

# Towards a Philosophy of Religion with the Concept of Pre-established Harmony as Guide

KITARŌ NISHIDA

## TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

THE modern Japanese philosopher Nishida Kitarō (1870–1945), whose complete works are now collected in 19 volumes (Iwanami Shoten, rev. ed. 1965), developed his philosophical position during a career which extended over a period of more than 30 years from his maiden work, *A Study of Good* (1911), through *The Logic of Place and a Religious World-View* (1945). During this long and active literary career Nishida's constant rendering of certain central insights concerning the immediacy of experience, or what he originally called "the condition of pure experience," led him through various stages of articulation of his thought culminating in his central notion of *basbo*, the *topos* of absolute Nothingness understood as the "place" of the immediacy of experience, i.e. the "place" of the "eternal present" and the "true self" as the self-identity of absolute contradictions and the negation of all negations. Nishida first explicitly developed this notion of the *topos* of absolute Nothingness in his key transitional work, *From the Acting to the Seeing* (1927), which then became the basis of his later ideas of the "social-historical world" as "dialectical universal." Questions of epistemology, philosophical anthropology, philosophy of science and mathematics, philosophy of aesthetic *poiesis*, of culture, nation, and religion filled out the latter half of Nishida's career when he came to be acclaimed as the foremost philosopher of modern Japan.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nishida's Complete Works are available in the *Nishida Kitarō Zenshū*, 2nd ed., Iwanami Shoten, 1965. The following essay is translated from volume XI, pp. 114–46. For translations in English: *Nishida Kitarō: Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness*, translated with an introduction by Robert Schinzinger, Tokyo, 1958; "The Problem of Japanese Culture," translated by Masao Abe in *Sources of Japanese Tradition*, ed. by Tsunoda, de Bary, and Keene, New York, 1958, pp. 858–72; *Nishida Kitarō: A Study of Good*, translated by V. H. Viglielmo,\*

Nishida wrote "Towards a Philosophy of Religion With the Concept of Pre-established Harmony as Guide" in 1944, about a year before his death. It therefore represents a very late condensation of some of his main ideas which came to be known as *Nishida tetsugaku* (Nishida Philosophy) after 1927. The essay has the added value of being his first sustained and explicit treatment of the question of a philosophy of religion and of the religious consciousness; it must be understood, in fact, as the intermediary link between his general position articulated in reference to a broad range of philosophical questions and his career-concluding work, *The Logic of Place and a Religious World-View* (1945), completed just two months before his death.

The ideas of "Towards a Philosophy of Religion" were subsumed within the more extensive structure of *The Logic of Place and a Religious World-View*, as noted above, and therefore prepared the ground for that latter work. But from another perspective the former essay stands on its own as a unique probing of the metaphysical aspects of the question of the religious consciousness, as Nishida understood it. The Western reader may particularly take note of Nishida's attempted reformulation of the thought of Leibniz, Cusanus, and Spinoza from the point of view of his own "logic of *basbo*." This metaphysical disquisition demonstrates Nishida's approach to a style of philosophy that has few serious rivals in modern times, namely an East-West philosophy based on a sophisticated mastery of key Western philosophers coupled with a penetrating return to Eastern tradition.

The whole of the essay is suffused with overtones of Buddhist metaphysical ideas. Its opening page takes its point of departure from the concept of "action"—of karma and of *engi* or "dependent origination"—and then proceeds to develop a kind of Middle Path logic of "the self-identity of contradictions." The reader will note again and again that the "place" (*basbo*) of absolute immediacy and self-identity is always to be found in the direction of the middle path between logical and experiential contradictions—indeed, that the "place" of the concrete and eternal present is the very Nothingness or Voidness (*śūnyatā*) of the Madhyamika. In another respect the whole essay is suffused with a fundamental Zen orientation which can be traced in Nishida's biography to some extent.

---

Tokyo, 1960; *Nishida Kitarō: Fundamental Problems of Philosophy*, translated by David Dilworth, Tokyo, 1970.

Nishida's use of the Hua-yen (Kegon) concept of "the unhindered mutual interpenetration of phenomena" (*jiji muge*) may also be discovered in his reformulation of Leibniz which constitutes the first half of the essay, even though this Buddhist concept is not explicitly cited.

Since many authors of East and West have noted the resemblance in thought structure between Leibniz and Kegon philosophy, Nishida's direct confrontation of the issues at stake from the point of view of his own philosophy may be judged of special value. We can further note that Nishida also takes up the question of the mystical *via negativa* of Cusanus which has often been compared with Buddhist thought. In his dialogue with Leibniz and Cusanus Nishida tells us that fundamental differences do indeed exist, and his own use of the *Prajñā pāramitā-sūtra*, of the *Lin-chi Lu*, and of the Japanese Zen masters Dōgen and Daitō Kokushi is persuasive of this crucial point. It was precisely this fundamental insight supported by the aforementioned sources of Buddhist tradition which became the nucleus of his articulation of the essence of the "religious consciousness" in *The Logic of Place and a Religious World-View*.

The translator would like to thank the staff of the *Eastern Buddhist* magazine for their help in preparing this translation, and particularly Professor Masao Abe for his careful correction of the original draft.

### NISHIDA KITARŌ:

## Towards A Philosophy of Religion with the Concept of Pre-Established Harmony as Guide

### I

I have been developing a position which considers the active world as a relational world of opposing individuals. Even the concept of a 'thing' must take its point of departure from this world of action. For thinking is already a form of acting.

However, it is sometimes argued that it cannot be held that individuals are relational and mutually opposed entities. But this is because they take their departure from an abstract concept of the individual. My position is that con-

versely the individual should be conceived from an understanding of the meaning of action. Action involves one individual in relation to another. If not, there is merely the development of one thing. In his *Discourse de metaphysique* VIII, Leibniz has already said that since activity and passivity originally belong to individual substances (*actiones sunt suppositorum*), the nature of the individual must be clarified. The Aristotelian definition of 'subject that cannot become predicate' is not sufficient. For it can be said that the individual, as subject, must contain all predicates which can be spoken of it. Thus Leibniz holds that all predicates must be able to be understood from and deduced from the subject. The individual concept of Alexander the Great must be the foundation of all predicates which can be spoken of him. In a later letter to Arnauld, Leibniz wrote that it is the same also with the concept of Adam. Even the events of Adam's descendents must be contained in the individual concept of Adam.

I hold that the 'place' (*basbo*)<sup>2</sup> in which individuals in such a sense exist in mutual opposition and relation must be an historical space, i.e., the world of the absolute present, which is the self-identity of the contradiction between the plurality of individuals and the whole. However, in Leibniz, the plurality of individuals are the ultimately real entities. The individual neither comes into being nor passes away; it can only be created or destroyed by God. Therefore, the fundamental source of the mutual relation between individuals must be sought in God. For this reason Leibniz developed the concept of pre-established harmony.

Contrary to this thought structure, I think that in philosophy since ancient times there has not been a profound consideration of the self-contradiction involved in the concept of the individual. Or if it was considered, a new logic has not yet been constructed therefrom. An individual is an individual through being relative to other individuals. This is a contradiction. However, individuals are mutually individual only through such contradictory opposition. And this, we must say, is possible as a self-identity of contradictions. For individuals stand in mutual opposition mediated by absolute negation. As long as individuals maintain themselves in their isolated individual selves, they cannot be said to be mutually opposed. Consequently, they are not individuals. A mere isolated individual is nothing at all. As a structure of absolute

<sup>2</sup> 場所 *Nisbida Kitarō Zenshū*, 2nd ed., vol. XI, pp., 114-36, written in 1944.

negation-qua-affirmation, i.e., in the dimension of mutual relation through absolute negation, this self-identity of contradictions which is a contradiction-qua-identity becomes essential to the concept of the individual. This may be termed the self-determination of absolute Nothingness. For the individual to be an individual presupposes that the whole is the whole. And the converse of this is also true.

As this self-identity of the contradictions between the many and the one, the individual is a self-determination of the absolute present in the structure of time-qua-space and space-qua-time. God must be the absolute present as the self-identity of absolute contradictions. In the world of absolute present, each event negates the past and the future, and determines itself as a unique event, on the one hand, but is an event which vanishes forever, on the other. This is the world of creation, and at the same time the world of coming into being and passing away. The notion of pre-established harmony must be, not some supposition as in Leibniz, but the logical principle of the structure of the historical world.

The mutual relation between independent entities can be neither a mechanical nor teleological structure. The world of the self-identity of contradictions in which the many are the many and the whole is the whole must be a world which is self-expressive. God as the absolute present can be said to be a self-expressive God. Leibniz already touched upon this point (*Discourse IX*). He tells us that the individual is the mirror of God—indeed, is a mirror which expresses the whole world from its own perspective. The concept that each monad is a perspective of the world is already involved here. A self-expressive being means that the subject and object of expression are one; it is infinitely self-expressive in itself.

Now, expression may be conceived only as the connection of mutually contradictory beings. For example, as in the relation between two men, expression has meaning only in the mutual relation between the two individuals. In such a relationship, the relation between action and being acted upon, of activity and passivity, must be conceived in terms of the relation between form and matter. In that structure, both mechanistic and teleological views must be abandoned. The being which expresses the other in itself is active (in contrast to passive). The being which most clearly expresses the world is the most active. Leibniz has already drawn attention to this point (*Discourse XII*).

He writes that the essence of a material thing does not lie in the properties of extension such as size, shape, and movement, but must be recognized as something spiritual, which he calls *forme substantielle* (Aristotle's *entelekia*). Having pondered the implications of modern physics, he thought to revive the scholastics' concept of substantial form which had been abandoned.

Therefore, in Leibniz, as in the tradition since Greek philosophy, a being with form is an acting being. He philosophizes about the world of power from this standpoint of substantial forms. He tells us that just as time is an order of continuity, so too space is an order of co-existence. A being in space is a composite being. The spatial world is not the real world; it is the phenomenal world. But here, too, Leibniz did not focus attention upon the logical principle of the self-identity of contradictions. For form structures matter. The former is considered as active, the latter as passive. However, even matter must possess a nature in some sense. If not, it is nothing at all. Moreover, if it is merely taken as form of a lower dimension, a structure between form and matter cannot be conceived; there would merely be an order of classification. Matter must be the negation of form. Only in the standpoint of affirmation-qua-negation the structure between form and matter can be conceived. That form is acting, is power, can be conceived. It must mean a transition from the total One to the plurality of individuals, and conversely from the plurality of individuals to the total One in the relation of the self-identity of the contradiction between the many and the One. Precisely this transition from the total One to the plurality of individuals is the process of structuring, and is action. This becomes possible on the basis that each monad expresses the whole world in itself.

Action involves the fact that an individual as substantial form, by so expressing the whole world, forms the world as the self-determination of the whole world. However, in order to say that an individual thus functions by expressing the whole world in itself, it must conversely be expressed and reflected in such a world as an individual which is self-expressive in the form of the self-identity of the contradiction between the many and the one. Herein arises the aspect of space. An individual as substantial form lies in that as the self-determinations of the world, which is a self-identity of contradictions, each individual is the world, and at the same time is one center of the whole context. An individual substance is both expressed in this world, and expresses itself; it reflects while being reflected. Real being is both reflected and reflecting. To be reflected or

expressed, means to exist; and there is the transition from expressing, reflecting, to acting. Electrons are also expressible in mathematical form; therefore they can be compared with imaginary numbers. From the consideration of the world being reflected in individuals themselves in the form of self-negation, there is always a world of merely coexisting things, whereas from the idea of their reflecting themselves in themselves in the form of self-affirmation, things become active beings. This world is a world which both reflects and is reflected. The world thus begins from reflecting itself.

The relation between form and matter must be conceived from such a perspective. From the perspective of being reflected, everything becomes spatial, i.e., material. Contrary to this, from the perspective of reflecting, everything becomes temporal, i.e., form. Leibniz' concepts of secondary matter or secondary power should be defined from the spatial standpoint. Moreover, to be reflected is to reflect, and vice versa. The energy of position is the energy of movement, and vice versa. Leibniz was already thinking in terms of energies in contrast to the Cartesian quantities of motion.

From the above standpoint, I would say that form is self-determining in the mode of the self-identity of the contradiction between form and matter. Form and matter stand in mutual opposition. Moreover, the transition from form to matter in this structure of the self-identity of contradictions is conversely a transition from matter to form. That which makes form to be form is the negation of matter; and the reverse is also true. In the past, philosophers conceived of the relation between the two, not from the standpoint of dynamic and concrete logic, but merely from the standpoint of abstract logic. What expresses is also expressed; the world of absolute reality which is self-expressive must be a world in which form is self-determining. Therefore, there is a transition from the created to the creating without any underlying substance or ground. The laws of nature must be such self-determining forms. God is infinite self-determining form. Such a form, as something which reflects itself, must be called the 'form of the formless.' God is absolute Nothingness. Beings of form may be called the shadows of the formless. God may be called an eternal mirror, the wisdom of a great perfect mirror (大圓鏡智).

Spinoza's God may perhaps be conceived from such a standpoint. He says that matter is a mode which expresses the essence of God in extension (*Ethics*, II, Def. I). In self-determining form, *natura naturans* equals *natura naturata*. But

Spinoza simply brought Cartesian substance to a logical conclusion in the direction of the logical subject. He ultimately ended up with an abstract, quiescent substance.

Spinoza, going a step further than Descartes' idea of extension, conceived of space in organic terms, and, by regarding the causes of motion which individualize matter as the self-determinations of space, would include them (the causes of motion) in space. (*Letter to Tschirnhaus*).

In terms of my argument above, we may say that the expressive is the expressed; the world which, being absolute Nothingness, is self-determining, is one in which the reflecting is the reflected; and, as transition from the reflected to the reflecting, it is the world in which the eternal future is reflected in the eternal past. It is the world in which is contained everything which will arise in the eternal eons of the future (未来永劫生起するもの). I call this 'pre-established harmony.' In other terms, it is the world of the self-determination of the absolute present.

That infinite individuals are expressed in the one in the form of self-negation is the form of time. It is the form of the moving world, the perpetually perishing world. In another respect, that the one expresses an infinite many in itself in the form of self-negation is the form of space. It is the form of the world which preserves itself, the eternal world. The world of the self-identity of the contradiction between many and one is both spatial as transition from one to many, and is temporal as transition from many to one. As self-determination of the absolute present, it is transition from the one to the many and from the many to the one; it is temporal-spatial and spatio-temporal.

Some men define action as something temporal-spatial, but it must rather be spatial-temporal. The temporal-spatial world is the world of subjectivity. The physical world is spatial-temporal. In the sense that all appearance is something reflected spatially, the existence of things is determined. The world of physical matter is abstract in one aspect, but in the spatiality of the absolute present, i.e., absolute spatiality, that which arises in the eternity of the future is reflected, and there is always opposition between individuals. Leibniz says that God had foreknowledge of the fact that Alexander defeated Darius and Polus, of whether he would die of sickness or be murdered, of whether Caesar would



cross the Rubicon. It cannot be said that a non-acting being exists, but neither can it be said that nonbeing is active. Things have existence from the fact of the world's being reflected and expressed in absolute space as the self-determination of the absolute present which is the self-identity of contradictions. Therein the individual may be thought to be eternally indestructible. Thus the transition from the reflected to the reflecting is that of the transition from the past to the future. Real things are all determined from the eternal past, and move into the eternal future. What will arise in the eternity of the future is reflected in absolute space, and included in the absolute present.

The concept of 'pre-established harmony' can be articulated from this thought structure. That things are acting means that forms are self-determining as the self-determinations of such an absolute present. We can also say, with Spinoza, that everything is a mode of absolute space. In the world of absolute being-qua-absolute Nothingness which is self-expressive and in which the expressive is the expressed, the fact of being formatively expressed is the very fact of the existence of a thing—the electron exists as something expressed mathematically. And action is expressive formation. Acting being is what it is by virtue of reflecting the world. Formation, reflection, expression are moments of one activity. When there is objectively the expressive and formative, it is subjectively said to be reflecting, and, in its ultimate point, action-intuition.<sup>3</sup> All beings which exist as individual substance in the world of the absolute present, the historical world, must be something expressed in God, something whose name is recorded before God. All beings which come historically into being as the self-determinations of the absolute present must be foreknown in God. The principle of identity that there are no two identical substances, and the principle of sufficient reason that nothing happens without a reason, must be one in essence with the concept of pre-established harmony.

From my perspective, Spinoza's 'substance' can be understood as absolute space. Self-determining forms of substance as *natura naturans* and determined forms as *natura naturata* are "modes". But since Spinoza's philosophy is one which absolutely negates the individual, and is nontemporal, its form is mathematical. Spinoza's active intuition was mathematical; even ethics became geometrical.

<sup>3</sup> 行爲的直觀的

The world which expresses and reflects itself in itself in the form of the micro-cosmic-qua-macrocosmic—in the sense that the individual both expresses the whole world and is one contextual center of the whole world—possesses order in itself, i.e., is a world of law. I call it a creative system; or to speak in logical terms, a world of the self-determination of the creative universal. But in what sense does it possess order and is it a world of law?

Leibniz has said that the expression of the world in which individuals, which belong to God in the form of pre-established harmony, each expressing the world from its own perspective, need not be one of complete identity, for if it is proportional, it is sufficient (*Discourse*, XIV). The individual is unique. It must be a world which is self-determining. If not, it is not individual. However, at the same time, it is individual relative to other individuals. It is individual through expressing the whole world. The more that it is individual, the more that it must be a unique self-expression of the world, and the more it must be a temporally-singular event. In that structure, I speak of self-determining events. The forms of the world of the mutual determination between the many, i.e., between individuals each of which is individual and unique in this way, cannot be called identical in the sense of being a mere self-identity. They may perhaps be said to be *proportionelle*, as Leibniz says. For that relations expressed from entirely different perspectives are identical would seem to mean that they are mutually *proportionelle*. Thus each world expresses itself in the form of a functional number. Self-determining form, self-reflecting form, may be said to be a functional number in this sense. In mathematical terms, in the self-expressive world from the perspective of what is expressed, i.e., from the perspective of the self-determination of the many, individual and individual respectively correspond in the mode of simple (cardinal) numbers. From the contrary standpoint of reflecting, the perspective of the self-determination of the total one, everything is mutually expressive i.e., is a functional number. The symbolic forms of the world which is self-determining in the mode of the self-identity of contradiction may thus be called mathematical.

However, when, as a creative system, each individual becomes a creative function in the form of negation of past and future, the world becomes a world in the “historical-bodily mode” (歷史的身體的), in the sense of a transition from the created to the creating. Forms which are self-determining in such a mode must be considered to be the ‘laws’ of the historical world. They are the

forms of the world in which each present is self-determining as self-determination of the absolute present. The laws of physical matter are also nothing other than this. The laws of the conversion of energy in the form of the transition from the energy of position to the energy of motion, and vice versa, can be considered as forms of the self-determination of the self-reflecting world. The world of Spinozan substance which truly exists and is understood in itself must thus be a self-reflecting world without underlying substratum or ground, a world of functional numbers. To conceive of either the total one or the plural many as substance or logical subject would be to substantialize concepts. In such terms, there can be no thoroughgoing empiricism.

Leibniz says that even though every substance or monad expresses the same phenomenon, their expression of it is not necessarily the same, and may be called proportional to one another. Said conversely, when one thing expresses itself in a different way, its expression may be said to be proportional to the expression of another thing. For example, 'I am growing old' and 'I am doting' are proportional. Such a proportion presupposes at its ground, something self-expressive in different ways of expression i.e., something self-conscious. What is self-conscious involves self-expression in the sense that the expressive and expressed are one. It becomes the functional number of itself. Relations of functional numbers are established from such a standpoint. If we take 'I am growing old' as  $x$  and 'I am doting' as  $y$ , we can say in terms of self-consciousness that  $y=f(x)$ . The self-expressive world, which exists and moves by itself, is a self-identity in the sense of being its own system of functional numbers in such a sense. To conceive of some substance or ground at its bottom would merely be a metaphysical dogmatism. The world which begins from self-reflection without any underlying substance or ground is one which becomes its own functional numbers (a self-identity of self-consciousness, i.e., its own system of functional numbers). What I have spoken of as a thoroughgoing empiricism arises in such a perspective. Even the physical laws exist in the form of functional numbers from such a standpoint. At their ground, there must be the self-consciousness of action-intuition of our 'self' as the concrete self. This is a physical

experiment. In mathematics, there is also the action-intuition of mathematics.

I think that a synthesis or mutual relation of various dimensions may be defined from such a standpoint of the self-consciousness of action-intuition. Dimensions can be considered as various ways or directions of expression of something self-expressive. Also in regard to continuity in the very broad sense, I think that even though the directions, i.e., dimensions, differ, whatever is one self-expressively i.e., self-consciously, would be continuous. A straight line is, as it were, something self-conscious in one direction i.e., merely temporally. Can't we think of geometry from this point of view? Geometrical space is merely self-determining form in abstraction from time. We can even think of it as the aspect of the self-consciousness of active intuition which is purely spatial.

Cannot Riemann's concept of space be viewed as space in the sense that every point is the self-determination of the absolute present which is self-conscious? But I should like to defer such considerations to another day (cf. my later article, 'Space.')

If we think in the above terms, we may be able to say, with Leibniz, that in one aspect God has created the best of all possible worlds in terms of pre-established harmony. The self-expressive world which reflects itself in itself as the self-identity of the contradiction between the many and the one is one in which the eternal future is reflected in the eternal past. It is the world in which the present is self-determining as the self-determination of the absolute present. In such a world, everything that arises into being, whatever it may be, arises as a unique event throughout past and future. Thus we can say that God, having conceived of all possible worlds, has created this actual world as the best world. As the self-determination of the absolute present, this actual world is the world of the *compossibles*. Every individual thing must be a possible world. The world which exists as one as the self-negation of infinite individuals must be the world of the *compossibles*. Conversely, it can be said that this world is a world structured through synthesis from an infinite perspective—indeed, from the standpoint of a perspective of perspectives.

This kind of metaphysical view seems not to be conceivable from the stand-

point of abstract logic. From the standpoint of abstract logic, such a thing as a world of compossibles has no meaning. Contingent truth does not arise from eternal truth. Abstract logic only goes from the universal to the particular—a form of logic in which one world determines itself within itself. Contingent truth must derive from the standpoint of the self-consciousness of the practical self which is one of action-intuition. It must derive from the standpoint of what I call the logic of *basbo*, which takes the law of sufficient reason as its fundamental principle. Abstract logic which follows the law of identity, the logic of the intellectual facts of the self, is included by it as one of its moments. The axiomatic mathematicians attempt to define even numbers from the standpoint of abstract logic, but I take the contrary position that mathematics is to be defined as a form of contingent truth.

The principles of inference must not follow the law of identity but the law of sufficient reason. Our recognition of a temporally singular and unique event takes place in the standpoint of the self-awareness of the self in the mode of action-intuition. As a creative point i.e., a self-determining point of historical space as a self-determining aspect of the absolute present, our 'self' can recognize temporally singular and unique events. In historical space, every point becomes the beginning of the world. An event is self-determining by virtue of negating eternal past and future, and at the same time exists by virtue of taking the self-negation of eternity as its condition. A unique event should be recognized to have such a structure. The world of contingent facts arises on the basis of such a structure. In other terms, it is the world which arises by the form of the compossibles. All scientific knowledge is grounded on it. The world of the self-determination of the absolute present is a transition from the created to the creating, a world of self-consciousness of the self as action-intuition. And the converse is also true.

Such a world, as the world in which the eternal future is reflected in the eternal past, is a world whose existence is grounded upon the logical form of the compossibles, i.e., of the logic of *basbo*. In this way of looking at things, everything that arises into being may be said to be in a structure of pre-established harmony, and of the law of sufficient reason. The more it is of the absolute present, the more we can speak in these terms. The principle of the smallest function which is considered the highest principle of physics arises therefrom. If the principle of the smallest function is understood subjectively or teleologically,

it cannot be said to be a scientific principle. However, conceived in the above terms, it must be the fundamental form of all causal law. What is conceived as objectivity for us arises in terms of the principle of the smallest function as the self-determination of the absolute present in which the future is reflected in the past. Even social phenomena arise as the self-determinations of the absolute present by subjectivity reflecting itself in the form of the environment. The physical world is a world in the past tense in that it is the self-determination of the spatiality of the absolute present, the self-determination of absolute space. It is the negation of the future, and deterministic. However, this does not mean a merely mechanistic world. Similar to the causality of the historical world, there must be pre-established harmony at its ground. The form of the logic of the compossibles is the form of scientific logic. Thus it must include action-intuition as the logical form of the self-consciousness of the self as *poiesis*.

The laws of the world, in which forms are self-determining as the self-determinations of the absolute present and in which the future is reflected in the past, cannot help being probable. They do not have their ground in the form of a total one, they also do not have their ground in the plurality of individuals. Laws are neither teleological nor mechanistic. It is not that as in classical physics, probability belongs to an observing subject, but that subjectivity is included by objectivity. Laws are not necessary; but saying this does not mean that there are no laws. Beings that arise into being exist by being expressed in the absolute present. They arise as the self-determinations of the absolute present, as transitions from the expressed to the expressing. Forms are self-determining. We see such self-determining forms, i.e., the laws of nature, by functioning as historical bodies, i.e., through scientific experiment. Thus, the more we are individual, thinking, and analytic, the more we see universal laws as expressive of the self-determination of the world of the absolute present which embraces past and future.

In the world of the absolute present, as I have maintained above, the eternal future is reflected in the eternal past. In such a perspective, the world is a pre-established harmony. In the ultimate of the standpoint of the self-determining present, the world may even be considered deterministic. The world may be

defined as physical in such a point of view. However, in the world of the absolute present the transition from past to future is conversely the transition from future to past. Were light rays of seven colors within a colorless ray of light? They existed. But they did so in the sense of appearing through the refraction of a prism. The reflected derives from the reflecting. Past is made from future. In such a standpoint, the world is always from the future. The world is teleological—indeed, the world is one of freedom. In the world of the self-identity of absolute contradictions, both past and future are infinite. Indeed, there is no point of departure in the past; there is no point of destination in the future. There is not even one unique direction. It is thus completely the situation of 'having no place wherein it abides, this Mind arises'<sup>4</sup> (the *Diamond Sutra*), and of 'thoughts suddenly arise'<sup>5</sup> (the *Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*). It is a world of the freedom of necessity and the necessity of freedom. Therefore, it is the world of the infinite ought, the world of morality. Being reflected in the eternal past, each individual has its own existence; at the same time, each individual is a free will as a being which is self-determining, and creates the eternal future.

Such necessity is not physical necessity, but moral necessity. Leibniz has already made this distinction. Here the sufficient reason must be Kant's 'you should act in such a way!' The world of the Leibnizian monad must ultimately be a world of co-existence in which unlimited persons face one another by taking God as center. Such an idea already reminds us of Kant's concept of the 'Realm of ends'. But in Leibniz, who had not escaped the standpoint of the logic of the Aristotelian subject of predication, the relation between the totality and individuals was not truly a self-identity of contradictions. The total one was always fundamental. In Christian terms, God was the absolute subject. Therefore, the world could not help being the best of all possible worlds as the creation of God who lacked no perfection. However, such a God is not the absolute God (not even *die Gottbeit*). As the perfect relative to the imperfect, the good relative to evil, such a God does not avoid being a relative God. Leibniz' God was merely the highest substance conceived in terms of the subject of predication, and could not include all predicates. True free will cannot appear

<sup>4</sup> 處無所住而生其心

<sup>5</sup> 忽然念起

from such a perspective. In it, there is no room for the concept of the true individual, the true individual person. Consequently, there is no true evil; evil is merely imperfection. It rather cannot avoid the coloration of being a pantheistic teaching which Christianity rejects most severely.

Contrary to this perspective, the world of the self-determination of the absolute present must include absolute negation, must include ultimate evil. The world of the absolute present neither has a point from which it arises in the past nor a point of conclusion in the future. It has neither beginning nor end. It is always the self-determination of the present. In medieval mystical philosophy, God was conceived as an infinite sphere (*sphaera infinita*) in which, because there is no circumference, the center is everywhere. It is conversely the world of opposition between unlimited individuals, i.e., of opposition between wills, a world of infinite struggle (Boehme's *centro naturae* is in this category). It must be Shinran's world of 'fiery passions and grave sins' (煩惱熾盛, 罪惡深重). The world begins from the fact of the self itself being reflected. 'Thoughts suddenly arise, their name is ignorance' (忽然念起, 名爲無明). The world begins from evil. Our existence consists in evil. In Christianity as well, man has original sin. In such a direction, the world is corrupt, is eternal death. However, the world also begins from the fact of reflecting itself. It may be called the creation of God as the determination of indetermination, as transition from nothingness to being. We are created as creative elements of the creative world, *creata et creans*. Therein, as servants of God, we have eternal life.

Man is also physical as transition from past to future. Man is impulsive and animal as transition from the reflected to the reflecting. Man is desiring and selfish as self-determination of the absolute present, as reflecting while being reflected. Men are always volitional and rebellious as unique individuals. But men are divinely moral as creating while being created. Moreover, it is not that man is divine because he is moral; but because he is divine, he is moral. As long as one's morality is conceived from the self as something reflected, it does not avoid being selfish in terms of self-power. This is not the truly moral. The same is true even of the rational (as well as the moral).

As said above, I think that I can conceive of the Christian God as creator in the standpoint of the self-determination of the absolute present. The relation between creator and creatures can truly be grasped as the self-determination of the world as self-identity of absolute contradictions. The relation between



God and man is a self-identity of absolute contradictions. There is absolutely no road from man to God. Nevertheless, the more that we become individual, the more we approach God: It is just as,

億劫相別而須臾不離, 晝日相接剎那不接

'Buddha and I, separate through a billion kalpas, yet not separate for an instant; encountering each other the whole day through, yet not encountering each other for an instant.'<sup>6</sup>

The true God is not the usual idea of God, but rather *die Gottbeit* such as spoken of by the mystics in the West. The true God is the 'Emptiness' of the *Prajñā-pāramitā-sūtra*. Christianity calls this pantheistic. But even if we conceive of a God as subject at the ground of the world, it on the contrary does not avoid being pantheistic. This can be said even of Leibniz. Contrary to this, may we think of God as absolutely transcendent, by negating such relations? This would merely produce a God of negation, a distant God, which would on the contrary not avoid being relative. A *Deus absconditus* cannot be said to be the absolute God.

I think there is such a weak point in present-day dialectical theology. The truly absolute God must both transcend and embrace us. But such a fact cannot be conceived from the standpoint of the logic of the Aristotelian subject of predication in the West. My concept of the self-determination of the absolute present cannot be understood in pantheistic terms. To do so would be to understand my thought in terms of objective logic. The standpoint of my logic makes the individual to be the individual. Each individual is a unique personal standpoint. Therefore, the individual is a perspective in relation to the person of the unique God as the total One—is a perspective which arises in the relation between creator and creature.

In the standpoint of the absolute present time is negated. However, this standpoint only negates abstract time, it rather is the standpoint of concrete time which truly makes time to be such. There is that which truly makes time to be such in the dimension which is the self-determination of the absolute present which is a spatial structure as the One as the self-negation of the many. It is neither the perspective which merely transcends time in Platonic fashion,

<sup>6</sup> Daitō Kokushi

nor the perspective which negates history. Rather, it is the perspective which truly makes history to be such.

An Eastern concept of motion must arise herefrom—that is, motion as the oneness of motion and rest. This is not a view of resignation, as persons may think, but must stand in the perspective of confrontation with the absolute at every moment. We exist in an eschatological perspective at every moment as the momentary self-determinations of the absolute present. In the standpoint of the self-determining present, each moment is the beginning and end of the world. Said even in the terms of the historians, in the historical world every point becomes the beginning (cf. Ranke).

Present-day Buddhists have forgotten such a true meaning of the Mahayana (Great Vehicle). Eastern culture must arise again from such a standpoint. It must contribute a new light to world culture. As the self-determination of the absolute present, the national polity (*kokusai*) of Japan is a norm of historical action in such a perspective. The above mentioned true spirit of the Mahayana is in the East preserved today only in Japan.

## II

In the world of the absolute present, in the standpoint in which the eternal future is reflected in the eternal past, everything has the form of pre-established harmony, and is a thing of destiny. However, all existence has existed in the sense of appearing. From the eternal past means from the eternal future. The world is an infinitely free world; it is the world of the will, of effort. As individuals of such a world our selves act by reflecting the world. Our selves are intellectual in this dimension of reflecting the world and are volitional in the dimension of forming the world.

The world thus begins in the dimension that the present determines itself as the self-determination of the absolute present. The self begins in the dimension that knowledge and will unite, in the sense that that which reflects and that which is reflected are one. The self arises in the place that the world arises; the world arises in the place that the self arises. Therefore, our self-consciousness is the self-expression of the world, and the self-expression of the world is our self-consciousness. Our eternal life is to be sought herein. To turn one's back on God is to die, and to return to God is to enter into eternal life. Religion must

be an exigency of such eternal life, i.e., it must be the exigency of man's true self-awareness. Therefore, Augustine states: 'Thou hast created us facing Thee, O Lord, and our hearts will never rest until they rest in Thee.' I am opposed not only to the attempt to discuss religion in merely intellectual terms or in the terms of objective logic, but also to the consideration of religion through the mediation of moral demands, for both knowledge and the will derive from the self-awareness of the self. The self is intellectual and volitional as an individual of the world of the self-determining present.

I have stated above that the self begins in the dimension that knowledge and the will are one, but actually the self is intellectual and volitional as a self-contradictory existence. Both learning and morality derive therefrom. Both learning and morality derive from self-contradiction, and both are based on the self-identity of contradiction. When we focus upon such a self-identity of contradictions in the very depths of the self-awareness of the self, we become religious. Therefore, to enter into the religious dimension one must encounter absolute contradiction along some road of life. However, once we have penetrated to the true self, it has been the call of God. From that ground both learning and morality become religious—indeed, 'wearing clothes and eating rice,' there is nothing that is not religious. Religion is the problem of the self.

Our self can be reduced to neither intellect nor will. Because there is a self, there is knowledge; and because there is the self, there is the will. What, then, is the self? It is something which is both created and creating, something which is in the mode of "historical-bodily." It is neither mere matter nor mere spirit. Form is self-determining in the dimension that the present is self-determining as the self-determination of the absolute present. Form is the shadow of the formless. The world is creative, "historical-bodily". The world is filled with life. Our selves are creative points of such a world. Leibniz called the monad a metaphysical point, but I conceive of each individual self as a creative point of the historical world. It extends to the eternal future and to the eternal past as the point of self-determination of the absolute present. The self is intellectual in the dimension of reflecting the eternal past; it is volitional in the dimension of reflecting the eternal future. It is a being which is self-aware and which has self-love in the dimension of reflecting itself in the sense that that which is reflecting is that which is reflected. The will thus arises from self-love.

Therefore our selves are beings of action-intuition as points of the self-

expression of the self-expressive world. To see with the body is to act, and conversely acting is seeing. Self-awareness involves action-intuition in some sense. There is no self-awareness when there is no action-intuition. Therefore rather than saying that the self-awareness of the self arises from within, I think that it rather arises from without. Our self-awareness exists in the dimension of immanence-qua-transcendence, and of transcendence-qua-immanence. In terms of psychology as well, the self-awareness of a child develops from facing persons in its surroundings. Persons who conceive of the concrete from the abstract derive self-awareness from knowledge or the will. But as I have stated above, exactly the converse is true. Or it may perhaps be thought in a developmental sense to arise from unconsciousness, but consciousness does not arise from mere unconsciousness; being does not arise from non-being.

It may then perhaps be said that self-consciousness is a process from the potential to the actual. But usually such a process merely means that something which had not yet appeared appears temporally, and the matter is understood in terms of objective logic. But to consider our self-consciousness to be such a process of emergence from the potential to the actual through such a thought-structure would be a mistake. It is not that our self-awareness can merely be conceived as a temporal process. For it begins from the present determining itself as the self-determination of the absolute present. Temporal process rather arises as self-determination in terms of *basbo*. The end exists in the beginning. Of course, perhaps the same may also be said in the structure of emergence from the potential to the actual, i.e., in a so-called teleological structure. However, the form of self-consciousness is such a form itself of the self-determination of the present. It is a spatial structure, so to speak. Therefore it may be said to reflect itself within itself. It is not something linear such as a teleological process, but is circular. The totality appears and acts from the beginning; it is not merely an unconsciousness.

Every process of consciousness arises according to the form of self-awareness. The essence of such self-awareness has not yet been fully investigated. Speaking in general terms, it may perhaps also be termed process of emergence from the potential to the actual, but it differs in its structure from a process of teleological development. It is a spatial process, as it were, in contrast to being a temporal process—indeed, it is a non-processive process. In the standpoint of knowledge we are unending processes of cognizing the objective world. In action we are

unending processes which form the objective world. But in the standpoint of self-awareness, there is neither something to know nor something to do in such a sense. Such a thing as one's personal character already belongs to the external; it is an historical fact. When we are conscious, the self already exists, and already functions. When we speak about a process, we are only clarifying this point. Therefore it is not that something different appears: for 'upon returning there is no different thing.'<sup>7</sup> However, this does not mean to enter within subjectively as is usually thought. Rather, it is to proceed outwards; it is to negate the self. Indeed, it means that interior becomes exterior and vice-versa. The very opposition between interior and exterior appears as the self-determination of the absolute present.

In self-awareness we do not merely enter within the self; for we return to the fundamental source of the self. This must be to enter into the fundamental source of the existence of the world. When the self begins, the world begins, and when the world begins, the self begins. The dimension of religion is this dimension of self-awareness. Therein arises the unique dimension of religion itself which differs from those of knowledge and morality.

Religion neither conceives God from the standpoint of knowledge as an ultimate principle nor asserts the existence of God as a postulate from the standpoint of morality. Again, even so, it is not based upon mere subjective mystical experience, either. As I have stated above, it is the standpoint as the foundation of knowledge and morality: it is the standpoint of self-awareness. No man would conceive the consciousness of self-awareness as something mystical. Nevertheless, this is a consciousness which differs in dimension from the consciousness of objective cognition or the consciousness of moral duty, for it is consciousness of the very existence of the self, and thus differs in direction from the other two. The content of such consciousness, or of such knowledge may not perhaps be called knowledge. But this depends on one's way of defining knowledge. Even such a thing as the Kantian *a priori* must rather today be understood as something which has the meaning of active self-awareness.

The discipline of philosophy also arises in the standpoint of the consciousness of our self-awareness. In previous philosophy, the uniqueness i.e., the fundamental nature of the consciousness of our self-awareness, was not deeply

<sup>7</sup> 到得歸來無別事

pondered. Hence its own form was not clarified. Self-consciousness is that in which knower is the known, thinker is the thought. Speaking more broadly, it is the undifferentiation of subject and object of expression. It may perhaps be said that this is an impossibility or a self-contradiction; but precisely because it is a self-identity of contradiction is it self-consciousness. It is not that it arises from the *cogito* of the self in a psychological way as expressed in Descartes. Rather, to express it in logical terms, as in the *Prajñā pāramitā-sūtra*, it may be said that 'because all minds are not mind, therefore they are called mind.' It may seem to be a paradox but the discrimination of non-discrimination is true self-awareness. (cf. Daisetsu Suzuki).

In Western philosophy, Nicholas of Cusa's idea of '*docta ignorantia*' (learned ignorance) is closest to this idea. Led on the one hand by negative theology, he desired at the same time to give it a logical structure. Thus Cusa may be said to be the precursor of Leibniz. He says that all investigation is already comparative based on analogy with things known. (*comparativa est omnis inquisitio*). Therefore Cusanus was mathematical. The maximum destroys comparison and opposition; it must be something than which there is no greater. Such a highest perfection must be one. Such a one which transcends comparison and opposition with all others is all things; it is something which exists in all things, and coincides with the infinitesimal. This is God. He states that the maximum fuses with the infinitesimal. (In Cusanus we are already reminded of the theory of infinity in modern mathematics.) He states that mathematics is the best help and guide to know the truth of God. He uses the example of an infinite sphere to express God. As the foundation of all things, God, who in terms of affirmative theology may be called the maximum of being is precisely God who in negative theology cannot be named. God is absolute being and at the same time absolute nothingness.

Cusanus' philosophy of the '*coincidentia oppositorum*' would seem to be best expressed by the logic of *basbo*. But Cusanus' thought was still subjective due to Christian influence. For even though he speaks of negation, he still did not avoid the standpoint of the logic of the Aristotelian logical subject. He did not have the idea of true absolute negation-qua-affirmation. In true absolute negation there is nothing which can be negated. Consequently, his philosophy did not avoid a mystical coloration. His logic was not a logic of true actuality. A logic of true 'learned ignorance' must be a logic of self-awareness. The source

of our knowledge and action is included therein. Our self knows itself and is self-aware in the place that the world is self-determining as self-identity of contradiction and as the self-determination of the absolute present. Conversely, the world is self-determining in the place that our self is self-aware. A logic of self-awareness is thus a logic of the formation of the world, and conversely a logic of the formation of the world is a logic of self-awareness.

Persons who think from the standpoint of objective logic may perhaps call this pantheistic, but exactly the opposite is true. That the individual is individual means precisely that the whole is the whole; that the whole is the whole means precisely that the individual is the individual. If not, there is no logic of self-awareness. The more deeply we reflect upon the source of the self in the deep interiority of the self, the more that we face the absolute God outside. The relation between God and man is that of a unity in the structure of the self-identity of contradiction. This is not something mystical. From the standpoint of such self-awareness our selves are infinite processes of the self-identity of contradiction in intellectual and active terms.

The logic of self-consciousness is an axiom of our historical life. The axioms of science also derive from it. As formative elements of the historical world our selves always function as self-identities of contradiction. We function in terms of the logic of self-awareness; the self is such a process of transition from the created to the creating. We always think that the self forms the world by reflecting the world. As long as our selves are individual we must think in such a way. The individual self is one of self-power. Therein lies a deep contradiction, anxiety and anguish, in the existence of the self itself. This contradiction cannot be eliminated by the power of the self. For it is our very existence, it is the very essence of our life. It is impossible to eliminate it even through moral efforts. For moral action is a process grounded on such a self-identity of contradiction. The root of man's religious exigency is to be sought herein.

That our selves as individuals reflect the world means in turn that we become focal points of the world which is a self-identity of contradictions. Such a self-identity of contradictions is always realized at the basis of our self-awareness. Our self-awareness is established thereon. The deeper that our self-awareness becomes, the more we encounter such a self-identity of contradictions. Hence 'our hearts will never rest, Oh Lord, until they rest in

Thee.' And this is conversely the call of God. Here there must be a conversion of life, or what is called religious conversion of mind. Whether called faith, or enlightenment, it must involve a fundamental conversion of life as the self-determination of the self-identity of absolute contradictions.

Although I speak of faith, I do not mean a kind of subjective belief, as some may think. In his preface to the *Epistle to the Romans*, Luther states that faith is not a fantasy or a vain imagination of man, as people sometimes take faith to be. Rather, faith is the working of God within us; we are made newly to live by God; killing the old Adam, faith makes us become entirely other men and is accompanied by the Holy Spirit. Enlightenment or intuition also does not mean to cognize something objectively. Dōgen says, 'To learn the way of the Buddha is to learn the self. To learn the self is to forget the self. To forget the self is to be enlightened by all dharmas. To be enlightened by all dharmas is to cause one's own body and mind and other bodies and minds to drop off.' This must mean the determination of non-determination, the self-determination of absolute Nothingness. He also says, 'it is by all dharmas' advancing that one enlightens the self.'<sup>8</sup> Our true self-awareness arises herefrom. Dōgen tells us that the attempt to enlighten all dharmas by bringing forward or advancing the self is an illusion.

The world of the self-identity of the absolute present in which the present is self-determining as self-identity of contradiction is therefore religious in the very ground of its existence. That the world arises from its self-reflection means that it exists religiously. In such a world the plurality of individuals and the One stand opposed in the structure of the self-identity of contradictions. God and man face each other as opposite poles. The more that our selves are personally individual the more that we face the absolute and unique God. Such a world is historical as transition from the created to the creating. The historical world is a structure of immanence-qua-transcendence and transcendence-qua-immanence; the religious dimension must be the very ground of its existence. Therefore we may think that there is *mythos* at the foundation of history. If not, history would be reducible to nature.

In the above standpoint, I attempt to articulate a philosophy of religion. The various questions of philosophy of religion must be considered from such

<sup>8</sup> 萬法すすみて自己を修證する



a standpoint. Various religions arise through the forms of the self-identity of contradiction between God and Man.

Now, each religion must be different from every other in its determined form. Christianity is historical. It considers this world to be the creation of God. It teaches that we are creatures of God. God creates man after His own image. Therein man is personal and free. God and man always face one another as opposite poles. The history of man begins from the original sin of Adam. Man who is the descendant of Adam is a sinner who should be thrown into the fires of Hell. However, he is saved only through belief in Christ who is man as the son of God who died and rose again for our sake. It thus teaches that we are justified through faith. This world is the world of the providence of God, an eschatological world.

Buddhism, on the contrary, may be considered to be non-historical. Where the objective world does not become the background, however, there is neither anguish and suffering, nor sin and evil, nor deliverance. For in that context no religion can arise. I have once said in comparing Eastern and Western cultures that Christianity is spatial and Buddhism is temporal. The world of the absolute present is always a structure which is both temporal-spatial, and spatial-temporal. Christianity sees this world as something spatial-temporal, as objective-formative. Buddhism, on the contrary, sees it as a world of birth-and-death, as something temporal-spatial.

In Christianity, this world is the world of the creation of God, whereas in Buddhism this world is always a transition from the created to the creating, a world of historical necessity, of karma. It is a world of infinite coming into being and passing away, a world of mere sorrow. There is absolutely no escape.

In Pure Land Buddhism, we are saved only by the compassion of Buddha. The world of eternal sorrow is in one aspect the world of the vow of the Buddha. It is thought that by believing in the Buddha and adhering to him we shall be born in the Pure Land. Both Christianity and Pure Land Buddhism have something in common in one aspect as religions of absolute dependence, but in another respect they are contrary perspectives. From this historical world which is transcendence-qua-immanence and immanence-qua-transcendence, it may be said that the former transcends this world in the direction of transcendence, and in the direction of objectivity, whereas the latter transcends this world in the direction of immanence, and in the direction of subjectivity. In

either case the essence of religion consists in penetration to the true source of our self as self-determination of the absolute present. Therefore, conversion of mind involves a kind of 'seeing.' Of course, though I say 'seeing,' I do not mean that we see anything objectively, for it is a kind of seeing of non-seeing. While Zen developed from Buddhism, its essence consists in this kind of seeing. Therefore, its 'seeing' is something that functions even in learning and art. Even enlightenment would seem only to mean to penetrate to the fundamental source of self-awareness. It is not anything mystical at all.

As is well known Descartes understood the intuition of self-consciousness as the form of truth. In the Cartesian school, knowing is thought of, to the same extent, as acting. Leibniz too conceived that which expresses the world clearly as something acting, whereas in Spinoza knowing was power. When we are the adequate cause for some matter, we are acting, (Spinoza, *Ethica*, Definition I, Prop. 3). This is nothing other than saying that the matter is to be understood clearly and distinctly from our very nature. Man is a completely intellectual being; *homo cogitat*. Various emotions exist as long as there exist the ideas of things which become objects. That he states that an effect follows from a cause is also mathematical. In Spinoza there is no time. However, our selves are intellectual by virtue of expressing the world as individuals of the world which is a self-identity of contradictions. That the individual expresses the world means in turn self-expressions of the world and thereby we are beings of action-intuition. Our selves are intellectual from the fact of form being self-determining. Man must be *creata et creans*. The *cogitans* derives therefrom.

Religious intuition is not so-called intellectual intuition; it involves the fact that the volitional self as a unique individual intuits its very self as a self-determination of the absolute present. In such a sense, it is true self-awareness. Our selves are unique individuals extending from the eternal past to the eternal future as self-determinations of the absolute present. The self is volitional in a sense that the reflected is the reflecting. The self is such as self-determination at the momentary instant of the absolute present. In such a sense, I follow Spinoza. Therefore, persons who attain religious faith in such a sense, who become self-aware religiously, may be said to illustrate the dictum that 'he is master of himself wherever he goes'<sup>9</sup> as self-determinations of the absolute

<sup>9</sup> 隨處為主 (*Lin-chi Lu*)

present. Such persons are always active. Moreover, this knowledge may be called 'learned ignorance,' or discrimination of non-discrimination. I do not mean that the man of religious self-awareness is the scientific savant or the man of practical powers. Here there is neither male nor female, neither sage nor fool. "As he stands all is right with him."<sup>10</sup> From the depths of such 'non-ego,' infinite compassion wells forth. Love is something objective. Hence in this instance, I should rather like to use the word Compassion.

It would be a great mistake if people should hold that religion is merely a matter of individual peace of mind, and therefore is unrelated to the question of nation. The world of the absolute present is always historical and formative as the self-determination of form. This must be called national. Nations are the forms of the self-formation of the historical world. National politics (*kokutai*) are such forms of individuality. Our selves must be national in the sense of always being historical and formative as individuals of the world of the absolute present. True obedience to the nation should be derived from the standpoint of true religious self-awareness. Mere seeking one's own peace of mind is selfish. This is a perspective diametrically opposed to religious self-awareness.

The historical world is a world in which forms are self-determining in a temporal-spatial, spatial-temporal structure. The world is creative through self-formation; it is infinitely processive, and temporal. As creative elements of the creative world, our selves touch the infinite self-expression of the world. The world is moral in this dimension. Nations must be the forms of the self-expressive world in such a sense. Therefore they may be conceived as the source of morality. However, the temporal world is conversely the spatial world. The historical world is a transition from one historical age to another; it is spatially self-determining. Herein forms intuit themselves, are the Ideas, in the sense that the temporal is the spatial and motion is rest. In such a standpoint, the world is always a structure of cultures. But such a world itself as self-determination of the absolute present, is one in which in its foundation each individual self reflects the world of the absolute present and at the same time is a self-determination of the world of the absolute present. Our selves must be the self-determinations at the momentary instants of the world in which the present

<sup>10</sup> 立處皆真 (*Lin-chi Lu*)

**THE EASTERN BUDDHIST**

is self-determining. Herein the world is religious. The world begins from self-reflection of itself. Both morality and culture are grounded on the religious.

translated by David A. Dilworth