The Self-Reflecting Mirror:
On Nishida's Early Logic of *Basho*

Andrea LEONARDI

〈要約〉
　画期的な「場所」概念は西田哲学の最も重要な発想である。西洋哲学からすれば，その オリジナリティが有を包む「真の無の場所」という特徴にあると言えるが，場所は有を生 むものでもあるため，肯定的な性質も持っていなければならない。拙論では，場所概念の 成立と意味を分析し，その肯定的な性質を考えてみたい。自己を映す鏡として，場所は光 で，自覚・自己同一・自己表現という再帰的構造を持って，それ以前の西田哲学に直接に 繋がっている。そのため，あらゆる限定を超える場所は，真の無としてだけではなく，真 の有としても理解され得るであろう。西田自身が，場所の思想の初期段階には，場所の神 秘主義的な直観を認めて新プラトン主義の用語を借用していたのである。それ故に，晩年 の西田哲学の場所的論理と異なった場所概念の発展も可能だったと言えるであろう。

Introduction

The formulation of the concept of *basho*（場所）, or *locus*,[1] can be considered the most innovative and important contribution to world philosophy by Nishida Kitarō（西田幾多郎）and constitutes the pivotal element in the evolution of his thought. Although the concept itself was partially eclipsed by other concepts he later formulated, the "logic of locus"（場所的論理）remained a foundational element throughout his mature philosophical development, taking once again pride of place in the title of his last completed essay, *The Logic of Basho and the Religious Worldview*（場所的論理と宗教 的世界観）.[2]

In the present essay, I analyze the genesis and the structure of Nishida's early concept of *basho* – as formulated mainly in the essays collected in *From the Actor to the Seer*（働くものから見るもの へ）[3] – focusing particularly on its often neglected positive aspects. Although the novelty of the concept, at least from the point of view of western philosophy, certainly lies in its negative aspect as "locus of true（or absolute）nothingness," its positive content is equally relevant to the understanding of its origin and meaning. In this respect, despite its radical novelty, in the early description of *basho* there are many elements of continuity with earlier Nishida's philosophy, particularly with *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness*（自覚に於る直観と反省 ; henceforth *IRSC*),[4] but also with the metaphysics sketched in *An Inquiry into the Good*（善の研究 ; henceforth *IG*).[5]

Using Nishida's metaphor of a self-reflecting mirror as an interpretive tool, I show that the

positive（cataphatic）description of *basho* as possessing attributes like luminosity, self-awareness, and self-identity is an essential element of Nishida's early idea of *basho*, particularly with regard to the function of *basho* as the ultimate source of reality that bestows on reality its ontic determinations. This, I believe, means that in Nishida's early theory of *basho* there is no evident, logically cogent reason to consider "locus of true nothingness" as the only possible definition of the ultimate *basho*, and that "locus of true Being"[6] could be considered as an equally valid definition. Nishida himself occasionally draws from the western mystical tradition to ascribe some positive attributes to the ultimate *basho*, and, at this stage of his philosophical development, he may have accepted an apophatic notion of *basho* admitting positive descriptions（including even Dionysius the Areopagite's "superessential Being"）as inadequate but useful pointers of what ultimately lies beyond any description. This leaves open the possibility to develop the logic of locus in a different direction from the positivistic one that Nishida finally took.[7]

The system of self-awareness as self-identity

Nishida's first major work, *IG*, is remembered and celebrated mostly for the introduction of the concept of pure experience. However, the text is a complex work in which pure experience is introduced as the basis for the ultimate understanding of reality.[8] In the latter sections of the book, Nishida describes reality as the act of self-reflection by an infinite consciousness he calls God（神）, and uses the metaphor of the mirror to express the structure of such act: God as pure will prior to the manifestation of the world reflects itself, making a mirror of itself. This act of self-reflection takes the form of the separation of the subject of experience – God itself considered apart from the world – and the object of experience – the world considered apart from God. "As God prior to revelation – an objectless will – reflects on itself, that is, makes itself a mirror, subject and object are separated and God and the world develop"（対象なき意志ともいふべき発現以前の神が己自身を省みること即ち己自身を鏡となすことに由って主観と客観とが分れ，之より神及世界が発展する I, 152）.

Although the analysis of the logical structure of reality is not the strong point of *IG*, it can be argued that in its metaphysical framework self-identity is assumed to be the formal structure of the self-reflecting act that constitutes reality. When considered apart from the world, God（as Godhead 神性）is the act of reflection, whereas the world considered apart from God is the content of the reflection; God is what looks in the mirror and the world is what is seen. However, God is looking at itself in the mirror, therefore what looks and what is seen, God and the world, are identical, as Nishida explicitly states: "God is none other than the world, and the world is none other than God"（神は即ち世界，世界は即ち神である I, 152 f.）.[9] Nishida takes a step further, and argues, albeit tentatively, that we may say that the notion of the unity of the universe, through which the totality of

things in the universe is established, is the consciousness of God's self-identity（神の自己同一の意識 I, 146).[10]

The lack of an adequate logical analysis in *IG* was highlighted by Satomi Takahashi in a review written right after the publication of the book.[11] While praising Nishida's endeavor as the birth of a modern system of Japanese philosophy, Takahashi criticized it as tantamount to a form of psychologism, since Nishida had not distinguished between factual reality（事実）and meaning（意味）within phenomena of consciousness, hindering the possibility of providing a foundation to the logical validity of knowledge. Stimulated by Takahashi's criticism, Nishida delved into the problem of the logical structure of the act of consciousness, drawing from the German philosophical tradition. He naturally turned to the dominant trend in German academia at the time, Neo-Kantianism, but the epistemological approach of Neo-Kantianism was not enough for Nishida. As his goal remained to explain the whole of reality on the basis of a fundamental concept,[12] Nishida required a metaphysical approach,[13] and was thus led beyond Neo-Kantianism to Fichte's idealism and its analysis of self-awareness as logical structure and ultimate foundation of reality.

Self-awareness, although not thematized, had already played a role in *IG* as the act by which reality（God）becomes aware of itself through individual consciousness becoming one with universal consciousness.[14] However, in the first essays of *IRSC* self-awareness takes center stage. Nishida, inspired by Fichte's notion of fact-act (*Tathandlung* 事行), analyzes the structure of self-awareness as self-identity. Self-awareness has the formal structure of the logical identity "X is X"（甲は甲である）, which is not first and foremost a mere abstract logical principle, but the essential dynamic of the self-reflective act of consciousness from which the logical principle is abstracted.[15]

The act of self-awareness consists in the self-positing of X, by which X replicates itself within itself（同一者が自己の中に自己を写す II, 55):[16] "X is X," as the concrete totality of the self-positing act, implies "X is," and "X," as the grammatical subject of the proposition（「甲は」II, 38), implies the predicate "is X." Here Nishida leverages a grammatical feature of Japanese, since the postposition は expresses the topic of a sentence rather than the grammatical subject, standing for "as for X," rather than simply for "X," therefore implying that something is said about it.[17]

Up to this point, the dynamic movement of self-awareness has produced only the act of cognitive reflection, "I am I"; but Nishida follows Fichte in arguing that by positing itself as "X is X," X also differentiates itself from not-X, thus positing the not-I. The opposition to not-X is the relationship with otherness that constitutes the encounter with the world given in experience（Fichte's *Anstoß*）, as the negative mirror image of the I that makes its self-recognition possible.[18] The self-positing of self-awareness is tantamount to an act of self-determination by which infinite consciousness – God prior to its manifestation（発現以前の神）, in the language of *IG* – becomes aware of itself by projecting a finite image of itself.[19]

Contingency, the absolutization of will, and beyond

However, Nishida could not be satisfied with a generic positing of the world as otherness opposed to the I. To fulfill his ambitious metaphysical program, Nishida needed to account for the fact that the world we experience, even if conceived as a necessary outflow of the logically-structured act of self-awareness, is just one of many possible worlds, with no apparent logical priority over all the others. The concrete content of experience is contingent and irrational (II, 59 f.) and cannot be immediately derived from a logical principle, albeit dialectical.[20] Though the transcendental form of the fact that I am now experiencing a particular red thing can be derived from the logical structure of self-awareness, the peculiarity of this individual red cannot be deduced a priori. In Kantian terms, thought can give form to the content of experience, but it cannot generate the content itself – the undetermined material multiplicity that alone can grant objectivity to conceptual knowledge.[21]

Furthermore, even the fact that there is a universal of red, as one of the many possible, but by no means necessary, self-determinations of the universal of color, cannot be deduced by a universal principle. The same holds true for the universal of color itself, as the fact that humans are endowed with the sense of sight is not an a priori necessity – as a matter of fact, some humans are not. Whereas the generalizing movement from the particular to the universal (Plato's collection, συναγωγή) unfolds according to a priori necessity, the differentiating movement from the universal to the particular (Plato's division, διαίρεσις), which is the movement by which self-awareness posits itself and the world, does not follow any a priori defined path. "How do Plato's ideas descend into reality... In relation to thought's universal objects, their particular determinations can only be conceived as contingent events added from the outside" (プラトンの理念は如何にして現実に堕し来るか（中略）一般的なる思惟対象に対して，その特殊的限定は外から加へられる偶然的出来事としか思はれない II, 7 f.).[22]

Realizing that the roots of the problem lie in the origin of the activity of consciousness (II, 7), Nishida tried different approaches to reconcile the necessary structure of self-awareness and the contingency of the world, ranging from Neo-Kantianism to Bergson. However, the failure of these efforts finally led him to draw from the Christian Neoplatonic tradition, particularly from Scotus Eriugena, and postulate absolute free will (絶対自由の意志) as the origin of reality. As the self-positing act of self-awareness is essentially an act of will that is ontologically prior to the logical structure it opens up,[23] it cannot be bound by any kind of necessity deriving from the formal structure of thought, like logical or causal necessity. Will, being prior to any constraints, must be conceived as absolutely free in its act of self-reflection and creation of the world.

According to Nishida, the priority of will over thought is not just an abstract necessity, but an

experiential reality. Although in its absolute freedom from any constraints will is fathomless, it is given in experience as a pre-logical intuition, the immediate datum of consciousness upon which conceptual knowledge is developed（II, 221）and which constitutes the primordial totality that develops itself in the oppositional structure of self-awareness（II, 216）. Far from being a derivative reality posited within the standpoint of thought, the contingent data of experience are given to thought within an experiential standpoint of a superior order, as Nishida reiterated towards the end of his voluntaristic phase: "In order to say that this thing is red or blue, an intuition beyond thought must come into play… The limit of thought is not established simply by thought itself, and in its establishment there must always be a higher-order standpoint than thought"（此物が赤いとか，青いとかいふには，思惟以上の直観が加はらねばならぬ（中略）思惟に対する極限は単に思惟より成立するのではない，そこには何時でも思惟より高次的な立場がなければならぬ。III, 273 f.）.

By resorting to the notion of absolute free will, Nishida not only forwent any concrete rational explanation of reality, but also introduced in his system an irrational element at odds with his basic philosophical orientation. As Nishida aspired to explain reality in rational terms and was not a theist, the idea of a God acting in a completely unfathomable, arbitrary manner – a God with an inscrutable personality[24] – could not be his final metaphysical position. That is why he criticized the idea as a capitulation to mysticism（神秘の軍門に請うた II, 3）,[25] and why many interpreters see it in a negative light.[26]

Despite all the problematic connotations of his concept of free will, Nishida appeared to be satisfied with it for a while, proceeding from there to investigate more specific problems within its framework. However, as he set out to tackle the problem of religion（III, 253）, he was prompted to reevaluate the foundations of his system. Being the intuition of the ultimate reality of consciousness, the intuition of the will is the gateway to religious experience, a sort of religious feeling（一種の宗教的感情 II, 142）; hence to analyze religion Nishida needed to thematize the intuition itself and probe its ability to provide the ultimate foundation for the understanding of reality. Such a reevaluation of his position led Nishida to move from voluntarism to a form of intuitionism（III, 255）.

In the essays collected in the first part of *From the Actor to the Seer*, while still relying on a voluntaristic position, Nishida stresses the link between will and intuition. In *Intuition and Will*（直観と意志）, Nishida takes a step back from Christian Neoplatonism to Plotinus himself, emphasizing that intuition is the goal of the act of will.[27] The act of will is the process by which the One intuits itself, a process originating in the one and returning to the one（意志とは一者の立場に於ける直観の過程である，一者より出でて一者に還り行く過程である III, 285）through the generation of the world as otherness. However, will is ontologically prior to intuition, as intuition is not a static reflection of things but pure activity in which subject and object become one, and can thus be understood as the ultimate form of will（意志の極致 III, 286）.[28]

However, at the end of the first part of the book Nishida's position begins to shift. In *Expressive Activity*（表現作用 ; henceforth *EA*）, Nishida states that the creative activity of consciousness is nothing but a seen object, a projected shadow（見られた影）behind which must lie the light that projects it（映し居る光其者）. Nishida interprets such light as the standpoint of Eriugena's *Natura nec creans nec creata*, that which is neither creating nor created and lies behind everything that is manifested. Activity of consciousness is seen when this standpoint becomes the standpoint of *Natura creans et non creata*, that which creates and is not created（III, 371 f.）.[29]

Nishida claims that his earlier standpoint of absolute will is the same as the standpoint of *Natura creans et non creata*（III, 372）, but a comparison with *IRSC* reveals that between the two there is a significant difference: At the end of *IRSC* Nishida had indeed already introduced Eriugena's distinction between the two aspects of *Natura non creata* to distinguish the positive act that generates reality（the actor）and the negative act that withdraws from what it creates to reflect on it as its own image（the seer）. However, Nishida had introduced the two aspects in the opposite order from that of *EA*, implying the priority of the act of creation over the act of reflection, and had qualified the latter as a possibility inherent in the act of creation, a return to itself that is nothing but a form of action and will（II, 222 f.）. Yet, in *EA* Nishida states that the ultimate standpoint is the One that lies behind will as that which establishes will within itself（意志其者をも超越して之を中に成立せしむる一者 III, 381）, and stands still within itself while establishing and seeing its own acts without being moved by them（作用に動かされることなく，自己自身の中に自己の作用を見るものでなければならぬ III, 379）. In *EA*, Nishida has already moved beyond absolute will.

Basho as necessary condition of consciousness

By overcoming voluntarism, Nishida did not simply switch to some traditional intuitionistic position. The intuition that Nishida postulates at the roots of consciousness and reality is not the simple absence of intermediation between the seen（that which is intuited）and the seer（that which intuits）,[30] as in the case of the immediate unification of subject and object. True intuition, according to the definition given in *Expressive Activity*, means that the seer enfolds the seen（見るものが見られるものを包む時，真の直観となるのである III, 383）.

Searching for the ultimate foundation of consciousness, Nishida came to realize that being aware of something implies a peculiar paradoxical relationship between awareness and its objects that had not been sufficiently understood by the traditional philosophy of knowledge. To fully grasp the reality of consciousness, awareness and its objects cannot be thought of as completely separated things that enter in an external relationship – as realists tend to do – given that the relationship of "being aware of" is internal to awareness and there can be no awareness of something outside of awareness（III, 271）. An object of consciousness must therefore somehow be included in

consciousness. However, neither can awareness and its objects be conceived of as not separated in the sense of simply being one – as idealists tend to do and as early Nishida himself had done. The lack of distinction would eliminate the relationship of being aware of, flattening it into mere indistinguishability, a "night in which all cows are black," as in the Yiddish saying that Hegel famously used to criticize Schelling's philosophy of identity.[31]

Even if the unity of consciousness and its objects were conceived of as inherence, with the object regarded as a property or modification of consciousness, it would be impossible to distinguish the peculiar relationship of seeing and being seen from the blind relationship of inherence of a material property in a material thing. Nor would the paradox be solved by conceiving consciousness as pure activity or will without a thing-like substratum, since it would not be possible to distinguish the act of will as seeing from a blind impulse without presupposing the seeing（意志は単なる作用ではなく，その背後に見るものがなければならぬ，然らざれば機械的作用や本能的作用と択ぶ所はない III, 431）. Furthermore, Nishida argues that activity without substratum is still conceived of as Being, albeit potential Being,[32] which implies that the objects posited by it are conceived of as actualizations of its potential, and therefore still seen as modifications inherent in activity as substratum.

To solve the paradox, Nishida came to conceive of the foundation of consciousness as *basho* （locus）, and of the peculiar knowing relationship as the *enfolding*（包む）of the objects by consciousness, to which corresponds the symmetrical relationship of *being located within*（に於てある）consciousness of the objects.[33] The characteristic of consciousness that allows it to see the objects within itself as different from itself is its emptiness. Consciousness is ultimately nothing （無）, and its lack of any positive determination allows it to accommodate anything within itself, in the way that being colorless allows the field of vision to accommodate any color, and being empty allows space to accommodate all extended things.[34] Aristotle famously wrote that the soul is, in a way, all things;[35] Nishida argues that to be able to be all things consciousness must ultimately be nothing in itself. Consciousness as locus does not only enfold its objects but also enfolds itself as the subject opposed to them, constituting the standpoint of self-awareness. In Kantian terms, the two heterogeneous elements of knowledge, the a priori forms belonging to the subject and the a posteriori material multiplicity（質量，雑多）belonging to the object as "thing in itself," interact in conceptual knowledge within consciousness; therefore, consciousness must be the common arena within which subject and object relate to each other.

Nishida goes one step further and extends the relationship of being located within to every level of reality: To be is to be within something, otherwise, Nishida claims, Being cannot be distinguished from not-Being（有るものは何かに於てなければならぬ，然らざれば有るといふことと無いといふことの区別ができないのである III, 415）.[36] To be is to be something, which means to be

the subject of a predicate, and the predication enfolds the grammatical subject within the universal expressed by the predicate, which in turn is located within a broader universal in a transitive progression. The progression goes on to the universal of Being, and the universal of Being itself must be located within nothingness. For Nishida, to be means to be apprehended by consciousness as something, and whatever is apprehended must be contrasted to its negation, as only such contrast can give a positive content (a "somethingness") to the apprehension. Being can therefore be recognized as Being only in contrast to nothingness (我々が有るといふものを認めるには，無いといふものに対して認めるのである III, 422), and consciousness itself, as the nothingness that allows anything to be, is the nothingness to which Being is opposed. However, such nothingness is not yet true nothingness (真の無，*absolute nothingness* 絶対的無), but oppositional nothingness (対立的無)that is objectified in its relationship to Being, and thus is still "oppositional Being" (尚対立的有である III, 422).[37] Oppositional nothingness as consciousness can be positively conceived as activity,[38] therefore, for Nishida, it is an object of thought whose conceptual content implies Being. The locus within which consciousness as oppositional nothingness and its objects as Being relate is the true nothingness beyond any opposition, being the ultimate locus within which any opposition must take place.

Basho as the source of reality

Nishida introduces *basho* as the necessary condition of experience, that which makes possible the relationship of knowing subject and known object, but he cannot feel satisfied with a mere epistemology, as he could not when he wrote *IRSC*. The ultimate foundation of consciousness should not just be a transcendental principle that justifies the otherwise given fact of experience, but also the sufficient condition for the actual occurrence of experience. It should be, in other words, the metaphysical foundation of reality, the *causa prima* from which phenomena of consciousness originate. Reintroducing the metaphor of the mirror, Nishida compares *basho* to a mirror that reflects itself within itself (自己の内に自己を映す鏡) generating the objective world as its own reflected image, and not merely receiving it as a sort of passive container.[39] As *basho* itself is what is reflected, the reflected objects participate in its nature and are thus enfolding loci of narrower scope than the locus in which they are located. The self-reflection of the locus of true nothingness is a recursive process of self-determination in which nothingness determines itself as Being, and at every successive step Being determines itself as more particularized universals with narrower extension.

This process is formally similar to the process of manifestation of reality that Nishida had been trying to articulate in his previous works, but its substance is different, insofar as it is not conceived of as the outflow of something contained in its source. In terms of Boehme's mirror metaphor, God

is not the fullness looking at the empty mirror in which it sees its own content, but rather the empty, luminous mirror itself that reflects its own luminosity within itself. The difference allows Nishida to give a better account of the contingency and irrationality of individual happenstances that transcend the self-determination of universals. Following Kant's hylomorphism, Nishida conceives of the principle of contingency and irrationality in experience as the indeterminate matter（質料）given in perception to be shaped and attributed conceptual meaning, but never exhaustively determined, by the unifying activity of the knowing subject. Nishida also describes indeterminate matter in Platonic and Aristotelian terms, as the receptacle that receives the forms without being exhausted in them and constitutes the final substrate of predication as *principium individuationis*. The inspiration for the better account of matter's irrationality（as well as for his new metaphor of the mirror）came to Nishida from Plotinus' notion of matter as the locus （χώρα） or seat （ἕδρα） of the phenomenal world, which is in itself not-Being（in the sense of being different from Being）[40] that receives the images of Being like a mirror.

However, whereas Plotinus considers the source of Being to be the One as the ontological opposite of matter, Nishida affirms the identity of matter and the One as the self-reflecting mirror of nothingness.[41] If matter is nothing, an empty locus that reflects forms, then matter is not different from consciousness itself as the locus of nothingness. When phenomena are considered as physical things, they appear to be constituted by a material substratum that eludes apprehension, but when they are considered as pure phenomena of consciousness – what they ultimately are – phenomena consist only of the forms as which they appear, and nothing is behind them. However, forms are constituted by a sort of "internal matter"（内面的質料 III, 385）that transcends them not as something external to them, but as their unchanging substratum. Such internal matter is the "stuff" of which consciousness is made, and consists of the luminous surface of the mirror that reflects itself in a myriad of colors.[42] Being completely free of content, the mirror of true nothingness can become any content without being bound by any internal necessity.

As necessary condition of consciousness, nothingness enfolds the world of forms by transcending and encompassing it at both extremities. In the direction of generalization, nothingness transcends the last determined universal, the universal of Being, and enfolds reality as the ultimate predicate that cannot become a grammatical subject. In the direction of particularization, nothingness as substratum of individuals transcends every specific universal and enfolds reality as the ultimate grammatical subject that cannot become a predicate. Likewise, as sufficient condition of consciousness, nothingness determines itself and generates the world of forms in a twofold movement: Nothingness as the ultimate predicate reflects itself within itself becoming Being, and Being recursively reflects itself within itself becoming ever narrower universals; in the opposite direction, nothingness as the ultimate grammatical subject reflects itself within itself as individual

forms that in their self-determination entail ever broader universals – as, for instance, a particular shade of red that entails the universals of red, of color, of perceptive quality, etc. Although Nishida repeatedly affirms the infinity of the recursive process of self-determination, by conceiving of *basho* as the ultimate universal/predicate and the ultimate particular/grammatical subject he sets a superior and an inferior limit to it.

The starting point of the process of self-determination that generates reality is the self-reflection of true nothingness that projects within itself Being as a sort of negative mirror image. Being constitutes the plane of objectified reality, and determines itself as the world, both in its particular and in its universal aspects. However, as the self-determination of nothingness is a self-reflective movement, nothingness itself is projected on the plane of objectified reality as oppositional nothingness, i.e., as the reflexively apprehended subject that experiences the world – the "field of consciousness"（意識の野）given as "I" in reflexive activity（反省）.[43] Phenomena seen as located within the locus of Being are unified as the natural world by the activity of judgment, which consists of the inclusion（the enfoldment）of particulars within universals. But first-order, not-reflexive acts of judgment – determining judgments（構成的判断 *bestimmende Urteile*）, in Kantian terminology – cannot determine consciousness itself, as consciousness is not the content of the acts but rather what performs them. In Nishida's own terminology, the locus of consciousness enfolds the locus of Being and cannot be immediately located within it.

The projection of consciousness itself on the plane of objectified reality entails an inversion of the relationship of inclusion in judgment, as the predicate plane（述語面）becomes the subject of the judgment in reflexive judgments（反省的判断 *reflektierende Urteile*）. As enfolding locus, consciousness lies on the predicate side of the particular-universal relationship, whereas the enfolded objects lie on the grammatical subject side; therefore, reflexive judgments in which consciousness becomes subject（like "I perceive this"）entail the inversion of the subject-object relationship. This inverted relationship also explains in Nishida's terms why consciousness is irreducible to physical phenomena: Consciousness belongs to a broader level of reality（a broader *basho*）than natural phenomena and cannot be objectified by the same kind of determining judgments.

Phenomena seen as located within the locus of oppositional nothingness are seen as phenomena of consciousness determined by the activity of consciousness. Therefore, to consider the locus of oppositional nothingness as the ultimate standpoint on reality leads to metaphysical idealism, whereas to consider the locus of Being as ultimate leads to metaphysical realism. However, beyond the locus of Being and the locus of oppositional nothingness lies the locus of true nothingness, the fundamental standpoint from which the whole of reality is ultimately seen. Being the ultimate standpoint, it cannot be objectified within a broader locus, but because an enfolding locus can be

projected upon a narrower enfolded locus – as in the case of the field of consciousness projected upon the locus of Being（which Nishida will later call the universal of judgment）to become the object of reflexive judgments – true nothingness can be projected upon the reflexive plane. The projection occurs through the transcendental subject（Kant's consciousness in general, *Bewußtsein überhaupt* 意識一般）, which constitutes the portal（入口 III, 432）leading from the locus of oppositional nothingness to the locus of true nothingness. Comparing loci to circles that encompass each other, Nishida states that, as the outline of an encompassed circle is in contact with the encompassing circle, so the limit of an enfolded locus is its point of contact with the enfolding locus. The transcendental subject is the point of contact（the interface）between objectified consciousness and the ultimate, per se unobjectifiable consciousness, and allows thus the projection of true nothingness on the plane of oppositional nothingness.

When projected on the objective plane, true nothingness is understood as will, being seen as the dynamic principle that produces the world by an act of self-reflection. Though at this stage Nishida has come to relegate will to a position subordinate to intuition, he still regards it as prior to conceptual knowledge, since he still considers knowledge as a moral imperative（当為）, a teleological act oriented towards the ideal of truth and grounded in will. Within the framework of the theory of *basho*, will and its objects cannot be immediately seen at the level of the locus of Being, since the objects located within the locus of Being are objective phenomena constituted in determining judgments that do not include the judging subject as such – judgments like "This is red." An act of will, however, is a subjective phenomenon that can only be expressed in reflexive judgments that contain the willing subject as a grammatical element, explicit or not – judgments like "I want to do this."[44] Will has the reflexive character of self-awareness, as its object is the subject itself and its implementation consists of acts of objective self-determination that express the subject in the objective world（我を客観的に構成することである III, 283）.

True nothingness is not nothingness

The acts of will expressed in reflexive judgments are objectified acts attributed to determined subjects, but will considered as self-determination of true nothingness cannot be conceived of as objectified activity – or as any kind of activity whatsoever, given that for Nishida activity is always objectified. Indeed, given that true nothingness is beyond any conceivable attribute, in a strict interpretation of the theory of *basho* the only valid reason to think that true nothingness can be seen as will should be the fact that will is the objective feature of consciousness closest to the ultimate, rather than some reason rooted in the intrinsic nature of the ultimate itself.

Here, however, we are faced with an unavoidable paradox of Nishida's notion of true nothingness: true nothingness is not nothingness, insofar as it possesses a quality, a dynamic, and a struc-

ture intrinsic to its dynamics. As true nothingness is beyond any objectification and is free of any determined content, Nishida defines *basho* as true, absolute nothingness. Nevertheless, he cannot avoid giving also a positive description of the nature and activity of the locus of true nothingness.

True nothingness possesses the quality of luminosity, as consciousness must be light to bestow visibility to the objects it enfolds. The open, empty nature of *basho* cannot by itself fully account for consciousness as seeing and for phenomena as what is seen. To constitute the seeing relationship between consciousness and its objects, the enfolding of something by nothingness must be different from the mere blind inclusion of something in a container or of things in space. The invisible source that makes everything visible is not simple obscurity, but Dionysius the Areopagite's dazzling obscurity（暗黒は単なる暗黙ではなくして，ディオニシュースの所謂 dazzling obscurity でなければならぬ III, 431）. The essence of phenomena generated in the mirror's self-reflection is their visibility; therefore, the surface of the reflecting mirror, as the internal matter that constitutes them, must be light. The quality of luminosity is also evident in self-awareness, as the self-reflection of *basho* qua *basho* within itself: I am aware of myself insofar as light is reflected in the mirror of my individual experience – insofar as there are phenomena that I refer to my experiencing activity. Nishida explicitly describes *basho* as a luminous mirror（明鏡）and as light that reflects a shadow of itself within itself（自己の影を映し居る光 III, 371）.[45]

True nothingness also possesses the intrinsic dynamic of creative self-expression（創造的無 III, 438）, as by reflecting itself within itself it manifests itself to itself, creating the world as its own expression（直観の立場からしては，此世界は表現の世界となる III, 382）. It is because of this creative dynamic that true nothingness appears as will when projected upon the objective plane by the transcendental subject. Since for Nishida activity is always objectified, he describes the unobjectifiable self-expressive act of *basho* as acting without an actor and reflecting without that which reflects（働くものなくして働き，映すものなくして映す III, 451）.

Finally, as a mirror that reflects itself within itself, true nothingness possesses a self-referential structure that can be understood as self-identity. In self-reflection, that which reflects and that which is reflected are the same.[46] J. Heisig has suggested that Nishida preserves the unity of reality by conceiving of the relationship between absolute nothingness and the finite world as a sort of *analogia determinationis*, akin to the western Medieval notion of *analogia entis*.[47] In the case of Nishida's theory of *basho*, however, the relationship of analogy is stronger than the Christian relationship of analogy, since for Nishida what is reflected（determined）as the world is absolute nothingness itself, unlike in the Christian doctrine of creation.

Nishida does not prima facie ascribe self-identity to the locus of true nothingness itself, but to objectified realities, namely to individuals, self-awareness, and to the general relationship of predication. Although individuality cannot be expressed by predicative attribution, individuals are not

completely outside of the realm of predication: Insofar as they are known as individuals and can become the subject of predication, their individuality must include a conceptual element. They are, Nishida argues, self-identical things that can immediately be predicated of themselves, and this intrinsic predicative structure, "X is X," is what allows further predication, the matrix of inclusive judgments like "X is P."[48] On a higher level, self-identity constitutes the essential structure of self-awareness, as what is reflected in self-awareness is immediately identical with what reflects it, as Nishida extensively argued in *IRSC*.

In a more basic sense, however, self-identity is the structure of predication as such, insofar as predication consists of the self-determination of a universal in which the universal reflects itself within itself. As Nishida conceives of the locus of true nothingness as the highest predicate, it can be assumed that he conceives of its self-reflection as the original predication, the matrix of any lower-level predication, starting with the predication expressing the self-identity of individuals and the inverse predication of reflexive judgments expressing self-awareness. Individuals, as ultimate grammatical subjects transcending the determination of objective predicates, are direct self-determinations of the locus of true nothingness as transcendental predicate plane; at the opposite end of the spectrum of self-determination, self-awareness is the direct self-reflection of the locus of true nothingness qua the seer of phenomena. Therefore, their structural self-identity must be directly grounded in the original self-identity of true nothingness.

In particular, although Nishida differentiates layers of self-awareness enfolded by *basho*（cognitive self-awareness 知的自覚 and volitive self-awareness 意志的自覚）, he states that true self-awareness is to be found in the locus of true nothingness and that its self-identity cannot be known objectively. True self-awareness is the intuition of itself（自己自身の直観）by true nothingness.[49] The cardinal importance for Nishida's later philosophy of the concepts of self-aware determination of nothingness（無の自覚的限定）and absolute contradictory self-identity（絶対矛盾的自己同一）demonstrates that after *IRSC* the notions of self-awareness and self-identity never ceased to play a fundamental role in his conception of the ultimate reality. In the early stages of the logic of locus, reality is already seen as the self-aware self-determination of nothingness developing as dialectical self-identity, albeit in a different, less articulated way from later phases of Nishida's philosophy. True nothingness not only reflexively projects an image of itself as oppositional nothingness in self-awareness but also creates Being as its own mirror image by negating itself.

Why not true Being?

Consciousness and its objects are nothingness, but at the same time, as we have seen, they are luminous, dynamic, and self-referential.[50] Why then must the ultimate nature of reality as *basho* be described as true nothingness rather than as true Being? As Nishida himself admits – perhaps a bit

reluctantly – answering to a similar criticism raised by K. Soda,[51] both Being and nothing are objective predications, therefore neither can properly be ascribed to *basho*. "By speaking of a locus of nothingness, I am not thinking objectively about something locus-like and saying it is either Being or nothingness. To predicate it of Being or nothingness is tantamount to seeing it as an object, and as long as this can be done, it is not what I mean by locus"（私の無の場所といふのは，場所といふ如きものを対象的に考へて，それが有であるとか無であるとか云ふのではない。それが有であるとか無であるとかいふ様に述語することは，それを対象的に見ることである，かくの如く論じられ得るかぎり，それは私の所謂場所ではない。III, 503）.

One may argue that here Nishida is just restating that oppositional nothingness, as the objectified correlate of Being, is not true nothingness. However, aside from the fact that the passage and its context do not justify such interpretation, if *basho* can be described as the true nothingness behind oppositional nothingness, why should it not be equally describable as the true Being beyond oppositional Being（対立的有 III, 435）? There seem to be three main reasons why Nishida qualifies the ultimate *basho* as nothingness rather than Being:

First, Nishida wants to give modern philosophical expression to an East Asian worldview rooted in concepts of nothingness and emptiness.[52] This first reason is certainly valid from a cultural and historical point of view, and world philosophy has been greatly enriched by Nishida's original interpretation of traditional East Asian concepts. However, if the goal is to understand reality as it is, putting cultural constraints on the endeavor by consciously limiting its scope to a given worldview defeats the purpose, be the worldview "eastern"（東洋的）or "western." *Basho*, being beyond any determination, must be beyond cultural determinations as well. While the fully legitimate need to express a point of view different from the western one can justify the emphasis on nothingness, it is by no means a sufficient reason to exclude the possibility of emphasizing Being.

Second, for Nishida, Being is objectified content of consciousness, therefore the ultimate locus that objectifies every content but is not objectifiable must differ from Being.[53] This second reason is more logically relevant, having to do with the nature of Being. However, it can be argued that it is merely a problem of wording: If Being is implicitly defined as that which is objectified by consciousness, then to qualify consciousness itself as Being becomes a contradiction in terms, but this definition is not the only possible one. Certainly, when we think of Being we objectify it, but the same holds true for nothingness, to the point that Nishida needs to distinguish true nothingness from objectified oppositional nothingness. The same distinction can be made in the case of Being.

Finally, to be able to become anything *basho* must be nothing, as to be able to enfold the fullness of the world it must be empty. An important feature of nothingness is that it allows things to appear as they are in themselves, without distorting them（III, 429）or negating their reality by

absorbing their Being into its own infinite Being, thus fulfilling the need to account for reality that had earlier led Nishida to the notion of pure experience. "Because it is absolute nothingness, mountains are mountains, waters are waters, and what is is as it is" (それは絶対無なるが故に，山は是山，水は是水，有るものは有るが侭に有るのである IV, 146). This third reason is the most theoretically relevant, having to do neither with cultural differences nor with definitions, but with the common, intuitive understanding of what it means to become or to enfold something. Indeed, to be able to become anything, *basho* must be nothing. However, its being nothing does not need to be interpreted as absolute nothingness, as it can also be understood in terms of being no-thing. Absolute Being does not need to be conceived of as some kind of "superthing" incompatible with the open nature of *basho*, as it can instead be regarded as the beingness of things, an open, indeterminate medium that allows determinations to be. As a matter of fact, Nishida states that universals, which in themselves are reflected Being, are nothingness from the point of view of particulars, thereby allowing particulars to be as they are (III, 429). By the same token, emptiness as opposed to fullness does not necessarily exclude Being.

Moreover, as *basho* is not only the ultimate openness that allows things to appear as they are but also the ultimate source that makes things what they are, it must be what bestows on things their ontic qualities. However, as absolute nothingness with no positive content whatsoever, *basho* cannot bestow on things anything else than nothingness itself. Indeed, Nishida does assert that things are in essence nothing, as he conceives of the identity of true nothingness and the world as substantial, rather than merely formal. What is located within a locus must participate (分有する) in the nature of the locus, as what is located in space must have a spatial nature (III, 430). Therefore, everything located within the locus of true nothingness must participate in the nature of nothingness. From sensations, whose internal matter is nothingness, to physical things, which consist only of sensations unified by thought, to ourselves as individuated oppositional nothingness, everything that constitutes the world we experience is ultimately nothing for Nishida. "Within absolute nothingness' self-awareness both the seer and the seen vanish" (絶対無の自覚に於ては見るものも見られるものもなくなるのである IV, 379). In seeing, nothing sees and nothing is seen.

However, Nishida also ascribes to things positive attributes, like their visibility and self-identity qua predicability, that can only derive from positive aspects of the nature of *basho*. Indeed, in the early stage of the theory of *basho*, Nishida was open to non-meontological descriptions. While adamantly stating that even Plotinus' concept of the One fails to reach the ultimate standpoint of true nothingness (主知主義の希臘人はプロチンの一者に於てですら，真の無の意義に徹底することができなかった III, 468), Nishida nevertheless recognized the validity of the mystical experience of true nothingness, and used, although sparsely, positive descriptions of the absolute, like "acting without an actor" and Dionysius' "dazzling obscurity."[54] This suggests that he might have

accepted an ultimately apophatic position admitting positive as well as negative descriptions as inadequate but necessary pointers, on the basis of the recognition that even the notion of "true nothingness" cannot be reified as the one and only true definition of the absolute.[55] As he states in *The Intelligible World*（叡智的世界）,[56] what is directly located within the locus of absolute nothingness is beyond words and thought, and constitutes a world of mystical intuition（神秘的直観の世界 IV, 145）. If what is located within the ultimate locus is ineffable, a fortiori the ultimate locus itself must be beyond words. And in the end, "nothingness" is nothing but a word.

However, Nishida eventually took a different path. In 1930, four years after the publication of the seminal essay *Basho*（場所）,[57] H. Tanabe criticized the early metaphysics of *basho*, suggesting that by positing an ultimate reality beyond the grasp of philosophy it could lead to the dismissal of philosophy itself.[58] As I have argued elsewhere,[59] after Tanabe's criticism, Nishida carefully avoided any associations with apophatism and mysticism, even dismissing mysticism per se in rather unkind terms. Refuting apophatism as a byproduct of objective logic（対象論理）, he came to conflate absolute nothingness and the world based on his logic of absolute contradictory self-identity, conceiving of reality as a fully immanent, self-referentially closed rational system that leaves no room for genuine transcendence – only for "immanent transcendence"（内在的超越）– and little room for religious experience – only for some forms of Japanese religiosity and a "bowdlerized" version of Christianity.

In this new framework, the word "*basho*" expresses the relationship of mutual enfoldment between elements of reality – like the world and individuals – rather than the ground of consciousness that transcends anything it enfolds.[60] Undoubtedly, such a position satisfied Nishida's need for a rational understanding of reality and succeeded in expressing a truly Japanese worldview.[61] However, the satisfaction came at the expense of the affinity that Nishida had felt for mysticism and Neoplatonic worldviews for most of his life. There is no way to know whether Nishida, absent Tanabe's criticism,[62] would have moved beyond his early idea of a transcendent *basho* with mystical connotations or remained faithful to his earlier tendency, but it is certainly possible to imagine that the logic of *basho* could have evolved in a different, less "positivistic,"[63] direction.

Notes

1) The term has also been translated as "place" and "topos." I use both the transliterated form (to refer either to the general notion or the ultimate basho) and its translation as "locus."

2) The title is translated differently in the two available English translations: *The Logic of Topos and the Religious Worldview,* trans. by Yusa, Michiko, in *The Eastern Buddhist*, 19:2, 1986 and 20:1, 1987; *Nothingness and the Religious Worldview*, trans. by Dilworth, David A., in *Last Writings: Nothingness and the Religious Worldview*, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 1987. As with other works by Nishida translated into English, I provide my own translation of the terms and passages I quote, except where otherwise indicated.

3) Other translations of the title have been used, for instance, *From That Which Acts to That Which Sees.* See Maraldo, John C. "Translating Nishida," in *Philosophy East and West*, 39:4, 1989, p. 489.

4) *Intuition and Reflection in Self-Consciousness*, trans. Viglielmo, Valdo H. with Takeuchi, Yoshinori & O'Leary, Joseph S., Albany, State University of New York Press, 1987. "Self-consciousness" is the term used by Viglielmo for self-awareness.

5) *An Inquiry into the Good*, trans. by Abe, Masao & Ives, Christopher, New Haven & London, Yale University Press, 1990.

6) I capitalize "Being" as a noun only to avoid any confusion with "being" as a present participle.

7) See below, note 63.

8) 「純粋経験を唯一の実在としてすべてを説明して見たい」(I, 6). In the references to Nishida's work, the Latin numerals refer to the volume, the Arabic numerals to the pages of the new edition of the *Complete Works*（『西田幾多郎全集』東京　岩波書店　2002－2009）.

9) Translation by Abe, Masao & Ives, Christopher, *An Inquiry into the Good*, op. cit., p. 169.

10) On God and self-awareness in *IG*, see my レオナルディ・アンドレア「『善の研究』における神」in 『哲学論叢』27, 2000.

11) 高橋里美「意識現象の実在とその意味 ── 西田氏の『善の研究』を読む」in 『高橋里美全集』第 4 巻　福村出版，1973. See Yusa, Michiko *Zen and Philosophy*, Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press, 2002, pp. 128 f.

12) 「余の所謂自覚的体系の形式に依ってすべての実在を考へ」て見よう。(II 5)

13) 「余は認識論を以て止まることはできない，余は形而上学を要求するのである。」(II, 7)

14) 「個人は一方より見れば直に神の自覚である」(I, 153)；「自覚は部分的意識体系が全意識の中心に於いて統一せらるる場合に伴ふ現象である」。(I, 146)

15) 「「甲は甲である」といふ自同律の意味は意識の内面的開発即ち思惟体験 Denkerlebnis と離して考へることはできぬ」。(II, 41).

16) I chose the word "replicating" because Nishida writes the Japanese word *utsusu* with the Chinese character 写 instead of the character 映 , which he uses in later essays. The character 写 is used when the word *utsusu* denotes the copying of something, like the copying of a text or the realistic painting of a landscape, and by choosing it Nishida seems to imply that what is replicated already exists within what performs the act of replication. However, it should be noted that Nishida still uses in later writings, albeit only occasionally, the character 写 as well, even using both 写 and 映 in the same sentence on at least one occasion (III, 376).

17) It should be noticed that in modern logic a statement of identity is not considered a predication, because the copula "is" is regarded as expressing a relation between two terms of the same logical order, rather than the inclusion of a term within the extension of a predicate of superior

order. However, Nishida drew only from the traditional understanding of logic that dominated western thought from Aristotle to Hegel and did not take into account the development of the theory of relations. See below, note 22, for an attempt to formalize Nishida's logic of identity in terms of modern logic.

18) Nishida refers to Böhme's metaphor in one of the final essays of *IRSC* (II, 232). On Fichte's "not-I," see Breazeale, Daniel "AGAINST NATURE? On the Status and Meaning of the Natural World in J.G. Fichte's early *Wissenschaftslehre*" in *Philosophia OSAKA*, 9, 2014, p. 22.

19)「主観的作用といふのは一般なるものが己自身を限定する過程である。無限の中に有限なるものを限定する」。(II, 56)「自同律の判断は自己が己自身を限定する作用である。」(II, 150)

20) See Nishida' statement, in *IG*, that the world emanates from God's inner nature (神の内面的性質より出づる I, 147) as a necessary outflow.

21) Nishida had already mentioned the contingency of individuals in *IG*, but only to downplay the idea of contingent individuals as an empty concept (I, 149).

22) T. Sueki has tried to express the problem in a modern logical form: Self-identity implies the positing of "a" as a concrete I, therefore its logical form becomes "$(\exists x)(x=a)$." It also implies that "a" becomes an object of experience, endowed with concrete properties – given that "a" as the grammatical subject of the identity equals "as for a," entailing a predication – therefore it becomes "$(\exists x)[(x=a) \cdot f(x)]$," where "f" stands for an empirical quality. Nishida's dynamic self-identity can thus be expressed as "$(a=a) \Leftrightarrow (\exists x)[(x=a) \cdot f(x)]$." However, this formula is not a tautology and therefore cannot be derived in a purely rational way. 末木剛博『西田幾多郎：その哲学体系 II』東京 春秋社, 1987, pp. 81 f.

23) Nishida had embraced a voluntaristic position since *IG*, conceiving of the fundamental act of consciousness as an impulse (衝動) towards self-expression (I, 152). See Dilworth, David A. "Nishida's Early Pantheistic Voluntarism," in *Philosophy East and West*, 20, 1970; K. リーゼンフーバー (Riesenhuber, Klaus)「純粋経験と絶対意志」in 上田閑照編『西田哲学：没後 50 年記念論集』東京 創文社, 1994.

24)「絶対意志は全体を統一して一体系となすが故に, 宗教家の考へる如く世界は神の人格的発現とな」る。(II, 255)

25) Nishida had been quoting mystical descriptions to corroborate his own rational descriptions of the ultimate reality since *IG*, as in the case of Böhme's mirror, but the notion of absolute will largely precludes such rational descriptions.

26) See 小坂国継『西田哲学と宗教』東京 大東出版社, 1994, p. 125；山田宗睦『西田幾多郎の哲学』東京 三一書房, 1978, p. 165; Dilworth, David A. "Nishida's Early Pantheistic Voluntarism," op. cit., p. 40. I have argued that the notion of absolute will is not completely irrational per se, but implies a theistic position that Nishida could not accept; レオナルディ・アンドレーア「西田の「自覚」と「絶対自由の意志」の立場」in *Cosmica*: *Area Studies*, XLII, 2013.

27) In *IRSC*, Nishida states that the One must be interpreted in terms of Scotus Eriugena's creative will rather than in terms of Plotinus' emanation (Plotinus' procession, πρόοδος, as more modern interpreters would say). (II, 222) For a general analysis of the relationship between Nishida and Plotinus, though mainly focused on a comparison with later Nishida's philosophy, see Okano, Ritsuko "Nishida and Plotinus," in *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, 9:1, 2015.

28)「意志の形に於て「善」が自己自身に還り, 自己自身を直観するいふことができる。」(III, 284) Nishida does not use the word "God" in this essay, but rather "spirit" (精神) or Plotinian terms such as "the One" and "the Good."

29) Here, Nishida refers to *Natura creans et non creata* as Eriugena's first standpoint（第一の創造の立場）.

30) In *From the Actor to the Seer*, Nishida often uses the verb "to see"（見る）and its derivatives as equivalent to "being aware of," and related expressions, and not as meaning visual perception (see III, 384: 音が音自身を見る "sound sees sound itself"). Similarly, he uses the words "light" or "luminosity"（光，明）to denote the quality of consciousness as manifesting its objects.

31) Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Miller, Arnold V. with Finlay, John N., Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977, p. 9.

32)「作用の背後には尚潜在的有が考へられねばならぬ。本体なき働き，純なる作用といふのは本体的有に対して云はれ得るのであるが，作用から潜在性を除去するならば，作用では無くなる。」(III, 423)

33) The term *basho*, understood as an essential element of self-awareness, first appears in the essay *On the Inner Perception*（内部知覚について ; III, 350）. See Fujita, Masakatsu "On the Idea of 'Basho' in the Philosophy of Kitarō Nishida," in *Ethos*, no 4(104), 2013, p. 70.

34)「自ら空しくして，すべての物を容れる空間の如きもの」(III, 394).

35) ἡ ψυχὴ τὰ ὄντα πώς ἐστι πάντα *De anima*, trans. by Hicks, Robert D., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, p. 144 (431 b 21).

36)「我と非我との対立を内に包み，いわゆる意識現象を内に成立せしめるものがなければならぬ。」(III, 415)

37)「それが対立的無であるかぎり，尚一種の有でなけれなならぬ。限定せられた類概念の外に出るといえども，それが尚考へられたものとして，一つの類概念的限定を脱することはできぬ。」(III, 424).

38) See below, pp. 38f.

39) On the importance of the metaphor of the mirror in the essay *Basho*, see 加國尚志「映すものと破るもの —— 西田幾多郎「場所」における鏡のメタファー」in『立命館人間科学研究』5，2003.

40) ἕτερον ὄν Henry, Paul & Schwyzer, Hans-Rudolf, eds. *Plotini opera*, tom. I, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1964, II, 4, 16.

41)「プロチンは質料の考を徹底して，物体も質料ではない，物の形や大さや，種々の感覚的性質すら形に属する，真の質料とは影を受取る場所とか，之を映す鏡とかいふ如きものでなければならぬと云った。此の如き非有が有となる時，叡智的実在が成り立つのであるが，更にかゝるものを成立せしめるものが一者でなけれればならぬ。プロチンは叡智的なるものは一者に包まれると云ふが，一者は叡智的なるものの空間である。」(III, 381)

42) Nishida uses the metaphor of a "colored *basho*"（色どられた場所 III, 430）. On nothingness and matter, see III, 444 f.

43) I differentiate between "reflective" as related to *basho*'s self-reflection, and "reflexive" as related to the recursive activity of consciousness knowing itself（反省）.

44) The distinction holds also for objective judgments like "I am tall," as in this case the "I" does not refer to the judging subject as such. The distinction is more evident in Japanese than in English – even though in Japanese the agent is often omitted and there is no personal conjugation – since the expression of someone else's will, especially the will of a third person, being about an internal state only indirectly accessible to the judging subject, usually takes a grammatically different form（verb stem+ たがる）than the direct expression of one's own will（verb stem+ たい）.

45) Luminosity is considered an attribute of consciousness in many Buddhist traditions. See Skorupski, Tadeusz "Consciousness and Luminosity in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism," in

Buddhist Philosophy and Meditation Practice: Academic Papers presented at the 2nd IABU Conference Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Main Campus Wang Noi, Ayutthaya, Thailand, Ayutthaya, Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, 2012.

46）「自己同一の具体的一般者は自己の中に自己を映す鏡の如きもの」である。（III, 394)

47）Heisig, James W. "Nishida's Medieval Bent," in *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, 31:1, 2004, p. 60.

48）See III, 470 f.

49）「自己同一といふのは，対象的に自己を同一として認識するといふことではない（中略）真の無の場所に到る時，意識的自己を忘すると考へられると共に，自己自身の直観としての自覚に到達するのである。」（III, 482 f.)

50）Objective qualities are dynamic and self-referential as they determine themselves as objects of consciousness thereby knowing themselves. From the ultimate standpoint, the judgment "This is red" is the self-determination of the sensation of red knowing itself, as the sensation is nothing but the self-reflecting mirror of nothingness.「色が色自身を見ることが色の発展で」ある。（III, 447; see 383 f.）

51）See Yusa, Michiko *Zen and Philosophy*, op. cit., pp. 205 ff.

52）See Maraldo, John C. "Nishida Kitarō: Self, World, and the Nothingness Underlying Distinctions," in Garfield, Jay L. & Edelglass, William, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2011.

53）See Dilworth, David A. "Nishida Kitaro: Nothingness as the Negative Space of Experiential Immediacy," in *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 13:4, 1973.

54）A more faithful translation of the original ὑπέρφωτος (*De mystica theologia*, in Heil, Günter & Ritter, Adolf, eds. *Corpus Dionysiacum*, tom. II, Berlin-New York, Walter De Gruyter, 1991, p. 142/997 B) than "dazzling" is "superluminous" (Latin *superlumen* or *superlucens*), as Dionysius coined the word using the same prefix he used to coin the expression "superessential Being" (ὑπερούσιος οὐσία *De divinis nominibus*, in Suchla, Beate R., ed. *Corpus Dionysiacum*, tom. I, Berlin-New York, Walter De Gruyter, 1990, p. 109/588 B). If Nishida was comfortable with describing *basho* as superluminous, he could have been comfortable as well with describing it as superessential. On Dionysius's prefix "super," see Mazzocco, Mariel "«Suressentiel» Aux sources d'un langage mystique," in *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 230:4, 2013.

55）Apophatic positions open to both positive and negative descriptions of the absolute can be found not only in the western Christian tradition to which early Nishida often refers, but also in the Hindu tradition. See Isayeva, Natalia *Shankara and Indian Philosophy*, Albany, State University of New York Press, 1993, pp. 105 ff. and 145 ff.

56）Trans. by Shinzinger, Robert, in *Intelligibility and the Philosophy of Nothingness*: *Three Philosophical Essays*, Honolulu, East-West Center Press, 1958.

57）Trans. by Krummel, John W.M. and Nagatomo, Shigenori, in *Place and Dialectic: Two Essays by Nishida Kitarō*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2012.

58）See 田辺元『田辺元全集』第 4 巻　東京　筑摩書房，1963，p. 309.

59）Leonardi, Andrea "Mysticism and the Notion of God in Nishida's Philosophy of Religion," in *Philosophy East and West*, 64:2, 2014.

60）"In later works Nishida shifts from the metaphor of 'place within place,' i.e., of a lesser context within a more inclusive context, to the language of contradictory self-identities. After Nishida develops the notion of the world as a dialectical universal, he seems to reconcile differences not

by picturing one "place" embedded in another, but by binding them together immediately into unities or 'self-identities.'" Maraldo, John C. "Self-Mirroring and Self-Awareness: Dedekind, Royce and Nishida," in Heisig, James W., ed., *Frontiers of Japanese Philosophy 1*, Nagoya, Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, 2006, p. 158.

61) See Leonardi, Andrea, "Mysticism and the Notion of God in Nishida's Philosophy of Religion," op. cit., pp. 462 ff.

62) As K. Kunitsugu remarked, Tanabe's criticism provided the "negative mediating trigger"（媒介契機）to the development of Nishida's late philosophy. 小坂国継『西田哲学と宗教』東京　大東出版社，1994，p. 281.

63) Late Nishida himself claims to be a thorough positivist, since he rejects any transcendence as "mystical thought."「自己自身を限定する形の背後に，何等の基体的なるものを考へてはならない。それは神秘思想に過ぎない。私は徹底的実証主義者である。」（X, 37）On Nishida's positivism, see Leonardi, Andrea, "Mysticism and the Notion of God in Nishida's Philosophy of Religion," op. cit., pp. 460 f.