

The Principle of “Mutual Transmission (卽)” in the Huayen and Zen Buddhist Philosophy

- Comparative Thinking as a Fundamental Method
for Philosophy in a Globalized World -

Hashi Hisaki*

주제분류 마음철학, 비교철학, 동서양 비교논리학

주요어 卽의 논리, 화엄불교, 선불교, 논리비교, 소통

요약문

오늘날 지구촌 사회에서 모든 것은 디지털 네트워크의 정보고속도로를 통해서 즉시즉시 전송된다. 점점 더 빠른 속도로 변해가는 양식 속에 나타나는 이러한 정보의 흐름 속에서 사람들은 중요한 것을 잊을 수도 있는데, 그것은 “무엇이 즉시 전송될 것이고 무엇이 그렇지 않은 것인가”를 구별하는 일이다. 그것은 좀더 깊은 질문을 함축하고 있다. “이러한 템포가 빠르게 가속화되는 것이 사람들의 사고와 행동 자체의 주된 목적인가?” 무용한 목표를 향해 돌진할 때 사람들은 자신들의 사고와 행동을 성찰해야 한다. IT매체 도구들에 의존하는 가운데 사람들은 곧잘 그들의 실제 환경으로부터 소외당한다. 생활세계에서 생존경쟁을 하느라 투쟁하면서 많은 사람들은 “소통”과 “사람들간의 관계”의 의미를 잊는다. 이 논문은 위에 언급한 오늘날 지구촌화 세계의 현상에 대해서 중요한 자극을 줄 수 있는 화엄불교와 선불교의 논리속의 ‘상호 소통’의 중요성을 고찰한다.

* 비엔나대학교

1. Introduction

Is it true that in the history of East Asian Cultures there was less “philosophy” before the modernization had begun in the 19th century?¹⁾ Someone who is fixed executively in a frame of the occidental philosophy tends to build up a dogma of this kind.

Really, there are *different characteristics* between the Philosophy of the Occidental World and the Philosophy of East Asia. But it isn't valid to state that there was no philosophy in East Asia before the

1) It is surely a confronted questioning. One of the most serious classical queries found by Hegel, “Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte”, chapters of India and China. In the other writing of Hegel “Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie”, chapters of Asia there are similar aspects. It was typical for several of the highest intellectuals in Europe of the 19th century that they are oriented to establish their own encyclopedia for cultures of the whole world. The orientation is progressive, a pre-“Interculturality” before the beginning of the globalization of the world. But, according to the chapters of “Asia” they are not free of any problems: The most grave causality is that they (Hegel and other thinkers) viewed a surface of Asian cultures exceptionally from their own orientation of Europe's centralization. There appear a lot of unneglectable failures by Hegel in the chapters dealing with Asian religions and philosophy, for example the mixing interpretation of Brahmanism (Hinduism and Buddhism). (Wissenschaft der Logik, Die Lehre vom Sein, Frankfurt a.M. 1988.)

The fundamental reflections on the question if there was „philosophy“ before the modernization in East Asia, was confronted by scholars at the period of the Meiji Restauration in Japan. By the translation of a number of works and writings of Western philosophy there are confrontations by Japanese scholars to find a suitable word or to build up a new word by combinations of fundamental Chinese scripts. For more detailed information of this confrontation see the article of Fujita M., in: 岩波講座: 哲学, vol. 14, Tokyo 2009.)

modernization and the contact to the Western World had begun. One of the correct scientific statements can be stated as follows: Before the modernization of the 19th Century there *was not* to find a *philosophy of Western style* in East Asia. It is evident that there are two categories in philosophy: *that of the Western World* and *that of East Asia*. The previous statement lacks a precious analysis in saying that there was “no Philosophy before the modernization in East Asia”. In the comparative thinking we set a certain category, for example, “philosophy”. If it is true that the “philosophy” of the Western World can be hardly identified with the “philosophy” (哲学) in East Asia, *we have to compare* their specific different to grasp the respective characteristics on the one hand of the “occidental philosophy” and on the other hand of the East Asian Philosophy 哲学. Then, by identification, we have *a pair of principal concepts* which are ***certainly in a complementary relation***: the *Philosophy in a Global World* and the different aspects of the Occidental World and the world of East Asia.²⁾

2) For the method of Comparative Philosophy see the article of Hashi, Nakamura Hajime: Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples - A questioning to a globalized world 中村 元 『東洋人の思惟方法』—グローバル現代への問いかけ, in: Studies in Comparative Philosophy, vol. 41, Tokyo 2014: Japanese Association for Comparative Philosophy

2. The Characteristic of the Origin in the Occidental Philosophy - Plato and Aristotle

Reflecting the characteristics of Western Philosophy, it is evident that the ancient Greek Philosophy showed a clear orientation to *scientific knowledge* from the beginning. Aristotle's focus is to research causalities of certain things and beings from which a person, as the thinking one, achieves the principle of a certain truth.³⁾ Reflections are developed by the method of a dialogue which enables a person to distinguish one thing from another in judging a certain aspect in a *duality* of [A] or [non-A], [A] versus [non-A]. One principle that Plato, Aristotle's teacher, often set at the beginning of his philosophy lecture at the "Academeia", is the following: "[The One] and "[The uncertain difference of Two]".⁴⁾ The First "One" is not God, is not the Absolute, not the whole enveloping One in the sense of Plotinos' New-Platonism. The "One" by the "original" Plato is a "one" that has to be seen as a unity with an ambiguity that hasn't been treated within a rational discourse. Parallel to this "One" there are unlimited numbers of "Two", meaning a differentiation like "Great – Small", "Long – Short", "Clear – Dark" and so on. These differentiations lead us to a clear knowledge which is always accompanied by the "one". A knowledge which is already achieved is a *unity*; the One, in which a further unclearness

3) Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, vol. ALPHA, [981b]

4) Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, vol. ALPHA [987b]

arises to question of *what it is*. If it is ambiguous, the thinking one should prove precisely *in which aspect* it is ambiguous *or* not ambiguous. This is the intellectual mighty of “philosophein”, the verbum which fascinated most ancient Greek thinkers. In short, it is evident that, from the beginning, it was the Occidental Philosophy’s purpose to clarify everything in the world in a rational and logical way. Goal of this “philosophein” was to discover an “*undividable truth*” which cannot be argued any more. (The naming of “dia-logos” shows this way of logics as every problematic would be questioned by the method of “dividing in a dichotomy” until a clear, undividable knowledge can be achieved: This kind of truth is valid as a “principle” which is fundamental to operate and deduce further problematics in the world. This way of “philosophein” is possible, only if the thinking human grasps the “nous”, the whole intellectuality including rationality and logics in thinking and acting which lights up every darkness, unclarity and ignorance.

The *dialogos* by Plato was skilled up in a daily exercise of philosophia in form of a discussion between a teacher and a disciple/disciples. Aristotle grows up under this method of “dia-logos” and dialectics. And *he*, the best disciple of Plato, executed this spirit of the dialogos *most critically against his teacher* Plato. The “Metaphysics” of Aristotle includes several sharp critiques against Plato’s philosophy, especially in terms of the “*idea*” (ἰδέα), one of the main concepts of Plato. Aristotle construes his own philosophy in elaborating his critiques against Plato and he confirms one of his own philosophical principles: ousia (οὐσία).⁵⁾ I explained this fact as a general example which shows us the fundament of the Occidental

Philosophy: It is oriented to grasp principles of an unneglectable, eternal truth. The whole intellectual act to getting knowledge is oriented to grasp a highly scientific truth.⁶⁾ Persons are bound to the end of their life. As concepts, Plato's "*idea*" (ἰδέα) as well as Aristotle's "*ousia*" (οὐσία) will remain.

3. From the Origin of East Asian Philosophy

If we focus on Aristotle's confrontation and his rigorous critique against his teacher Plato, most intellectuals of East Asian cultures have a kind of cultural shock, as the behavior of Aristotle is the opposite of the principal concept of 礼 (禮), one of the well-known articles of the five principal categories of Confucian philosophy.⁷⁾ In regard to these different ways of thinking we can say: The "philosophy" in a global world is *a unity*, but it implies the uncertain "One". Within this "One"

5) Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, vol. A [987a-988a], vol.M [1078b-1079b]. Besides there are a lot of parts in which Aristotle did not show the name of Plato, but executed his own theory in taking the same topics from Plato whereas he distinguishes his thinking in opposite to the former thinkers. Cf. Hashi, "The ousia of Aristotle and the idea of Plato", in: *Biocosmology*, vol. 5/2, 2015, pp. 174-185.

6) H.-D. Klein analyzed the characteristic of the ancient Greek philosophy in which he acknowledges this tendency as a difference to another philosophy of ancient type: H.-D. Klein, "Der Begriff der Seele in Philosophie und Religion", chap. 2, in: J Figl, *Der Begriff der Seele in der Religionswissenschaft*, Würzburg 2002, pp. 28-33.

7) Confucius, Lunyu, Kaizuka (Ed.), Tokyo 1978. One of the example is, vol. I. 2 (為政篇), paragraph 7: 不敬何以別; paragraph 5, 生事之以禮、死葬之以禮、祭之以禮。

we acknowledge the different characteristics and orientations: The *uncertain Two* between the European and East Asian Philosophy. Let us say – in regard to the original of Confucius’ “Lunyu”: Ways and systems of philosophical thinking in East Asia have been striving for another approach with regard to the European and Occidental Philosophy: I.e., Philosophy (including religions) in East Asian cultures is *due to establish an ethical life for an ethical society in a real world*. It did not have a keenly critical *dialogos* which was used by Aristotle in argumentations in the above mentioned style. For this way of dialogue and dialectic in the Occidental Philosophy, the Aristotle’s critique is right, almost correct and promotable, as he was stimulated by the elder knowledge of Plato and therefore developed several conceptions as the direct successor of Plato’s school. A lot of queries on Plato’s cognition could be answered by Aristotle, so that a critical dialectic continuum was succeeded for a progression and a development in philosophy: The continuous renewal through the argumentation towards an old and classical thing accompanies the development of a Philosophy in the Occidental World.

But, in view of “constant renewal”, there is a philosophical question appearing and that is if this unity, namely the category of a “renewal by overcoming of an old one” cannot always be perfect in all mighty: Is a renewal of old things always valid as a “progression” of quality? Is an old, classic thing only there to put us out of the main stream? Evidently, the answer is **No**. Every intellectual in East Asia remembers the well-known phrase of Confucius: 温故知新. In our modern language it can be interpreted as follows: “In evaluation and acknowledgement of

classics, human being is able to achieve a new knowledge.”⁸⁾ I.e., something new can emerge in *crossing points of classic and modern thinking*. Let us focus its logical function and its essential mind on a philosophical level in a globalized world.

4. The Logical Function of the Script “soku 卽”

By focusing on this, let us remain that in East Asian Cultures there is a number of other approaches to philosophy, logics and science in the long history, which can contribute and enrich our contemporary philosophy in a global world. One of the most important things in this case is the principle concerning logics. The meaning and function of 卽 (jap; *soku*. chines; *jié*) has been well known by researchers of Buddology, but its philosophical significance and possibility for contribution to Philosophy in a global World has not been clarified. For this purpose the Comparative Thinking in Comparative Philosophy is most necessary.

The script 卽 primary has the function to connect one thing with another one. This often gets clear in the philosophy of Huayen⁹⁾ and

8) 温故知新 Confucius, Lun-yu 論語, vol. I. 2 (為政篇), paragraph11: 温故而知新、可以為師矣. In: , Kaizuka (Ed.), 孔子·孟子, Tokyo 1968, p. 80.

9) In the originals of Huayen Buddhist Texts this term is mostly shown in: Taishō Tripitaka (大正藏經), Tokyo 1990, vol. 45, Commentary and Interpretation to the Huayen-Sutras. The basic theory is in the original of 法順 (柱順), interpreted by 宗密, “註華嚴法界觀門”, in: Taishō Tripitaka, vol. 45, ibidem, pp. 684-692. Sueki T., 東洋の合理思想 tōyō no gōri-shisō (The Rationalism in Asian Nations), Tokyo 1980, pp. 218-219.

Zen Buddhism¹⁰⁾ in which its own terminological significance has been shown.

But, let us examine the function of logics clearly. Here we are, as a mediator facing the cross-cultural dimension of the European’s Formal Logic and the Huayen- and Zen logics of East Asia. As a preposition we have to notice that the script of *soku* has its value, if different things, [A and B], in other words, [A *and* non-A] are in connection or in bounding. If we find the same word twice, [A *soku* A] or [B *soku* B], it has less meaning, as it only shows a tautology. SUEKI Takehiro (1921-2007), one of the most excellent logicians in Japan (University of Tokyo), presented a unique thesis that the logics of *soku* 卽 in Huayen Buddhism have a special position – especially in view of the comparison between formal logics and analytical philosophy in the Occidental World:

- 1) The *soku* 卽 includes the definition of identity – as [A is A], and [B is B].
- 2) It shows at the same time the definition of difference.
- 3) It shows the significance of “*Transmission between A and B*”, in other words, [A *and* non-A].

It is remarkable that 1) and 2), the *definitions of two opposite categories*, i.e. *identity and difference*, are shown at the same time in *the same term*. Just this point is hardly to grasp by several occidental philosophers and logicians who keep the thinking frame only in a pure

10) See the Original 金剛般若經, vajracchedikā prajñā pāramitā sūtra in Reference.

analytical philosophy or formal logics (of Western style). By their query or argument I would confirm that this is the *most important characteristic of language and culture*. It is characteristic that the Chinese script *per se* is build up on the base that both opposite categories are just integrated: It shows a sensual picture in the sense of icons in the empirical world. On the other hand it presents deep dimensional conceptions and meanings. *A* 即 *A*, twice the same, it happens nothing; it is a tautology. Only if there is a difference appearing, *A* and *non-A*, there occurs a kind of relationship. Identity and Difference, both belong to “a pair of opposite”, but in well-organized harmony. The real core of the term “即” is in reference to 3), the *mutual transmission between different positions*.

The fundament of logics is in general – in the Chinese philosophy and Buddhist philosophy in East Asia – dealing with the world of environment, the world of experience in a tangible life.¹¹⁾

Let us look at a phenomenon arising out of this circumstance. In the world of nature there is nothing which is in every detail “*only the same and identical*” with another. Every plant has its own face and its identity even if they are belonging to the same species. There, we have to notice that this logic of Buddhist Philosophy orientates actually to the “*theory of relations*”. The theory of substance (or substratum) is not in the foreground in this thought of Buddhism,¹²⁾ because Buddhist

11) Akizuki R., 公案—實踐的禪入門, Tokyo 1987. Hashi, Philosophische Anthropologie zur globalen, II. Main section, chap. I,

12) Nāgārjuna, Mūla madhyamaka karikā: Philosophie der Leere, Weber/Brosamer, Back (Eds.), Wiesbaden 2005. prajñā pāramitā hrdaya sutra, in: 般若心經·金剛般若經, Nakamura H., Kino K. (Eds.), Toyo 1991. Nakamura H., 大乘仏典, vol. 1, 般若經典, Tokyo 2003. Hashi, Philosophische Anthropologie zur

Philosophy focuses on the phenomenon of a real world, the problem of real life, the causality of human beings suffering and that of other beings and the method to overcoming them. Things in the world are always belonging to the “running time” with a dynamic change of space. *Every moment is emerging, staying shortly and vanishing forever.* Nothing remains for eternity. Nothing remains substantially. – What does remain is only the principle of “*anitya*” (無常 jap; *mujō*), the running and vanishing of every being in time-space. On the other hand there is something more remaining, i.e. the “*relation*” of things and beings through their causal logical connection.¹³⁾ Let us review this core, the theory of relation: A plant α finds itself in the same time-space with another plant β . They both present themselves with their own identities, but they don’t struggle in brutality. They exist despite their own unities and identities in harmony. A *co-existence* of [A and *non-A*] in a complementary relationship is the core of this logics.

globalen, III. Main section, chap. 2.

- 13) Since Buddhism as a complex mixing of religion and philosophical thought from the beginning on, it problematizes the problems of the life phenomena, suffering of human and the problematics of overcoming of suffering. A phenomenon of life is grasped in the middle of empirical life. Because the life phenomena are always changing dynamically which is trans-mitted by different relations, a substantializing of particular things which is stable by any influence and disturbance from empirical world is hardly to show and confirm actually what the essential being of “substance” is. Instead of a theory for substance, theories to explain the “relations” of various changing phenomena are stated principally since the Early Buddhism: see for example the term of *pratitya samutpāda* 因縁生起, in: Takasaki, Hayashima, *Lexicon for Buddology and Indology* 仏教・インド思想辞典, Tokyo 1993.

5. What does it contribute for the Philosophy in a globalized World?

Let us have a look at the construction of logics. [A *soku* B] means *A* and *non-A* in a co-existential relation in a full *complementarity*. [A *soku* B] never causes a negative relationship for an isolation, for example hating, or struggling in brutality. [A and B] are not substratums that exists forever, but they are beings in a co-relation of *emerging, developing and vanishing*. Because they are not eternal stable substratums, they both are striving for peace in *co-existential relation*. [A and B] are *sō-soku* 相即, i.e. they are in a *mutual transmission* and *Intra-Relation* in their mutual encountering. [A] accepts [B], [A] accepts [non-A], and vice versa. [A and B] are in the Intra-Relation *sō-nyū* 相入: [A] puts itself into the dimension of [B], and [B] also puts itself into the dimension of [A].¹⁴⁾ Through this active exchanging of one's own position, the transmission of energies from different characteristics arises dynamically. SUEKI Takehiro called this way of Huayen logics the “*Processual Dialectic of Harmony*”.¹⁵⁾

14) Taishō Tripitaka, vol. 45, Tokyo 1990: 宗密, “註華嚴法界觀門”, pp.691-692. Fa zang 法藏, “華嚴一乘教義分齋章 (華嚴五教章)” especially vol. 4, pp. 503, 505, ibidem Sueki, ibidem, chap. 2.3., pp. 203-206.

15) T. Sueki, ibidem, pp. 218-219. 調和の弁証法.

6. The contribution of the soku (卽)- logics for Interdisciplinary

Principally we can say that in this *soku*-logic of the Huayen Philosophy the things and beings [A and B] ([A and non-A]) are not “monades” in the original and rigorous sense of Leibniz: Primary then each of them is not shown as a closed organism. Particular things in Buddhism are not bound to a “substantiality”; in the Madhyamika School since Nāgārjuna, everything is an “emptiness” and free of substantiality. Each thing is not focused as a static one. Everything is changing “free of substance” dynamically in a real time-space relation. Their potentiality for accepting and learning from others is enormous. *A* and *B* have among their bodily existence a “*Field of Between*” in which the different Two (*A and non-A*) are encountering, communicating, crossing and emerging for each other. I name this kind of particular things, which are “free of substance” in bounding to the environment in my terminology: *corpus*, *A*, *B*, *C* (...) and so on. Each of them has a [*Field of Between*] in encountering with another one, in which the one (for example *A*) has its own characteristic, bodily existence and contents of self-consciousness. The latter is an open court for crossing, encountering, competing and completing. Every personal self has one’s own system of life which I call “*intra-system unity*”. The others are *extra-system-unities* whereas each one is *not isolated* from another. They are *corpora* (corpus in plural) in an open court with their different disciplines and thinking systems. “The *Field of Between*” is a

potentiality for Inter-Action, mutual transmission and *Intra-Relation*, and its possibility of emergence. For our focal point there is just one issue important to remark: It is not the field of a random mixing to a unity of any kind. To integrate different factors, [A and non-A], both must be compared cautiously from both positions of [A and non-A]. *Every step of scientific and ethical thinking is bound to a comparative reflection.*

7. The “corpus” in the “Field of Between” - How does it work?

In one word, I will quote the term of Varela, “*enactivism*”.¹⁶⁾ It positions an *intra-system* into an environment which is able to recognize a *tangent between itself and other selves*. The latter are the *extra-systems*. The *corpus* as an *intra-system* puts itself within the experience of *inter-action*, construes a dialectical field of tension, taking a query and question between one’s *own intra-system* and *other’s*

16) For the comparative philosophical reflection to Varela’s enactivism and theories of Buddhist Psychology (*vijnapti matravada*) see Shiba, *Cognitive Science von Varela und psycho-physische Philosophie im Buddhismus. Zur Phänomenologie der Erfahrungen*, in: Hashi (Ed.) *Denkdisziplinen*, Nordhausen 2015. The corpus of one’s self, as a physical body and the ability to grasp, to memory and to keep an essential knowledge and cognition builds up this dimensional core of physical reality and cognitive unit. Hashi: *Philosophische Anthropologie zur globalen Welt*, main section I. *Cognition embodied in Buddhist Philosophy*, in: *Philosophy Study* 2014/2, New York 2014. *Cognitive Science von Varela und psycho-physische Philosophie im Buddhismus*, in: *Asian Studies*, III/1, 2015: University of Ljubljana

extra-system-unities. It enters into the *extra-system unity*. It presents one’s *intra-system* in regard to a dialogue to come to the essential core of the problem, getting an answer in a higher level of “*integration*” of intra-system and extra-system unities¹⁷⁾ by which the mutual transmission between intra- and extra-system is executed. A dynamic self- transformation based on comparative thinking is the key point to fulfill this process step by step. By grasping this pair of terms, [Intrasystem] and [Extrasystem], it would be irrational to assume that one is fixed executively to the position of an old style of analytical philosophy, taking that a “system” should be defined exceptionally as an objectivized unity by which a thinking person as an observer and operator is definitively separated from the objectivized thing. With regard to the above mentioned pair of concepts, the *Intrasystem* means [one’s own thinking unity] based on his bodily life and existence. The *Extrasystem* is something that is not similar or that cannot be integrated into one’s own thinking system. The theory of comparative thinking includes both units, the [Intrasystem and Extrasystem] whereas the thinking and acting one as an executor of its own bodily life finds itself confronted with both pair categories – in other words, the *Identification and Difference*.

17) Hashi, *Philosophische Anthropologie zur globalen Welt*, I. Main Section, Prologue.

8. Co-Existential Mind of Huayen Buddhism as an Optimistic Utopia?

- The Significance of the Logics of Intellectual Negation in Zen Buddhism

An empirical phenomenon of life is that we have to struggle to achieve a validity of our right, our opinion and our existence in a society. A correct opinion alone does not help and support to execute one's own right. The Huayen Buddhist Philosophy orientates towards a beautiful world like the Network of Indrah which implies that every particular being has its own essential unity within its entelechy.¹⁸⁾

If the core of the entelechy of [Alpha] arises, its essential being is reflected by another being [Beta] within its own essential nature. Reflecting from one jeweler to another, the world is fulfilled by respectable entelechies. Does this sound too optimistic when faced with a hard life? In a severe world of human beings, we can complete the Huayen logics for dynamic harmony *soku* with a sharp and severe "logics of negation" of Zen Buddhist philosophy: 即非 *soku-hi*, the [negation of *soku*]¹⁹⁾ a dialectic logic of the negations to [*A* and *non-A*]

18) The net of Indrah: Nakamura H. (Ed.), 大乘仏典 vol. 5, 楞伽經·華嚴經. Tsujimura, „ Zur Differenz der All-Einheit im Westen und Osten“, in: Henrich (Ed.), All-Einheit, Stuttgart 1985.

19) 即非の論理: Akizuki R.: 著作集 vol. 8, chapter 3. "The Study for a Zen Philosophical Theory - Where are you being?" (禪哲學的試論—あなたはどこにいるのか?), chap. 3, in: Zen and Contemporary World (禪と現代), pp. 22-25, Tokyo 1986. Suzuki Daisetz, Complete Works, vol. 5, Logics of prajñā (般若の論理), in: Zen in the Diamond Sutra (金剛經の禪), Tokyo 1968, pp. 380-383.

at the same time: The original expression was quoted from the Diamond Sutra (vajracchedikā prajñā pāramitā sutra) in classic Chinese translation. “*A is A. At the same time A is non-A: (Through these negations we can achieve a true knowledge, that) This is called A.*” The criticism of Zen Buddhism is oriented primarily to examine one’s own position, own opinion and own mind in focus, how far it is mixed up with a false position, with one’s own subjectivism or egoism of any kind. The sharp negation of “*A is non-A*” goes on in purpose of clarifying the following point: The first *A* in a tautology must be examined dialectically by various viewpoints in problematizing of that “why can we name it *A*?”, “What is *A* and what is *non-A*?” and also, “What is my self who decides this category *A* and another?” The self-critical questioning accompanies one’s own life and enriches its field of experiences. Also in the middle of an inter-action with another one, the sharp logical examination of 卽非 *soku-hi*, works as a sharp negation to the *soku*-optimism and accompanies the whole development of one’s own experience, thinking and communicating. It stimulates with a warning position against optimism, syncretism and the lacking of critical views. The core of Huayen Logics of “*A soku non-A*” and the cautiously critical and self critical negation of the Zen Buddhist “*soku-hi*”, [A is A] and [A is non-A], [B is non-B, non-C ...]etc.”²⁰⁾ insists in the relationship of complementarity. Both logics are located in

20) The dialectic construction of logics to grasp the problem what is the [A] per se is similar to Hegel’s “Wissenschaft der Logik”, Die Lehre vom Wesen, the article of “Widerspruch” (Contradictory of A and non-A). See Hashi, Die Dynamik von Sein und Nichts, IV. Main section, Frankfurt a.M. 2004. Hashi, 認識と論理, in: 東洋学研究 Oriental Studies vol. 43 (東洋大学東洋学研究所).

an open mind, in an open court for *real and intellectual inter-action*. Its principal orientation is the mind of transmission from one to another, a dynamic interaction and the mutual transmission of the self and that of other selves in the *Field of Between*. In this mind the thinking and acting system is highly useful for the contemporary world in which everything runs only in the level of briefly information in purpose of getting only more and more material profit for one's own ego which is isolated from others.

9. Conclusion

The Logic of *soku* 即 and *soku-hi* 即非 (*non-soku*), as a pair of logic principles can show an open gate for application in our thinking system in the contemporary world.

-It construes a cooperative logic for interdisciplinary community.

-It has an ability to distinguish of that, what can be a similarity and what should be more and more questioned and should be discussed in an *inter-activity*.

-It has an ability to achieve an integration in an advanced level. The latter is able *with-out mixing with an easy average, without* simple and false harmonizing, *without* a one-sided dogma, *without* an ignorance of other's entity.

-It has a potentiality to achieve a *one-minded* group work for a community: Here, the Huayen logic of *soku* shows the most effective approach.

-It is able to reflect one’s own thinking and acting in *human relations*, especially in the logics of Huayen.

-The logic of soku-hi/non-soku in Zen has a direct contribution to getting and constructing a critical and self-critical mind.

-It shows the *relevance of complementary* of [A and non-A]: The logics of [soku] (卽) and [soku-hi /non-soku] (卽非) of Huayen and Zen Buddhist Philosophy should be perceived in a “Complementary Relationship”.

Regarding contemporary society in our globalized world, things and beings are presented often as a collected information around of the hours. Self-identification and self-reference is always possible via IT medias and networks. Relating one’s data to many, things are easy to “copy-paste-deliver” immediately. On the surface everything is related in digital networks. In a cautious view of reflections – reality is running to an opposite direction. A lot of human beings as *different selves* are isolated from the environment. They often have a relation only in depending to one’s own portable IT media instrument. As human society is characterized by isolation and solitude, communications lack in many surfaces. The mind of a particular self falls into a dependency on a portable IT media. The morality of a community cannot be construed ordinary because every individual is mostly isolated from one’s own circumstance and environment. The most lacking factor is the personal interaction, a “transmission” from one to another one, whereas the mutual transmission enables an *intra-relation* in meaningful communications. The principle of Huayen Buddhist Philosophy *soku* 卽

enables us to remember the significance of mutual transmission by members of the human society, the relevance of a co-existential mindfulness. The Zen Buddhist logics of *soku-hi* 即非 (*non-soku*) accompanies our reflection with its sharp criticism to avoid an easy optimism. Both principles are useful just in our time of global networks and communications, because the collected position of *soku* 即 and *soku-hi* 即非 stimulates us with reasonable questions due to achieve a meaningful communication in our daily life.

References

AKIZUKI Ryōmin:

秋月龍珉著作集 Collected Works, vol. 8, Tokyo 1978: San’ishci shobō

公案—実践的禪入門 (Kōan – Introduction to Practical Zen Buddhism), Tokyo 1980: Chimuma shobō

禪哲學的詩論—あなたはどこにいるのか? (The Study for a Zen Philosophical Theory – Where are you being?), chap. 3, in: 禪と現代 (Zen and Contemporary World), pp. 22-25, Tokyo 1986: Kawade shobō

ARISTOTLE:

Metaphysik, edited by F. Schwarz, Stuttgart 2000: reclam

CONFUCIUS:

Lun-yu 論語, In: Kaizuka (Ed.), 孔子・孟子, Tokyo 1978: Chūō kōronsha

HASHI Hisaki:

Philosophische Anthropologie zur globalen Welt, Münster/Berlin/ Zürich/London/Wien 2014: LIT

Cognition Embodied in Buddhist Philosophy, in: *Philosophy Study*, 2014-2, New York: David Publishing

中村 元 『東洋人の思惟方法』 —グローバル現代への問いかけ (Nakamura Hajime: Ways of thinking of Eastern peoples - A questioning to a globalized world), in: *Studies in Comparative Philosophy*, vol. 41, Tokyo 2014: Japanese Association for Comparative Philosophy

The Method of Comparative Thinking (比較という方法), in: Philosophy Lectures of Iwanami-Publishing 岩波講座 哲学, vol. 14 The Philosophy of Philosophical History (哲学史の哲学), Tokyo 2009: Iwanami shoten

Phenomenology and Buddhist Philosophy, in: *Dialogue and Universalism*, 2015-3, Warsaw 2015: Polish Academy of Sciences, Institute of Social Philosophy and Social Science

Phenomenon of Life and Death by Dōgen and Heidegger—In View of “Embodied Cognition” in Buddhist Philosophy and Phenomenology, in: *Asian Study*, III-1, 2015: University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)

HEGEL, Georg Willhelm Friedrich:

Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte, Stuttgart 1975: reclam

Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Philosophie, Frankfurt a.M. 1996: Suhrkamp

Wissenschaft der Logik, Frankfurt a.M. 1986: Suhrkamp

KLEIN, Hans-Dieter:

Der Begriff der Seele in Philosophie und Religion, in: *Der Begriff der Seele in der Religionswissenschaft*, Johann Figl and Hans-Dieter Klein, Würzburg 2002: Königshausen & Neumann

NAKAMURA Hajime (Ed.):

般若經典 (Prajñā Sūtras), 大乘仏典 (Sūtras of Mahayana Buddhism) vol. 1, Tokyo 2003, 2004.

楞伽經・華嚴經 (Lankāvataṛa Sūtra & Huayen Sūtra), 大乘仏典 (Sūtras of Mahayana Buddhism) vol. 5, Tokyo 2003, 2005

NAKAMURA Hajime, KINO Kazuyoshi (Eds.):

般若心経・金剛般若経 (Herat Sutra & Diamond Sutra) (Prajñā pāramitā hrdaya sūtra& vajrachedikā prajñā pāramitā sūtra), Tokyo 1990: Iwanami shoten

SHIBA Haruhide:

Cognitive Science von Varela und psycho-physische Philosophie im Buddhismus. Zur Phänomenologie der Erfahrungen, in: Hashi, H. (Ed.) *Denkdisziplinen. Interdisziplinäre Philosophie von Ost und West*, Nordhausen 2015: Traugott Bautz Verlag

SUZUKI Daisetz: Complete Works vol. 5, Tokyo 1968: Iwanami shoten

SUEKI Takehiro:

東洋の合理思想 (The Rationalism in Asian Nations), Tokyo 1980 : Kōdansha

TAKAKUSU Junjirō, WATANABE Kaogyoku (Eds.), *Taishō Tripitaka* (大正新修大蔵経), vol. 45, Tokyo 1990: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai

TAKASAKI Jikidō, HAYASHIMA Kyōshō (Eds.):

仏教・インド思想辞典 (Buddhology and Indology), Tokyo 1993: Shunjūsha

TSUJIMURA Kōichi:

Zur Differenz der All-Einheit im Westen und Osten“, in: D. Henrich (Ed.), *All-Einheit*, Stuttgart 1985: Klett-Cotta

The Principle of “Mutual Transmission (即)” in the Huayen and Zen Buddhist Philosophy

- Comparative Thinking as a Fundamental Method
for Philosophy in a Globalized World -

Hashi Hisaki (University of Vienna)

In our time of the globalized world everything is transmitted immediately in an information high way of digital networks. Within this ‘main stream’ – involved also by tempo up modus – humans can forget something relevant: What must be transmitted only immediately and what is not? It includes also the further question: Is this tempo up and acceleration a main purpose of thinking and acting of human per se? Running in a high speed sometimes also to a disqualified goal, humans have to reflect the contents of their thinking and acting. Depending on IT media instruments humans are often isolated from their real environment. Struggling in a survival game in a life world, many humans forget the significance of “transmission” and “intra-relation”. This article shows the relevance of the ‘mutual transmission’ in the Logics of Huayen- and Zen Buddhism which can be reflected carefully as a critical stimulation just in the above mentioned phenomena in our the globalized world.

Key words: Logic of *soku* (即), Cognition in Huayen and Zen Buddhism, Comparatist reflection for logics

The Principle of “Mutual Transmission (卽)” in the Huayen and Zen Buddhist Philosophy / Hashi Hisaki

Hashi Hisaki e-mail: hisaki.hashi@univie.ac.at

투 고 일	2015년 10월 27일
심 사 일	2015년 11월 02일
게재확정	2015년 11월 19일