

## ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF INOUE ENRYŌ

TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男

### 1. "The Basis of All Learning Lies in Philosophy"

INOUE Enryō's 井上円了 (1858–1919) early education was based on the Chinese classics. Later he entered the Nagaoka School for Western Learning, where he studied English and Christianity. An exceptional student, he was selected from among the nationwide sectarian temples of his Buddhist order, the Eastern Temple of the Original Vow 東本願寺, to study at the Teachers Academy of the order in Kyoto, which he entered in 1877. In 1878 he was sent to Tokyo as a student of the Eastern Temple of the Original Vow and enrolled in the Preparatory School of Tokyo University in September, where he could further refine his language skills. It was three years later, in September 1881, when he first started to study Western philosophy regularly at the Philosophy Department of the Faculty of Letters of Tokyo University. He graduated in July 1885 and soon became active as a writer. During this time he published *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy* 『哲学一夕話』 in three volumes (1886–1887), the *Epitome of*

<sup>0</sup> TAKEMURA Makio 竹村牧男, Professor of Buddhist Studies and President of Toyo University (Tokyo). The commemorative lecture was given on the occasion of the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Toyo University in September 2012. Translated by Rainer SCHULZER, Toyo University (Tokyo). Japanese original 「井上円了の哲学について」 published in same issue.

*Philosophy* 『哲学要領』 in two volumes (1886–1887) and other books in which he introduced the essentials of philosophy to the Japanese reader. Both his important works, *The Golden Needle of Truth* 『真理金針』 in three volumes (1886–1887) and the *Prolegomena to a Living Discourse on Buddhism* 『仏教活論序論』 (1887), were bestsellers at the time.

He founded the Philosophy Academy in September 16 1887 and the opening ceremony was held in Rinshō Temple 麟祥院. Three months before, in June 1887, Enryō had published the *Principles for Establishing a Philosophy Academy* 「哲学館開設の旨趣」 in which he explained why it was necessary to open a school of philosophy:

The science [学問] which is most superior among the various sciences is philosophy. If philosophy is not studied, it is impossible to develop superior intellect and progress to superior enlightenment. I take this to be self evident. Herein, the necessity of philosophy should be admitted. *Philosophy is the science which searches for the principles behind all things and determines their laws.* From politics and law above to the numerous sciences and technologies beneath, they all receive their principles and laws from this science. Therefore, one does certainly not praise philosophy too much if one calls it *the central government in the world of science, the learning which unifies the myriad forms of learning.*<sup>1</sup> (25:750)

According to this quotation, we have to rely on "science" (or "scholarship") 学問 to develop the human intellect. This is because, if we rely on a superior form of scholarship, we will develop a superior intellect. This superior scholarship is nothing other than philosophy, for it is philosophy that searches for the principles and laws of science. Philosophy is the "central government in the world of science, the learning which unifies the myriad forms of learning." Therefore, Enryō reasoned, philosophical education is necessary. This represents Enryō's basic idea of philosophy.

Toyo University has made "The Basis of All Learning Lies in Philosophy" its highest academic ideal. It has often been pointed out that these are not Enryō's own words. But in the preface of his earliest work, *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy*, one finds a passage that can be regarded as an authoritative source: "In short we can say, that genuine philosophy [純正哲学] is the science of the pure principles in philosophy and science. It investigates the principle of truth and *the basis of all learning*" (1:34). Therefore, we can say that "The Basis of All Learning Lies in Philosophy"

<sup>1</sup> All italics here and in later quotations are added by the author.

expresses Enryō's intentions. Admittedly, instead of using the phrase, "the basis of all learning", he more often speaks of "the learning which unifies all forms of learning" or "the central government in the world of science." Further Enryō calls philosophy "the king of the sciences" or "unifying science" (1:254) in his *Lectures on Genuine Philosophy* 『純正哲学講義』 (1893). However, these phrases can be understood as different ways of expressing the same basic idea.

We can interpret the phrase "The Basis of All Learning Lies in Philosophy" as saying that through philosophy the various sciences first acquire their meaning. In the following paragraph this is relatively clearly expressed:

Genuine philosophy determines the principles and laws of ethics, logic, and the other philosophical disciplines. The various philosophical disciplines are determining the principles and laws of physics, law, and the other sciences. Philosophy is therefore the central government in the world of science. [...] In general, the advancement of civilization in our country is not done only by politics and law. It is also not done only by physics and engineering. It is necessary to study *the science, which is the government of the sciences and the foundation of the arts. The science which well unifies the sciences, establishes their areas, and assures their positions.* [...] I believe that from now on it should be promoted in public that for advancing civilization and for benefiting the country it is necessary to research philosophy, because it is the central government in the world of sciences and the foundation of all scholarship and all arts.<sup>2</sup> (1:256–257)

Enryō here points out, that philosophy "establishes the scientific areas, and assures the position of the sciences." If this is the case, philosophy affirms the significance of the other sciences, and by doing so also "advances civilization and benefits the country." Therefore, Toyo University, which holds up the idea that "The Basis of All Learning Lies in Philosophy," endeavors, on the one hand, to be conscious about the foundation from which each science emerges, and, on the other hand, encourages the practice of philosophy to investigate the highest principles by which the system of the sciences is organized. The mission is to inquire generally about the significance of education and research activities and it will thereby pioneer ideas that point to a future ideal world society.

<sup>2</sup> The quoted paragraph first appeared in INOUE Enryō 井上円了, 「哲学の必要性を論じて本会の沿革に及ぶ」 [Discussing the necessity of philosophy together with an account of the society's origin], 『哲學會雜誌』 [Journal of the philosophy association] 1 (1887).

## 2. Enryō's Philosophy (I): From Kant to Hegel

INOUE Enryō studied philosophy at Tokyo University. But at what philosophy or line of thought did he himself finally arrive? In the philosophy department of Tokyo University, Ernest F. FENOLLOSA taught Enryō western philosophy, such as Kant, Hegel, and Spencer. HARA Tanzan 原坦山 lectured about *The Awakening of Mahāyāna Faith* 『大乘起信論』 and other Buddhist thought. It was engaged in this research that Enryō finally discovered the truth he was searching for and that was philosophy. From his philosophical standpoint of truth, Enryō reviewed the Buddhist teachings. Upon finding that the same ideas had already been taught in Buddhism, he was exultant. Enryō wrote about this event in the *Prolegomena to a Living Discourse on Buddhism* (hereafter cited as *Prolegomena*):

*After I had discovered the bright moon of truth in the world of philosophy, I reviewed the older teachings. It became more and more clear that there was no truth in Christianity. And it was also easy to prove that the truth could not be found in Confucianism. I realized that only the teachings of Buddhism were to a large extent consistent with philosophical reasoning. At this point, I again read the Buddhist scriptures and became more and more convinced of the truth of their teachings. I clapped my hands and exclaimed: 'Who would have thought that the truth that had been established by research in the West during the past thousand years, was already present three thousand years ago in the ancient Orient.' [...] This actually occurred in 1885. (3:337)*

1885 was the year Enryō graduated from Tokyo University. At this time he had grasped the highest truth elucidated in western philosophy and had arrived at the firm belief that Buddhism was teaching the same truth. But what was the content of this truth? In *The Golden Needle of Truth* Enryō wrote as follows:

It should be *acknowledged* that the Absolute does not exist separately from the Relative. [...] *In the West, the philosophy of Schelling established the Absolute apart from the Relative. This was opposed by Hegel, who demonstrated that the opposites of the Absolute and the Relative are not separate. Now, this inseparability of opposites is the standpoint of Buddhism and it does not differ in the slightest from Hegel's position.* In Buddhism it is argued that the myriad relative things are ontologically nothing else but the one principle of Suchness [真如]. Therefore, it is said 'the myriad entities equal Suchness.' The argument that the one principle

of Suchness is not separate from mind and matter is expressed as 'Suchness equals the myriad entities.' The reasoning that Suchness and the myriad things are substantially one and inseparable is called 'the myriad entities equal Suchness, Suchness equals the myriad entities,' or in other words, 'emptiness is form and form is emptiness.'<sup>3</sup> (3:304–305)

According to this quotation, Hegel is the apex of western philosophy and Buddhism is regarded as teaching the identical truth. Enryō famously selected four representative philosophers to perform in a special ceremony, which formed part of his program of raising public awareness about the importance of philosophy. Those he selected are thought to represent a balance between East and West, and antiquity and modernity. The philosophers were Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, and Kant, whom he calls the "Four Sages" 四聖. Amongst these four, Kant is meant to represent the modern West. Indeed, Enryō valued Kant highly, as can be seen in his *Quick Primer to Philosophy* 『哲学早わかり』 (1899):

Then Kant appeared and brought them [skepticism and dogmatism] together. In establishing criticism, he penetrated the traditional philosophy of hypothesis and dogma. After he had developed his great perfect system, western philosophy largely reached completion. Therefore, I call the age *after* Kant until the present the age of completion in modern philosophy. [...] Anyway, to restore for ancient philosophy Socrates, who appeared four hundred years B.C., and to restore for modern philosophy Kant, who lived one hundred years ago, I selected in recent years the Four Sages representing the eastern and western world of philosophy. (2:48–49)

The book, *A Glance at the World of Philosophy* 『哲界一瞥』 (1913), is an explanation of the "Philosophy Hall" 哲学堂 where the Four Sages are enshrined. In this book Enryō calls Kant the "modern scholar of singular greatness." He further points out: "It is right to say that his personality and conduct is exemplary for a scholar and that he exhibited no flaw whatsoever. It can also be said that modern philosophy which had begun with the French philosopher Descartes was completed by him" (2:76–77). However, as regards philosophical content, Enryō did in fact appreciate Hegel more than Kant. What was the reason for this? According to *Epitome of Philosophy* Kant needed to be criticized in the following way:

<sup>3</sup> The common translation of 「色即是空、空即是色」 as "form is emptiness and emptiness is form" is in fact misleading. 色 for Sanskrit *rūpa* means "that which has shape", i.e., "matter."

In short, although his [Kant] scholarship had the same starting point as Descartes, namely in the conduct of research as guided by truth, Kant held that the objective phenomena which are constituted in time and space all return into the subject. He called this the self-apperception of the mind [心体を自覚]. This differed greatly from the intent of Descartes's dualism. Although Kant further rejected sensualism and argued against Bacon, Locke, and others for the capacity of the mind to be necessary and universal, he also conformed with them in regard to sensual experience as the source of data which in turn gives content to the categories [原形]. Moreover, Kant's theory of the subject originates from Leibniz. Although he agrees with Leibniz's views in some points, he disagreed in saying that it is not possible to know the substrate [実体] of matter through intuition. But *in determining that matter exists outside of the mind and in stating that it is absolutely impossible to know its substrate his philosophy exhibited his greatest shortcoming*. This caused Fichte, who investigated Kant's theories, to put forward absolute idealism. (1:141–142)

According to Enryō, Kant was close to the standpoint of idealism in that he interpreted everything we see and hear as already taken in by the senses and therefore as being on side of the subject. Yet, in stating that the things itself which bring about sensation exists in the outer world, he fell back into dualism. Enryō concluded that herein lies a great shortcoming. He concisely expressed the same point also in a *Quick Primer to Philosophy*: "Kant overcame the skepticism of Hume and unified the two principles of experience and dogma by putting forward critical philosophy. Moving away from idealism, he proposed objective realism [物体實在論] and thereby raised anew a great problem in philosophy." (2:51) Interestingly, in *Philosophy of Struggle* [奮闘哲学] (1917), Enryō used modern verse to convey again the same concern:<sup>4</sup>

The next champion who appeared was the famous Kant. Deeply consternated by Hume's nihilism, doubts arose in him. Once more he investigated the principles and forged the sword he came to swing. He excelled in cutting through the imbroglio of nations and the clutter of philosophy. Kant's epoch-making philosophy crushed the bias of the dogmatic school and swept away the shallowness of the empiricists. His critical philosophy penetrated their foundations and revealed the roots of knowledge. With his voice like thunder, white rain washed from heaven and earth. Suddenly

<sup>4</sup> Enryō titled the verses "Song of New Shape" [新体の歌] alluding to the genre of "New Shape Poems" [新体詩] which had appeared during the Meiji period. The verse has loosely ten syllables each line. For reasons of accuracy for the philosophical content, I translated the verses into prose. – Trans.

the admirable world of philosophy was purified as the vista of the lucid moon in crystal wind. Yet in conclusion, the substance of the myriad things was expelled from knowledge. Instead of returning into the truly unfathomable, in the end he provoked opposition. Fichte appeared, restored substance into thought and erected the architecture of idealism. But soon again [...]. (2:245)

Fichte "perfected idealism by bringing back the substrate of things into the consciousness" (*Epitome of Philosophy*, 1:142). In short, Fichte included Kant's thing itself in the consciousness and thus established idealism, according to Enryō. But Fichte's standpoint was centered on the I and therefore lacked concern for the non-I. This problem was then again overcome by Schelling:

*He opposed the absolutization of the I by Fichte and posited the I on the side of the Relative. He separated the absolute substance [絶対の原体] from the realm of the Relative, to which I and non-I belonged, and ranked it as beyond. The two complementary realms of I and non-I were basically merged into the absolute substance, which became the ground [本源] of both. This ground itself had the force to successively emanate the two realms of I and non-I, i.e. the two worlds of mind and matter. This setting free of the different worlds or the bearing of all phenomena is called evolution [進化]. Schelling's philosophy discusses the evolution of the Absolute. (1:143–144)*

But a problem remained in Schelling's positing of the Relative separate from the Absolute. It was then Hegel's turn to solve the problem:

Next, Hegel complemented Schelling's approach and also made it more perfect. Compared to Fichte, Schelling made a step forward by positing the realm of the I on the side of the Relative and understood the Absolute as the ground of the realms of I and non-I. *But the theory which established the Absolute ontologically separate from the realms of I and non-I could not be conceded.* Since our knowledge derives from the Relative, we finally would not be unable to know anything only one step beyond the range of the Relative. If the Absolute were outside of the Relative, how could anybody know about its existence? So Hegel refuted Schelling and brought forth his own philosophy. *Hegel did not locate the Absolute outside the Relative, but identified them ontologically.* In other words, it was his theory that the Absolute and the Relative could not be separated in any way. He determined that they existed as mutual union and that the Absolute was immanent to the range of the Relative. He held that it is pos-

sible to know about the Absolute because it was located in the Relative. This absolute whole he named Ideal and the emanation of the realms of mind and matter from this comprehensive whole he called evolution of the Ideal. [...] At this point, German philosophy had first reached completion. (1:144–145)

The word "Ideal" 理想 in this quotation requires attention. It does not mean the way something ought to be in our contemporary understanding. Here, it actually means nothing else but substance. Enryō further explained this sense of Ideal in his *Epitome of Philosophy*:

This Ideal is the name given to the substance [本体] of mind and matter. The substance is not identical with matter and also not identical with mind. And although it is neither matter nor mind, it also does not exist separately from them. Matter and mind are ontologically equal with the Ideal. The various phenomena of mind and matter are present at the front and back side of this Ideal. Therefore mind and matter are the phenomena and the Ideal is the substrate [実体]. In this way, we can understand the principle of the ontological identity of duality [二元同体]. The ontological identity of all duality is because mind and matter exist through the same Ideal. (1:154)

Hegel arrived at a point where the Absolute is perceived immediately in the Relative, where the Absolute is nothing apart from the Relative. Enryō regarded Hegel's thought of the 'inseparability of the Relative and the Absolute,' or the 'principle of ontological identity of duality' as the ultimate standpoint.

### 3. Enryō's Philosophy (II): Hegel's Philosophy and Buddhist Thought

So far we have followed this ultimate philosophical standpoint through the history of ideas. Now let us try to assess this point again by returning to Enryō's various explanations. In his very late work *Philosophy of Struggle* Enryō included a "Hymn of Philosophy" 「哲学和讃」 in fifty verses. Some of these go as follows:

In the history of the world of philosophy  
the struggle between materialism and idealism,  
the fight between monism and pluralism  
left their traces on the old battle field.

Before the flame of monism  
even the struggle between materialism and idealism  
having lumped to ice over long generations  
melts and turns into water.

The relation between matter and mind,  
the mystery of being separate and yet not,  
this neither one nor two  
for sure is the ultimate of monism.

The one homogeneous substance  
is the unfathomable in the unfathomable.  
Because neither mind nor language can reach it,  
I call it the Absolute and Unlimited.

The manifold cosmic phenomena  
but waves of the Absolute,  
the boundless coordinates of time and space  
the splendor it emits. (2:436–437)

Generally, it is noted that materialism is related to pluralism and idealism to monism. According to Enryō, the history of western philosophy can be roughly depicted as developing from materialism to idealism, and from pluralism to monism. The cited verses express that in the ultimate monism, mind and matter are neither one nor two. But if matter and mind are not two, there must be something which runs through both. It is necessary to assume a substance or "essence" 本性, which is common to the differing phenomena of mind and matter. In doing so, the relationship between the substance, on the one hand, and mind and matter, on the other hand, also has to be specified. This is to say, monism ultimately does not simply mean singular (mind) as opposed to plural (matter). It does also not just mean that mind and matter are neither one nor two. But such monism results in a world in which ontological plurality (matter, mind, phenomena, the Relative) and ontological unity (essence, substance, being, the Absolute) are neither one nor two. In other words, a world in which the Relative and the Absolute are neither one nor different.

Enryō explained the theoretical content of such an ultimate monism very clearly, for example, in the first volume of his very first book, *An Evening Conversation about Philosophy*:

Generally, discussing philosophy comes down to nothing else but the

questions, what is mind, what is matter and what is the world? The standpoint that the world is only matter and no mind is called materialism. The standpoint that the world is contained in the mind, and that there is no matter outside, is called idealism. Idealism [唯心] is biased towards the side of the mind, materialism [唯物] is biased towards the side of matter. Obviously both are not impartial [中正] theories. If one wants to take the standpoint of the impartial middle, it is necessary to integrate mind and matter based on the logos [理] of no-matter and no-mind. The standpoint that there is neither mind nor matter apart from logos is called panlogism [唯理]. Because panlogism is biased towards logos, it is again not an impartial theory. However, it is also not correct to hold that mind and matter exist separately from logos. *Therefore, logos includes mind and matter; mind and matter are present in logos. Although they are different, they cannot be separated from each other. Although they cannot be separated from each other, they are not the same. This is called the Middle Way of philosophical reasoning.* (1:35)

Moreover, in the *Prolegomena* Enryō explained:

To determine the substance of mind and matter, it is first necessary to take the standpoint of the rational ground [理体] of neither matter nor mind. This ground is called Suchness. Suchness is matter and also not matter; it is mind and also not mind. In other words, *it is neither matter nor mind, and at the same time it is mind and it is matter. This is called the Middle Way of 'neither existence nor emptiness as well as existence and emptiness.'* Although I use the term rationalism here, this theory is not biased in the least towards reason. *Reason is conjoined with matter and mind. They are in a relation of neither one nor two.* If I was to give the theory another name, I would therefore call it theory of middle reason or theory of perfect rationalism. (3:367)

It is worth quoting, repetition notwithstanding, how this same point is made in the second volume of the *Epitome of Philosophy*:

According to the preceding discussion, it would be illogical to assume that the substance of the Ideal could exist outside of matter and mind. Therefore we have to say that it exists inside of them. If we consequently think of the Ideal as part of the Relative and indeed determine it as part of mind and matter, then it becomes difficult to explain how from this substance mind and matter could emanate. If we alternatively hold the Absolute and the Relative to be completely identical, we cannot explain their differing characteristics. To give at all an insightful answer to this problem, *one has*

to rely on the theories of Hegel and the Heavenly Plain [天台] School of Buddhism. According to their theories, the Relative and the Absolute cannot be differentiated in any measurable range, rather, they are ontologically the one and the same. In other words, if the Relative and the Absolute are ontologically identical, it means that mind and matter, as well as phenomena and substance, are all existing in the same realm. The distinction, then, between matter and mind as well as substance and phenomena, is due to differences appearing within the undifferentiated. It is like one material body having a front and a back side. I will call this theory the *theory of the ontological identity of mind and matter*. The ontological identity of mind and matter means the ontological identity not only of the duality of matter and mind, but also of the duality of substance and phenomena. (1:203–205)

Hence, mind, matter, and substance (i.e., the Ideal, Suchness), as well as the Relative and the Absolute, are all present in a single phenomenon. Further, no matter if this phenomenon is material or mental, in this one phenomenon both the phenomena of mind and matter as well as their substance can be found. This standpoint, which discovers in each and every particular of the real world the Absolute or "true reality" 眞実, is not necessarily abstract or "idealistic" 観念的, but in fact results in a very powerful position abundant with a sense of life.

Enryō arrived in Western philosophy at Hegel's position: the Relative and Absolute are not two. Further, it was Enryō's understanding that Hegel's theory is identical with the standpoint of Heavenly Plain 天台 (Ch. Tiāntái, Jp. Tendai) Buddhism. This is expressed in the already cited quotation from the *Prolegomena*: "Now, this inseparability of opposites is the standpoint of Buddhism and it does not differ in the slightest from Hegel's position" (3:305). If we take a closer look at the relationship between western philosophy and Buddhism, the following passage from the *Epitome of Philosophy* is useful:

I believe that Buddhism is half science (or philosophy) and half religion. The Kōsa School of the Small Vehicle is science, whereas the Consciousness-only, the Flower Adornment [華嚴], and the Heavenly Plain School of the Great Vehicle are philosophy. Moreover it can be said, that the Gate of the Holy Path is philosophy and the Gate of the Pure Land is religion.<sup>5</sup> [...] Next, the doctrine of the manifold entities being modifications of consciousness only held by the Consciousness-only School of the Great

<sup>5</sup> In the following, Enryō argues that the Kōsa doctrine is equivalent to materialism.

Vehicle resembles idealism in western philosophy. The eighth form of consciousness called *ālaya* is an analogue of Kant's self-apperception of the mind and Fichte's absolute subject. Then the argument of the *Prajñā* [Pāramitā-sūtra] that all entities are empty resembles the nihilism in western philosophy, which holds that matter and mind are both empty. Next, there is [the doctrine of] dependent arising from Suchness of the Heavenly Plain [School] which resembles the school of logic, or the idealist school [理想学派] in western philosophy.<sup>6</sup> *The position of the Heavenly Plain School, that the 'myriad entities equal Suchness and Suchness equals the myriad entities,' is identical with Hegel's argument that 'the phenomenal equal the a-phenomenal [無象] and the a-phenomenal equals the phenomenal.'* The theory of the *Awakening of Faith*, that two gates depart from the one mind, is the same as Schelling's theory that the Relative departs from the Absolute. What in the *Awakening of Faith* is called Suchness is analogue to Spinoza's substance [本質], Schelling's Absolute, and Hegel's Ideal. (1:103–104)

In this quotation Enryō takes the teaching of dependent arising from Suchness to be the thought of the Heavenly Plain School. In light of contemporary scholarship, I believe that there should be further research into, first, whether the teaching of dependent arising from Suchness can be regarded as a doctrine of the Heavenly Plain School and, second, on the exact content of this teaching. We can represent the thought of the Heavenly Plain School in a quotation from the *Great Cessation and Observation* 『摩訶止観』: "One color, one fragrance – nothing is not the Middle Way."<sup>7</sup> In so far as this thought perceives the Absolute within real things, it arguably shows a perspective beyond the dualism of the Relative and the Absolute. And Enryō believed that Hegel's philosophical position corresponds to this view. This belief is quite possible if we take Hegel's position to be 'the phenomenal equals the a-phenomenal and the a-phenomenal equals the phenomenal.' The Buddhist notion of Suchness as the essence of the various entities is certainly not that of an existing thing, but it is characterized by emptiness. I assume that it was Enryō's understanding that emptiness also applies to Hegel's Ideal (i.e., the substance), which Enryō paraphrased here as the a-phenomenal. If not, Hegel's substance (i.e., the Absolute) would again be seen as a "substrate-like existence" 実体の存在 besides the phenomena (i.e., the Relative).

This is actually the standpoint which I would like to call "phenomena-as-being

<sup>6</sup> Here, we probably have to understand logic in the Hegelian sense. – Trans.

<sup>7</sup> The quotation appears in the first of the twenty fascicles of *Great Cessation and Observation* 『摩訶止観』 by Zhiyi 智顓 (T 1911).

theory" 現象即實在論. This phrase is, however, discussed by HARIU Kiyoto 針生清人 in the commentary to the first volume of *Inoue Enryō Selected Writings*:

Enryō used the expression phenomena-as-being only once, in his *New Proposal in Philosophy* (1:151). And the usage there is not necessarily positive. There he says that all teachings and theories are always biased towards one side. If we affirm phenomena as being, this will elicit the objection that there is being apart from the phenomena. Therefore, Enryō used the phrase not to present a certain view but, rather, used it in an argument that asserted the unification of the two worlds of mind and matter. Enryō was investigating the *substance* (the "One Thus" [一如], "Original Thus" [如元], or "True Source" [真元]) that unifies both worlds. He did not affirm the phenomena-as-being theory, instead it can be said that he wanted to overcome it. I believe that this was underlying Enryō's thoughts. (1:422–423)

This commentary is rather difficult to understand. It is fair to say that Enryō did not use the expression 'phenomena-as-being theory,' but he did use, for example, phrases like 'theory of the ontological identity of mind and matter' or 'theory of the ontological identity of duality.' About the content of the theory of ontological identity it should be kept in mind, first, that the Absolute is seen in each and every material and mental phenomenon, second, that the relationship which is implicated in the expression 'ontological identity' is the relation of 'neither one nor two,' and third, that the relation of 'neither one nor two' applies not only to mind and matter, but also for example to the relationship between (material or mental) phenomena and substance.

#### **4. Enryō's Philosophy (III): The Philosophy of "Infinite Recursion"**

In his late work from 1909, *New Proposal in Philosophy* 『哲学新案』, Enryō furthered this argument about the relationship between the Relative and the Absolute:

The principle of mutual ontological inclusion of matter as such and mind as such means that there is something that unifies the myriad phenomena and processes at the base of the material world. It does not only unify the myriad imaginations and feelings at the core of the mental world, but it also unifies both worlds of mind and matter at their deepest level. This becomes clear if we observe the coincidence and harmony of mind and matter in reality. What name shall we give to this [unifying] substance? I will call it the One Thus, the Original Thus, or the True Source. The One

Thus ontologically provides and embraces, supports and includes the myriad phenomena and feelings, and it gives rise to the two worlds of mind and matter. At the same time, the myriad phenomena and feelings provide and embrace, support and include in infinite recursion [重々無尽] the One Thus (or True Source).<sup>8</sup> And again in infinite recursion the One Thus (or True Source) is contained in every single thing, particle, or element, and is stored in every single mind and imagination. (1:354)

Further to this, Enryō wrote:

The constellation of the resonance between both edges and of the reverberation between both poles, as described above, can be compared with two opposite mirrors reflecting each other. In the case of two reflecting surfaces facing each other, one can see the first mirror containing the second, and at the same time one can see the second mirror containing the first. In this way the mutual reflection is infinitely recursive. The responses of our thoughts and the mutual enclosure of the phenomena itself are equally infinitely recursive. Not only from among the mental phenomena are endless forms arising, the material phenomena too own endless forms. In the case of the mirrors, two different bodies enclose each other. However, in the case of the One Thus as the substance of the universe, there exist relations in infinite recursion between the ontologically identical phenomena [of mind and matter]. Because such a condition is finally incomprehensible for our minds, we cannot but call it the marvel of the marvelous, the mystery of the mysterious, the treasury of marvels and mysteries within the true form of the cosmos. (1:355)

The contents of these sentences are itself mysterious and difficult to understand. In a single (mental or material) entity all other (mental or material) phenomena and substances, as well as Suchness as the source of both, are present. Although an entity ultimately exists as an individual, infinitely recursive relations are present within it. At this point in Enryō's philosophy, it becomes almost identical with the "world of non-obstructing entities" 事事無礙法界 (i.e., 'one in all, all in one' and 'one equals all, all equals

<sup>8</sup> The expression *jūjū mujin* 重々無尽 is difficult to translate. Because it is strongly connected with the image of mutually reflecting mirrors, as explained later in the text, it conveys the idea of "infinite reciprocal reflection." The character 重 here means "layer" or "again." Possible translations of 重々無尽 are, for example, "boundless strata," "infinite interleaving," "over and over inexhaustible," "endless repetition," or "infinite multiplicity." However, I decided on the structuralist or computer-linguistic term "recursion" because it captures the notion of an infinite loop, which is suggested by the simile of the mirrors. – Trans.

one'), which is taught in Flower Adornment Buddhism.<sup>9</sup> This standpoint is indeed itself the doctrine of the Flower Adornment School. Enryō had already noted the Heavenly Plain and the Flower Adornment School as teaching the ultimate Middle Way in the *Prolegomena* (1887). There he also wrote:

Therefore, there exists in Buddhism the saying that 'a mustard seed contains Mt. Sumeru and Mt. Sumeru contains a mustard seed.' The doctrinal Gate of non-obstructing entities, which is taught by the Flower Adornment School, is also based on this principle. This doctrinal gate says that every single particle of dust or every single hair is ontologically arising from Suchness, and that the principle of Suchness is present within each of them. Therefore all things in the cosmos are inter-penetrating each other, which moreover means that no gap exists between them. In Buddhism, there further exists the doctrine of the ten worlds present within each other. Thus follows the conclusion, that in each of the ten worlds the other nine are present. (3:373)

But in *Philosophy of Struggle* (1917) we can see that Enryō recognized the teaching of non-obstructing entities as the distinctive doctrinal standpoint of the Flower Adornment School:

The Heavenly Plain School teaches that the world merges into one mind, and that Suchness and the myriad entities are ontologically identical and not separate. But it does not reveal the inter-penetration and non-obstruction of every single fact, thing, particle. In stating this, the non-obstruction between the myriad entities, the Flower Adornment School is distinguished. (2:273)

Because individual things also have temporal existence, they are certainly no static beings, but as phenomena they do change from moment to moment. Yet, Enryō attributed not only movement to them, but speaks of evolution and degeneration, and in repetition this becomes circulation or rotation.<sup>10</sup> The following quotations are from *Epitome of Philosophy* and *New Proposal in Philosophy*:

<sup>9</sup> The Flower Adornment 華嚴 (Ch. Huáyán, Kr. Hwaem, Jp. Kegon) School of East Asian Buddhism is based on the Sanskrit *Avatamsaka-sūtra* [Flower ornament sūtra], which was translated into Chinese as 『華嚴教』.

<sup>10</sup> For the following discussion, it should be kept in mind that the Japanese term for "evolution" *shinka* 進化 connotes "progress" much more than the English term does. In Enryō's usage here *shinka* in fact means both. – Trans.

Further, because evolution and dissolution are complementary, it would be illogical if one is missing and the other present. If there was only the function of evolution, at the peak of evolution [the process] would revert towards its beginning because its change could not go beyond its ideal scope. Therefore, when evolution has reached its maximum, it will again dissolve, and when dissolution reaches its maximum, it will again evolve. They will not stop to rotate around each other. If we see it like this, the rule of cyclic turns appears to be based on the nature of the Ideal. The law [of cyclic turns] originates from the principle of the ontological unity of duality. If the ontological unity of duality is the case, there is necessarily the functioning of cyclic turns. If the functioning of cyclic turns is the case, there is necessarily the ontological unity of duality. This is why I take the functioning of cyclic turns as the principle of the ontological unity of duality, and the ontological unity of duality as the cause of the functioning of cyclic turns. (1:211)

Since my abridged discussion of the vertical view is finished, I will now summarize the important points. We have observed the true shape of the cosmos in a vertical perspective stretching from the past to the present world. We have also seen, that before and after the present world countless other worlds exist, repeating evolution and degeneration, expansion and contraction, continuing from no-beginning to no-end in limitless cycles. This is nothing else but the eternal cycle of the three worlds of past, present, and future. During the great evolution and the great degeneration of one world age, countless smaller processes of evolution and degeneration appear. There is progress and regression in the rise and fall of societies, in the life and death of us human beings, in the flourishing and withering of plants, and in the becoming and weathering of mountains and rivers. There is also progress and regression in every cell that constitutes a single weed or a single tree. Knowing these endless rotations, we should recognize that there are cycles within cycles in an infinite recursion. This is called endless circulation in infinite recursion. This is the true shape in a vertical perspective. (1:313)

The cosmos, seen in this way, endlessly moves in rounds or circles and every single thing has a relation to the whole. Further, in every single thing *temporal* relations of infinite recursion to the past, present, and future can be recognized. And, as already discussed, equally every single thing has *spatial* relations of infinite recursion to all the other things. In consequence, every single thing owes relations of infinite recursion that extend boundlessly in space and time. The following paragraph states the ultimate

consequence of the theory of the ontological identity of mind and matter.

*In the vertical perspective, we recognize the infinite recursion of cyclic turns. In the horizontal and the introverted perspective we realized an infinite recursion of mutual inclusion. This means indeed that infinite recursion expands through the vertical and the horizontal [dimension]. If we perceive this with the unlimited eye of reason, the coordinates of time and space are consummated with the appearance of the one mind. In this very moment an immeasurably large size fits into a pin-hole and an endlessly long period shrinks to the instant of a flashlight. Infinite cyclic recursion pass away by one twinkling of the eye or with one breath of air. At this point, the extremes of greatness and smallness are envisioned as coinciding, and the fusion of the extremes of length and brevity is realized. Because every single particle or element is comprised in the womb of world and cosmos, and world and cosmos are at the same time contained in the deep pouch of each particle and element, we grasp their mutual inclusion. [...] When our insight has come this far, we should further awaken to the fact that the infinite recursion of cycles, and the infinite recursion of mutual inclusion, include each other again. One mind opens and reveals unlimited time and space. One thought moves and operates in unlimited cycles. At the same time, the unlimited cycles return into one thought, and unlimited time and space enter into the one mind. This should be called the true shape of the true shape of the cosmos, or that what covers the mysterious with mystery. (1:355–356)*

It is no overstatement here to say that the investigation of the true shape of the cosmos in these passages is already beyond Hegel. The background to this, however, in the Buddhist thought of the Heavenly Plain and the Flower Adornment School must also be remembered. The work, *Philosophy of Struggle*, follows the theory laid out in *New Proposal of Philosophy*:

After this discussion we finally have to inquire about the relationship between the theory of cyclic turns and the theory of mutual inclusion. Along with the argument, that the horizontal is included in the vertical and that the vertical is included in the horizontal, it follows that the theory of mutual inclusion is included in the theory of cyclic turns, and that the theory of cyclic turns is included in the theory of mutual inclusion. And because these mutual inclusions are again circulating, we have to say that there is mutual inclusion while there is circulation and circulation while there is mutual inclusion. This truth about the cosmos is the philosophy I have read in the living book of heaven and earth. (2:253)

We can point out that Enryō's philosophy finally arrived at the theory of cyclic turns and mutual inclusion, as is also expressed in the following quotation: "My view of the cosmos can be subsumed in the two theorems stated before, the theorem of cyclic turns and the theorem of mutual inclusion" (2:251).

## 5. Enryō's Philosophy (IV): Philosophy of Activism

Enryō did not interpret material and mental phenomena as fixed or objective, but rather regarded them as being in a "moving" (or "active") 活動 state. Based on this interpretation, Enryō arrived at the belief that to be unremittingly active as a human being is the ultimate philosophical attitude. This position can be called "activism" 活動主義. Thus far, we have canvassed complex theoretical expositions, I do think, however, that activism demonstrates the simplicity at the core of Enryō's philosophy. In the *Philosophy of Struggle* he wrote:

Look! Aren't the birds flying and the fishes swimming? Isn't the water flowing and the clouds drifting? Isn't all this a Sūtra without letters, an unwritten teaching? Can't this be expressed in one sentence, namely that everything is active? If so, it is obvious that we also ought to be active. And if we ask by what it is that this activity arises, it is by the impulse of the great force immanent to the cosmos. The cyclic turns of the world are through this force. Yet, in its purest form, this force is transmitted in the human mind. It is our specific innate conscience [良心] which gives us commands. Therefore, if we see the activity of all things outside and if we listen to the commands of our conscience inside, the purpose of life becomes naturally evident. We will become aware of our duty to continually expend our energy in uplifting activity. (2:255–256)

This can be interpreted as an explanation of the phrase from the *Book of Changes* 『易經』: "The motion of heaven is vigorous. In accordance with this, the noble one drives himself to relentless [activity]" (乾 1: 象伝). In the world of Zen Buddhism there is the saying: "A day without work – a day without eating" (Bǎizhàng 百丈). These words contain the spirit of the simplicity of diligent work. I believe that at the heart of this activism is an eastern worldview. The Pure Experience in NISHIDA Kitarō's *Inquiry into the Good* 『禪の研究』 (1911) is also a state of spontaneous and self-enfolding activity. There might even have been a connection between Enryō's and NISHIDA's activism. In *Philosophy of Struggle* Enryō wrote:

In the past I have surveyed the general ideas of the ancient and modern philosophers in East and West. I realized that their teachings all return to nothing else but activity as the purpose of life. So I understood that the aim of philosophy is nothing else but to uplift human life. Since then and until today, I took activism as my stance. *Activity is heaven's principle, courage its will, struggle its commandment.* This is my doctrine. In other words, I am confident that our heavenly mission is to uplift human life by being active. This uplifting can be achieved in the order of first extending from the person to the country, and then from the country to the world. Therefore, I put forth that everybody should devote oneself to benefiting his country. (2:442–443)

The sentence: "Activity is heaven's principle, courage its will, struggle its commandment," is certainly the origin of the title *Philosophy of Struggle*. Enryō expressed his philosophical activism also in a very interesting way modeled after the *One Sheet Prayer* 『一枚起請文』 (*Ichimai kishō mon*) of Hōnen 法然.

This philosophy is different from the philosophies expressed by the various scholars of Japan, China, and the West. It is also not a philosophy based on a study of books from these various schools. There are no other details to activity, save an understanding that the original duty of life will surely be fulfilled by striving and struggling for the sake of Loyalty to the Lord and the Love of the Country. If someone mentions the view of the cosmos, the view of life, and the like, *they are all implicated in life's original duty to determinedly strive and struggle.* If I knew any other profundity, it would serve to divert us from the original idea of philosophy and go against the purpose of human life. The persons pursuing philosophy, even if they study all the ancient and modern philosophies, should all become like illiterate fools, mingle with the ignorant peasants and countrymen, abstain from behaving like scholars, and devote themselves simply to activity. (2:282–283)

This expresses clearly that there is no profundity whatsoever besides 'determinedly striving and struggling.' Despite the fact that Enryō was a well-read man, what impresses me most is that he came to such a plain and lucid standpoint. Now, if we ought to be unremittingly active, what is it, then, at which we should aim? The text says 'Loyalty to the Lord and Love of the Country,' but this can be understood in a more contemporary fashion as aiming for a "just development of world society." It is certainly not an aim like accumulating money or becoming famous. In other words, it

is for the *other* we should work unremittingly. Enryō is very clear about this point. As evidence, Enryō's theory about an Upward and a Downward Gate of philosophy from *Philosophy of Struggle* shall be cited:

*If we understand philosophy as the learning which, starting out from the discussion of the relative domain of mind and matter, arrives at the true realm of the Absolute, then this is the Upward Gate of philosophy. Besides this Upward Gate there is also a Path which, starting out from the absolute sphere, reasons down to the world of the Relative. This I name in turn the Downward Gate.* The latter is nothing else but the direction of the application of philosophy. The Downward Gate always also existed in religion, but its tenor there is rather different from the one in philosophy. If there was only an upward, but no downward direction in philosophy, philosophy would be a learning only to satisfy the individual thirst of knowledge. It would become a thing of no benefit for the worldly path of the human mind. It could not escape from finally being a superfluous thing of no use. *Therefore, both, the Upward and the Downward Gate must necessarily be established.* Because the Upward Gate is the direction affiliated with theory in philosophy and the Downward Gates is affiliated with practice, the two can also be understood as the Theoretical Gate and the Practical Gate. (2:231)

The Upward Gate of Philosophy goes from the Relative to the Absolute and is the Gate of Theory. The Downward Gate on the other hand goes from the Absolute down to the Relative and is the Gate of Practice (i.e., application). The path of investigating the truth is the Upward Gate, the path of applying truth is the Downward Gate. If there was no Downward Gate, philosophy would end up being a self-satisfying form of research with some philosophical content. In Enryō's view, this would be meaningless. About the relationship between the Upward and Downward Gate, Enryō further stated:

Speaking about what philosophy essentially is, we have to take its upward form as its main characteristic. Although importance has to be attached to this side, if we move on and ask about the what-for of the upward direction, we have to answer that it is for the sake of the downward. In other words, it is for the downward that we move upwards. The Upward Gate is the means [方便], the Downward Gate is the aim. (2:235)

Indeed, "upward for the sake of the downward" are extraordinarily profound words. It really is a superior insight, that the Downward Gate is the aim and the Upward Gate is only the method (or means) to realize it.

The Upward Gate and Downward Gate have equivalents in Mahāyāna Buddhism: "upwards striving for awakening, downwards teaching sentient beings" 「上求菩提、下化衆生」. Or in the terms of Enryō's school of origin, that is, the True School: the "characteristic of going" 往相 (from the mundane world into the Paradise of the Pure Land) and the "characteristic of returning" 還相 (from the Paradise of the Pure Land into the mundane world). Now we can say that striving for rebirth in the Pure Land serves the purpose of returning to the mundane world to rescue human beings. Enryō probably believed that the ultimate meaning of the True School was to be found therein.

From this perspective, it is obvious that the spirit of Mahāyāna Buddhism was central to Enryō: There is no meaning in life but the altruistic practice of unremitting work for human beings and for the world. Following the *Teaching of Real Words* 『実語教』, Enryō expressed this meaning as follows:

Mountains are not considered precious because they are high,  
but because their woods are useful.  
Rivers are not considered precious because they are broad,  
but because they are useful for irrigation.  
Scholarship is not precious because it is deep,  
but because it benefits the people.  
Knowledge is not precious because it is broad,  
but because it saves the world. (2:217)

This is a clear message that science and scholarship are meaningless if they are not pursued for the sake of the other and for society. I think it becomes obvious to what extent Enryō, who wholeheartedly emphasized the importance of philosophy, at the same time also emphasized activity in society.

## 6. Summary

Above I have given an account of the philosophy of INOUE Enryō. I think this can be summarized in the following seven points.

1. Enryō attached importance to philosophy as the "basis of all learning."
2. He appreciated Hegel's philosophy and regarded the non-duality of the Relative and the Absolute as the highest standpoint.
3. He believed that Buddhism revealed the same truth.
4. He further discovered the relationality of every single phenomenon stretching

out unlimited in time and space.

5. From this standpoint emerged 'activism,' which he regarded as the ultimate philosophy.
6. He held that there must be an Upward Gate and a Downward Gate in philosophy and that the upward direction is for the sake of the downward direction.
7. He finally regarded working in actual society for the benefit of the people and the deliverance of the world as most important.

Enryō actively introduced Western philosophy and proposed the importance of philosophical investigation. But at the bottom of his activity the spirit of Mahāyāna Buddhism was firmly present. In my present understanding, Mahāyāna Buddhism indeed lies at the basis of Enryō's philosophy.

## References

- INOUE Enryō 井上円了. 『井上円了選集』 [Selected writings of Inoue Enryō] (Tokyo: 東洋大学, 1887–2004) (abbr. as IS).
- . 『哲学一夕話』 [An evening conversation about philosophy], 3 vols. [1886–1887], in IS 1.
- . 『哲学要領』 [Epitome of philosophy], 2 vols. [1886–1887], in IS 1.
- . 『真理金針』 [The golden needle of truth], 3 vols. [1886–1887], in IS 3.
- . 『仏教活論序論』 [Prolegomena to a living discourse on Buddhism] [1887], in IS 3.
- . 「哲学館開設の旨趣」 [Principles for establishing a philosophy academy] [June, 1887], in IS 25.
- . 『純正哲学講義』 [Lectures on genuine philosophy] [1893], in IS 1.
- . 『哲学早わかり』 [Quick primer to philosophy] [1899], in IS 2.
- . 『哲学新案』 [New proposal in philosophy] [1909], in IS 1.
- . 『哲界一瞥』 [A glance at the world of philosophy] [1913], in IS 2.
- . 『奮闘哲学』 [Philosophy of struggle] [1917], in IS 2.