Oh, this path is like the light that shines from heaven! Oh, our delusion has melted like snow!" At this moment, the sunlight [天日] of Full Perfection emitted its rays, the delusion in their breasts melted away and faded from sight.

Afterword to the Translation

This is the first complete English translation of INOUE Enryō's (1858–1919) renowned essay *Tetsugaku ichiyū wa* (also *Tetsugaku isseki wa*) 『哲學一夕話』: *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy*. The essay consists of three consecutive parts, which were published by Philosophy Press 哲學書院. "Discussing the Relation of the Worlds of Matter and Mind" 「物心兩界ノ關係ヲ論ス」 appeared in July 1886, "Discussing the Original Substance of God" 「神ノ本躰ヲ論ス」 in November 1886, and "Discussing the Nature of Truth" 「眞理ノ性質ヲ論ス」 in April 1887.⁴

The Impact of the Translated Work

The historical significance of Enryō's life's work has long been acknowledged both in Japan and in the West. Starting with the most recent Western scholarship, Rainer SCHULZER's intellectual biography *Inoue Enryō: A Philosophical Portrait* shows,⁵ in particular, Enryō's importance for introducing philosophy to the general public of Meiji period Japan. As stated in his introduction: "Through his large body of writings, the distance learning program at the Philosophy Academy, and his extensive lecture tours over the course of almost three decades, Enryō is likely to have reached more people than any other public intellectual of modern Japan until the end of the First World War."

Regarding Enryō's *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy* (= *Conversation*), John MARALDO translated its Prologue for the inclusion in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*⁶ and, demonstrating his high esteem for the text, commented that, "Enryō took terms and methods established in one cultural context and tried to convey and implement them in another. His *Conversation* teaches us that defining philosophy in Japan was a creative endeavor requiring more than a straightforward translation of terms" (p. 562). Through this creative endeavor it became possible to both transplant philosophy from Europe and to root it in Japan.

Robert WARGO best encapsulates Enryō's systematic approach as developed in the *Conversation*, as well as its philosophical possibilities and limits.⁷ He reads Enryō's

4 The complete work was reprinted in vol. 1 of 『井上門了選集』 [Inoue Enryō selected writings], 25 vols. (Tokyo: Eastern University 東洋大学, 1987-2004), pp. 33–84.

5 Forthcoming, State University of New York Press, 2018.

6 James W. HEISIG et al, eds. *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2011), pp. 560–61.

7 Robert WARGO. *The Logic of Nothingness* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2005), pp. 11–17. There are,

central idea in terms of an idealism modeled after German post-Kantian thinking, which tackles a problem as old as philosophy, the problem of individuation: "Differences can only exist in the context of unity, and unity cannot manifest itself except in differences." Even if Enryō "has not really offered a solution" to the problem of individuation, he offered at least "the hint of a direction to seek a solution through the consideration of the nature of distinctions in general rather than opting for a particular distinction as the basis for an explanation." And this new direction invokes the history of the Asian tradition: "Inoue had partially uncovered the roots of the problem, a problem endemic to Western philosophy, and had attempted to bring to bear on it a concept fundamental to Mahayana Buddhism" (p. 17).

To single out three important Japanese figures in the reception of the *Conversation*, let us consider ŌNISHI Hajime 大西祝 (1864–1900), NISHIDA Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1870–1945), and FUNAYAMA Shin'ichi 船山信一 (1907–1994).

Enryō's "little book" sparked interest from the very beginning, indeed, not only in the general public but among his colleagues as well. As early as 1887, ŌNISHI (the Kant of Japan) formulates a critique in a review⁸ of the *Conversation*'s second part in which he linked Enryō's idealism to Spinoza's philosophy, pointing out that it had some clear systematic deficits.⁹ Following this, the Marxist philosopher and historian FUNAYAMA Shin'ichi 船山信一 (1907–1994) presented a concise description of the *Conversation* interpreted through the lens of his historical studies of idealism in Meiji period Japan and within the framework of NISHIDA Kitarō's idealism.¹⁰ Indeed, NISHIDA himself remarked in an interview (published in the journal *Today* 『現代』 in 1934) that Enryō's booklet sparked his interest for philosophy and inspired him to choose philosophy as his subject of focus during his university studies.¹¹

Based on its historical impact as testified to by these and other scholars, the great importance of the *Conversation* can be delineated according to five specifications: First, it is the earliest philosophical text in Japan written in an autochthonous style,

of course, numerous works in Japanese.

8 「哲学一夕話第二編を読む」 [Reading the second part of 'An evening of philosophical conversation'] [1887], in vol. 1 of 『大西博士全集』 [Doctor Ōnishi's complete writings], 7 vols. (Tokyo: Keiseisha Shoten, 1903–1904).

9 For an account in English with short selections from the review see KŌSAKA Masaaki 高坂正顕. *Japanese Thought in the Meiji Era*, trans. by David ABOSCH (Tokyo: Pan-Pacific Press, 1958), pp. 249–50.

10 「明治哲学史研究」 [Research on the history of Meiji philosophy], in 『船山信一著作集』 [Collected writings by Funayama Shin'ichi], (Kobushi Shobō, 1998–1999), vol. 6, pp. 108–14.

11 『西田幾多郎全集』 [Complete works of Nishida Kitarō], new ed. (Iwanami, 2002–2004), vol. 24, p. 80. NISHIDA refers to the text of the *Conversation* with the word "pamphlet" パンフレット.

mirroring the Greek structure of maieutics. Second, it is the earliest Japanese dialogical and polylogical meta-reflection exploring—both in content and form—what the cultural practice of philosophy is. Third, considering the prologue of the *Conversation*, the text has two levels where the first, the prologue, sketches in broad strokes the array of intellectual positions within the discourse of the time. It thereby represents a kind of self-historicization, since it contextualizes the content of the debate of the main text, the second level. Fourth, it is a statement outside of Europe regarding non-European sources of philosophy and thus offers a synthesis of Eastern and Western thought from within the East. And last, it is the earliest attempt to present a systematic position of idealist philosophy in Japan, which—at least implicitly—makes use of the Buddhist tradition.¹²

The Conversation as Object of Research

Published more than 130 years ago, the text is still of great importance as an object of historical and linguistic research. The paramount achievements of the *Conversation*—as indicated above by MARALDO—become more palpable when viewed within the breadth of Enryō's activities. These encompass far more than the linguistic transmission of philosophy to Japan: Enryō also achieved a sort of 'horticultural' translation¹³ which was not simply an adaptation of Western garden culture to Japan, but an original invention, which 'oversees' the picturesque landscape 'intellectually': The meaningfulness of Enryō's Temple Garden of Philosophy 哲学堂公園 grows immensely when related to its discursive appendix that is housed in its library annex.¹⁴ As William BODIFORD states: "Because the collection [of the Garden's library] contains only pre-Meiji books and because of its systematic structure, it offers us a rare and in some ways invaluable overview of what kinds and quantities of books that constituted traditional learning in premodern Japan."¹⁵ Represented by and displayed in the library that

¹² For a broader view of how he treats Buddhism, cf. Kathleen M. STAGGS. *In Defense of Japanese Buddhism: Essays from the Meiji period by Inoue Enryō and Murakami Sensho*, PhD thesis (Princeton University, 1979), pp. 162–453; for a more detailed study cf. Ralf MÜLLER, "Die Entdeckung von Sprache im Zen: Inoue Enryō's Prolegomena zur Philosophie der Zen-Schule von 1893," in Raji STEINECK et al, eds. *Begriff und Bild der modernen japanischen Philosophie* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Frommann-Holzboog, 2014), pp. 63–105.

¹³ I owe this expression to Michael BURTSCHER who considers Enryō's Philosophical Garden in "Facing 'the West' on Philosophical Grounds: A View from the Pavilion of Subjectivity on Meiji Japan," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East*, vol. 26, no. 3 (2006): pp. 367–76.

¹⁴ For a historical and systematic account of Enryō's Philosophical Garden cf. Ralf MÜLLER. "A horticultural translation of philosophy: Inoue Enryō's Philosophical Garden," forthcoming 2019.

¹⁵ "Inoue Enryō in Retirement: Philosophy as Spiritual Cultivation," *International Inoue Enryō Re-*

is part of the well-designed landscape, the collection forms the intellectual source from which the linguistic and cultural translation of philosophy / *tetsugaku* 哲学 was born.¹⁶

As can be seen, the *Conversation* becomes an object of contemporary textual research on Meiji period philosophy. Published in 1887, it arrives 25 years following the introduction of the term *tetsugaku* in 1862 by NISHI Amane 西周 (1829–1897), 25 years before the first complete translation of Plato's works¹⁷ as well as the publication of NISHIDA's maiden work, the *Study of Good* 『善の研究』.

Regarding the 25 years after 1862, it is well known that NISHI provided the groundwork for the establishment of a modern Japanese terminology which first became fully available with the so-called *Philosophical Vocabulary* 『哲學字彙』 of 1881. The coinage in 1862—as documented in a letter to his colleague TSUDA Mamichi 津田真道 (1829–1903)—went unnoticed until 1874 when NISHI used the term in his work *A New Discourse on the Unity of the Hundred Teachings* 『百一新論』. Nevertheless, one still must work out the process of linguistic transmission both in greater detail and in its entirety in order to appreciate what is at stake in this intellectual and cross-cultural event. Little is known about the conceptual corpus as displayed in the 1881 *Philosophical Vocabulary* 『哲學字彙』, which was revised in 1884 and 1912 to include not only Western but also Sanskrit words as part of the terms to be used in philosophy. At the same time, a comprehensive study is missing that covers the majority of Meiji terminology, which dates back to the pre-Meiji period and had already evolved in the context of "Dutch learning" 蘭学 (*rangaku*).¹⁸

Jumping ahead to 1887 when the vocabulary was becoming established, the text marks not only the successful/felicitous translation of philosophy on a linguistic level but initiates the translation on a deeper level, including the cultural dimension of the philosophic discipline, its linguistic pragmatics, and its actual practice. Despite Enryō not being a strong systematic thinker, his work—of which the *Conversation* displays greatest lucidity—represent important resources for the study of the transmission, translation, and globalization of philosophy before these processes became rigidified in the course of time. Therefore, both linguistically and ideally it exhibits the process of

search 2 (2014): 19–54; *ibid.* p. 34.

16 Cf. Rainer SCHULZER, trans. and ed. "Guide to the Temple Garden of Philosophy: Based on Fragments by Inoue Enryo and Inoue Genichi," *International Inoue Enryo Research* 5 (2017): 99–176.

17 Cf. 『プラトーン全集』 [Complete works of Plato], transl. by MATSUMOTO Matatarō 松本亦太郎 and KIMURA Takatarō 木村鷹太郎, 5 vols. (Fuzanbō 富山房, 1903–1911).

18 Cf. for example TAKANO Chōei 高野長英 (1804–1850). "Seiyo gakushi no setsu: The Theories of Western Philosophers" 「西洋学師の説」, trans. by Gino K. PIOVESANA, *Monumenta Nipponica*, vol. 27, no. 1 (1972): pp. 85–92. For a broad view of terms available in pre-Meiji period cf. the early Dutch-Japanese dictionary *Haruma Wage* 『波留麻和解』 (1799).

translation and reception in an importantly exemplary fashion. Hence, the translator takes this text as crucial for the initiation of philosophy in Japan and our understanding thereof.

About the Translation

When reading the translation, it is important to keep in mind that the voices animating the conversations are not always specified in the original text, but are provided parenthetically in this translation. It was thus necessary to modify the original text where elliptical structures of the Japanese left ambiguities regarding who is speaking, responding, agreeing to, or rebuking the point of view of the other.¹⁹

Because of the inherent translational complexity of the *Conversation*, its English rendition—as well as that of the vast majority of Meiji period philosophical texts—is a challenge to the received principles of translation. This challenge involves more than translating the semantic difference between Japanese and English: One must also keep alive the elusive distance that would have separated Japanese intellectuals from philosophy when first engaging in what was to be called *tetsugaku*.²⁰ Thus, let us say a brief word regarding the translation of important terminology used in the original Japanese text. Given the essay's origin in late 19th century Japan, the translator attempted to match the English text with its source both in style and content. Terminological choices and syntactical changes were made carefully such that important features of the Japanese original are still discernible throughout the translation.

In addition to imposing the Japanese structure—at least in part—onto the English text, there are several core terms of Enryō's, whose translation present challenges that must be noted. Among those, the greatest challenge presented were the terms *ri* 理, *tai* 体, and *ryoku* 力.

The first term *ri* can be thought of as a meta-term that oscillates between its Eastern and Western connotations making it particularly challenging to translate.²¹ Given

¹⁹ This circumstance thwarts WARGO's observation as incorrect: "The last round of the discussion, devoid as it is of cogency, sophistication or philosophical merit, would seem reason enough for Nishida to avoid referring directly to Enryō in his writings. The conversation seems to lump such an odd assortment of philosophical positions together that one begins to suspect that somewhere along the line, someone—the printer or perhaps Enryō himself—attached the wrong name to a line in the dialogue and sent the arguments spinning out of control." WARGO. *The Logic of Nothingness* (see note 7), p. 14.

²⁰ For the most comprehensive account in English cf. HEISIG. *Japanese Philosophy* (see note 6), pp. 554–65.

²¹ FÉNG Yǒulán 馮友蘭 (1895–1990) declared that the Chéng-Zhū 程朱 Neo-Confucian notion *ri* (Ch. *lǐ*)

the character's importance within East Asian traditions, it is pregnant with meaning, which provides myriad opportunities for rephrasing in the English language. While this is so, the translation bypasses this Asian context altogether in order to let it become the mediator for the Japanese. Hence, this concept of Enryō's is almost exclusively translated as "principle."

Another term, which presented significant difficulty for translation is *tai*. The ontological dimension of Enryō's idealism is best pinpointed by this term, because it designates the underlying or all-encompassing fabric of reality. This term was translated as "substance" throughout the text although in some cases the English reader's ear would rather expect "essence." The former was chosen since "substance" is in line with Enryō's intent as it suggests a sense of ontological hypostatization.

The third term that presented distinct challenges for translation was *ryoku* 力, which—on its own or as part of a compound—was translated as "energy." The compounds in particular (e.g., *seiryoku* 勢力) are likely to have been derived from Herbert SPENCER'S *First Principles* (1st ed., 1860), one of the most influential books of the Western tradition in Japan at the time Enryō was composing his work. Because it represents a term that articulates Enryō's understanding of what the world and life really are, "energy" was also kept in instances of *ryoku* where other terms would be more natural for the English reader.

The terminological framework of the *Conversation* can be divided according to the fields of philosophy of nature, epistemology, ontology and methodology. The most important terms include:

Core concepts

- 哲理 - the principle of philosophy
- 理 - principle
- 理体 - logical substance
- 体 - substance
- 事物自体 - thing itself
- 平等 - equality
- 自觉 - self-awakening, self-consciousness

was the traditional Chinese equivalent of the Platonic forms. See FUNG Yu-Lan. *A History of Chinese Philosophy*, trans. by Derk BODDE (Princeton University Press, 1953), vol. 2, p. 537. As a translational term *ri* is a kind of mediator between Eastern and Western thought. For example, the word *kyūrigaku* 究理学 used in the prologue has *ri* and probably derives from Dutch *wijsbegeerie*, which is another word for philosophy. Cf. *Haruma Wage* 『波留麻和解』 (1799), vol. 9, p. 170.

中道 - middle path
三性 - three essences
差別 - difference
無差別 - non-differentiation

Subjects

哲学 - philosophy
純正哲学 - pure philosophy, metaphysics
心理学 - principles of the mind, psychology
論理 - logic
唯理論 - principlism
唯物論 - materialism
唯心論 - idealism
有神論 - theism
無神論 - atheism

Philosophy of nature

力 - energy
生活力 - life energy
思想の力 - energy of thinking
知力 - intellectual energy
心の力 - energy of the mind
一大活物 - one great living being
勢力の進化 - evolution of energy
種類 - species
造物者 - creator
經營者 - orchestrator
妙用 - wonderful function
変化 - transformation(s)
大化 - the great transformation

Epistemology

主観 - subject
客観 - object
境 - realm[s]
感触 - feel

身 - body
意識知覚 - conscious perception
内・外部 - inner/outer realm
作用 - acts
現象 - phenomena
表象 - representation
影像 - image
現存 - appear
形 - property
質 - quality
形質 - form
思想 - idea
念 - thought
惑い - confusion
情 - desire
想像 - imagination
感覚 - sensation
意志 - will
経験 - experience
推して知る - know by inference
推究 - inference
実験する - experiment with, or, experience

Ontology

実在 - reality
実質 - real nature
性質 - nature
存在 - existence
万物 - ten thousand things
本 - origin
原体 - primal substance
本源 - original source
本体 - original substance
実体 - real substance
物体 - material substance
物質 - matter

物象 - material phenomena
事物 - entities
神 - god
天神 - heavenly deity
神体 - divine substance

Methodology

究理 - investigation of principles
学問 - study
理学 - sciences
説 - view, explanation
道理 - principle
原理 - foundational logic
原理原則 - foundational axioms
純理 - pure principles
道理界 - the world of principles
自明の規則 - self-evident laws
通則 - general laws
一定の規則 - a constant law
理法 - law
結成 - organizing, structure
憶説 - hypothesis
推想 - speculation
空想 - empty thought
推想 - speculation
憶定する - hypothesize
回帰 - converge
論理回転 - logical circle
論法 - logical method

Ralf MÜLLER