Philosophical Reflexion of Everyday Language as a Dimension of Comparative Study Including the Greetings of the Closing Session

Tomonobu IMAMICHI

Our entretien will be successfuly finished with the visit of Kabugi-theatre tomorrow afternoon. For the preparation for it we invite professor Toshio Kawatake at Waseda University, who is a specialist of the theatre-science especially of Kabugi, who has organized several times the performance of this traditional theatre in the foreign contries like France, United States, Soviet Union and West Germany etc,, and who has already written several important books on the drammatic structure of Kabugi. Professor Kawatake will appear this evening in the farewell banquet directly after this closing session. You need not to be afraid of a long philosophical speech again, because he will give you some essential informations suitable for the appreciation of the theatre in question in the desert course of todays banquet.

Our entertien will be successfully finished because of the realy philosophical and friendly engagement of every member of this entretien. As an organisator I thank you very much for the philosophical friendship of all of you.

In every entretien it is usual that one or two reporters do not come or do not prepare the paper and that the organisator must prepare some papers. So this time we have prepared also some another papers. The one by myself and the other by Miss Hashimoto. But for them there is no chance to be read. It signifies already how diligent and appliqué and honest every member is. Now in this closing session within fifteen minutes I would like to speak to you about the philosophical reflexion of everyday language in respect of comparative study. It forms originally the first part of my conference for this entretien. Because of the lack of time here, the second part will be read in the linguistique entretien in the next month in Tokyo.

Logo-ontical methode

In my book "Betrachtungen über das Eine "I qualified the methode of Laotse as "logo-ontique" in contrast against "ontology". The reason why I named it so is following.

According to chinese tradition there was in the begining the chaos, from which the triade the heaven, the earth and the human being appeared. When one thinks on this process logically, so one finds a very remarkable effect of the negation. In the begining was the chaos. This physical indifference must be separeted in two, so that the clear structure takes place. This first difference is that the heaven is

not the earth. This proposition is the perfect negation, in which the subject and the object have no medium. This situation was also denied because of the generation of the human being, which is partialy heaven and partly earth. The essence of the position of the human being is therefore the effect of the limited negation of the universal negation. The logical position of the human being is in this way the result of the negation of negation, in german das Ergebnis des Nichtens des Nichtens. However who does this double negation, if each moment of the triade is seen as nothing other than the object of these negations? What is the subject of this negation, in french qu'est ce que c'est que le sujet de ce nier? Is it the chaos, which has already exists before the separation caused by the negation in question. But how is it possible for the chaos to deny or to "nichten"? To deny, zu nichten, especially to negate in logical sense, it is the effect of the clear thinking. If the chaos has in itself the clear thinking, that is to say, if the chaos has in itself the certain clarity, it is no more chaos. So the subject of the negation can not be the chaos. The chaos can not negate. Who is then the subject of the negation in question, if each moment of the triade and the chaos itself is not the subject of the negation? Nothing. Yes, the nothing, das Nicht, le néant must be the requested subject'. This is the logo-ontical extraction of the ontic relations from the logical level.

Application of Logo-ontique for the Interpretation
of Everyday Language

As I said in my conference of the opening session, it is necessary to find out one keyword for the comparative study on the intercultural dimension. The keyword is very important not because it is a word respected in semantic level, but because it has semiotic function for the being or its situation what is very important. So for instance we choiced the problem of liberation as keyword in the case of religion, not because the orient and the occident have a common word liberation, but because the fact liberation belongs to the most important moments of religious phenomena. This choice of the moment is the task of the phenomenological ontology. After this ontological analyse one must go to the dimension of the philology in order to enter into the field of the comparative study. In such a way we could search out the two urtypes of liberation in the contrasted form in the east and in the west. Therefore for the comparative study of the eminent cultural phenomena the starting point of research is ontology and then philology and finally the interpretation of the urtypes. Is this process always valid in the comparative study? I think, this process is only possible in the case of keyword on the level of highly developed ontological object, because the keywords for quotidian phenomena do not have some objectified realm of culture which can be the object of ontology. The ontology presupposes the subject-object constellation which is found in the objectified realm of culture.

Now this time I wish to think about quotidian use of language from the standpoint

of the comparative study between east and west. Because our subject is our everyday language which is not objectified enough for our consciousness, we can not depart with ontological analyse like in the case of the phenomena which we related in the opening session. I try here the logo-ontical approach to the interpretation of everyday language. The logo-ontique is really the contrast against the ontology. Its vector is from logos as language to the phenomenal being as ὄν. It departs from the linguistique form as the grammatical dimension of logos and goes to the semantic level and finally reach to the ontic phenomena. The axis of the comparative study here is not the keyword as a sign for the cultural moment which is common in terminological level between east and west.

In the opening session we have introduced ourselves each other. As you all did, I said also "I am Tomonobu Imamichi, professor at the University of Tokyo." The order of the issued words is as follows: the first is personal name, the second is the family name and the third is the circle to which I belong. I said in this order of words, because I must speak in one of several European languages because of the present situation in which Japanese can not be understood by almost all the members from Europe or America. That means, we Japanese do not say in this order of words among Japanese. I must say, Watakushi Tokyo Daigaku Kyôju Imamichi Tomonobu de gozaimasu, that it to say, I am Professor at the University of Tokyô. So the order of the words is as follows: the first is the name of the group to which I belong, the second is the position in it, the third is the family name and the last is personal name. The order of word is not of grammar in the strict sense of word but at least idiomatic, so that one may not change in each language.

Now we can say without danger that an European language, so far as the idiomatic use concerns, suggests that the personal consciousness of individuality is highly estimated and so in the case of self-introduction the word of the sign for the unchangable person must be issued at first and then the name of the seldom changeable personal group to which the person belongs and after it his position and his professional group which are changeable according to his decision or to any social accident.

Now on this idiomatic level of logos as speech, we find out the contrasted opposition of the consciousness between east and west. In the east, as japanese idiomatic way of self-introduction shows, the sens of belonging is very strong, so that one must make clear to which group one belongs. The most important is not he himself, it is the official society and his position in it, and then not yet his personal individuality, but the family as the kinship group and it is the last that one makes clear ones own personal name. This spiritual structure, namely, the thought that the sens of belonging is stronger than the individual self-consciousness, or better said, the self-consciousness is equal to the sens of belonging in the oriental spiritual climate, this mental structure reminds us of the socalled oriental morality. The self, the me is nothing but the moment of the social unit. It means naturally that the individual consciousness has not developped enough in the history in the east. But it means

also that the evaluation of the society to which one belongs is very important. So the honour is sometimes more important than the personal ursubject. If one loses ones honour, one has inclination to kill oneself. Here is the confusion between social honour and personal dignity. However there are also some positive points in this tradition. The tendency to make one's own name not remarkable means the evaluation of modesty and the loyalty to one's group. The human existence as correspondence with the other evocates a moral virtue of responsibility. Our logo-ontical reflexion on the idiomatic form of self-introduction makes us now think about various ontic phenomena. The western form of self-introduction which cherishes the unchageable personal individuality reminds us of the constructive thinking way for the world. The most certain thing is not given in the phenomenal society, the most certain is not other than one's own person. The whole woŕld must be constructed by this person from its standpoint. The principal dichotomy subject-object in the west can be recognized already in the western locution in question.

Ontological and analogical Character of Language

Aristotle writes in his Metaphysics "To on legetai pollachôs", namely the being is talked in various ways. What does it mean? The essence of this proposition is clarified by Thomas Aquinas saying in his De ente et de Essentia "Ens dicitur dupliciter", namely the being is said in two ways. It means the semantic functions of the word 'being" are twofold, that is to say, the being as a word for existence and for integration of categorial enunciation, in another word, for copula. Really we use "to be" in English for the existence of a thing like "There *is* a box", and also for the copula like "The box *is* big". These two "*is*" are same in the linguistic form, but are different in the logical function. This isoformic-heterosemantic identiy of the being is the pretext of the so called ontological keyword analogia entis. Friedrich Klingner, the late professor of latin classical philology in the "Blüte Zeit" of the University in Munich, whom I always respected in those days and whom I respect now more than in those days, this wonderful gentleman of philology has said smiling to me, as I said "In Japanese we use the other form for existence as the form for copula", that our language (i.e. Indo-germanische Sprachfamilie) is therefore more ontological than any other language. I must say Keiswegs In order to avoid the misunderstanding that he had to some extend the superiority complex of his culture. "Keineswegs". Keine Spur davon hatte er. Bruno Snell was one of his friends and Snell, who was in those days professor in the University of Hamburg, wrote sometimes very interesting and provocative articles in the realm of the philosophy of language. So Klingner was stimulated by this friend and thought "ab und zu" about the relation between grammar and logics. I have very pleasant memories that we (i.e. Klingner and I) took a walk very often after his lecture on Vergil or Oberseminar of Horatius from the University to his house along the Arcis Strasse. He stopped

suddenly as I said to him, "Nein, Herr Professor, Ihre europäische Sprache ist meines Erachtens nicht ontologisch, sondern analogisch, denn sie ist genug semiotisch. Je semiotischer ist die Sprache, desto mehr analogisch ist sie. (No, Mr. Klingner, your European language is, according to my opinion, not ontological, but analogical, because it is semiotique enough. The more semiotic is the language, the more analogical it is.) The word has semiotic function. The highest point of this semioticity is univocal universality. Its ideal form is mathematical number. It is very practical to denote many things with few semiotic signs, if it is possible, because then it is enough for us to calculated these signs in order to operate things surrounding us. But the word has at other side the naming function, which is the mental act of corresponding to the things. Concerning the being the European language choiced the semiotic inclination, and the Japanese the naming. So in the former there is no linguistic difference to denoting the existence of the animal and of the inorganic. Here *is* a dog. Here *is* a box. The "*is*" is the semiotic sign for the existence in general. But the ontic meaning of this "*is*" is same only in the analogical sense. Because the being of the living has the more than the being of the inorganic, the both beings can be said by the same word "*is*" only in the analogical sense. In Japanese, which choiced the other inclination, for the exsistence of the living one uses iru and for the inorganic aru. So for the sentence "Here *is* a dog" we say "Inu (dog) ga *iru*", and for the sentence "Here *is* a box" "Hako (box) ga *aru*." Moreover there is another form for denoting the integration of categorical enunciation than the form for existence. "The box is big" is in Japanese "Hako wa ôkii desu", in this case the English "is" which is same for the sentence denoting the exsistence is trañlated in to Japanese in the totally different word than "aru" for exsistence. At least we can say without danger that the socalled anlaogia entis is valid only in the Indo-european language family, so far as one tries to certificate the theory of analogy from the linguistic fact of the identity of the various meanings in "being".

Japanese language has so strong keen sensibility to life that it sacrificed its semioticity for being in general in the linguistic level. This sacrifice supposes the ontological correspondence between word and things or their relations. The grammatical ambiguity of the form of respect is also one exemple of this dynamic corrrespondence between the speaker and his correlatives. Many words which are synonym are found in Japanese. This fact designates also the abundance of semioticity and the acceptance of ontological differenciation. Such a language cultivates its poetical depth in the semantic dimension, and so it promotes also the power of the image or figure in the place of form. The form is the telos of the immobility and the act of the definition. It is closed and the end of the univocity of reasoning. But the image is the topos of the dynamic ambiguity and the act of the magnification of spiritual faculty. It is opend and the issue of the liberty of speculation. The logical demonstration with its logo-ontic vecteur suggests us there is the other form of thinking way than the aristotelian logics.

Towards the end of our entretien I would like to say to all members my heartily

thanks.   Thank you very much, which is in Japanese Arigatô.   And this "arigatô" is an ontological word.   It consists of two parts, namely "ari" and "gatô".   Ari comes from aru (to exsist, to be as a phenomen) and "gatô" come from "katai" which means "difficult".   Arigatô means therefore "It is difficult (for such a kind deed) to exsist (in this world).", namely, "It is rare for me to experience such a kindness" or "Your kindness is the good deed for which it is difficult to be or to appear in this world."   Anyhow for the international entretien it is really difficult to exsist or to be in such a series of high leveled discussions and in such an atmosphere of friendships.   Arigatô!

University of Tokyo