

Title	The meaning of the philosophical methodology and a try to study it historically and systema-tically
Sub Title	
Author	山本, 万二郎(Yamamoto, Manjiro)
Publisher	三田哲學會
Publication year	1956
Jtitle	哲學 No.32 (1956. 3) ,p.B2- B4
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	Abstract
Genre	
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00150430-00000032-0279

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

ring of the philistinised formation of democratic education. The thesis insists again that the ideal of the well-rounded personality and the stress on every man's enjoying whole-heartedly his national and international life, should be aimed by new education all the time, under the condition of social reform in every aspect.

The meaning of the philosophical methodology and a try to study it historically and systematically

Manjiro Yamamoto

Methodology has two aspects: as organ with which to acquire truth and as principle upon which truth to be founded. From this point of view, methodology is to be classified into three grades; formal logic, scientific logic, philosophical logic. The philosophical logic is still more to be divided into three grades; epistemological, ontological and philosophical in a narrower sense. Among these methodologies, the former is to the latter each other what the method as organ is to the method as principle. Therefore the philosophical methodology in a narrower sense is in the highest grade of all.

This philosophical methodology is to be divided into two parts; theory of elements and theory of methods. The former is the basic ground of the latter. Then the theory of elements is the narrowest or ultimate philosophical methodology. We are trying to study this ultimate one historically and systematically.

The ultimate one, after all, consists in the point of view or standpoint from which to find truth. First we try to find it outside of us. And then inside of us. At last in the communication of each other.

When we try to find it outside, nature cannot answer us directly. One who can answer directly is another people. Then the method is to be dialogical. But dialogical is to be pushed into monological. Then we must try to reflect in ourselves.

The reflexive method is divided into three grades; naive, dogmatical, critical. When we cannot discern outside from inside and stand on a simple mixed point of view self-unconsciously, it is naive. Then although we become aware of the difference, when we decide the conformity of the two sides arbitrarily, it is dogmatical. At last when we try to fix how far the two sides can conform, it is critical.

The naive method, presupposing the conformity of logos and thing simply, is to be divided into two grades; pre-scientific and scientific. The former is archaical or analogical, the latter is inductive or deductive. In the latter we are unaware they are operating methods, but not constructive ones. Then we must be aware of the difference between logos and thing.

The dogmatical method is to be divided into two grades; speculative and intuitive. In the former we, distinguishing logos from thing, decide the parallelism or identity of the two phases without proof. In the latter we, at one stroke, decide the conformity or fusion of the two sides (outside and inside), neglecting logos.

The critical method is to be divided into two grades; sceptical and critical in a narrower sense. The former is absolute or relative. The relative one is, in spite of negative, methodologically efficient and it comes near the critical one.

The critical one in a narrower sense is still more to be divided into two grades; formal or material, abstract or concrete, transcendental-logical or phenomenological. The former tries to find the conditions and limits of our true knowledge. The latter intends to find the basic foundation of all the scie-

nces, and tries the intentional analysis of the pure consciousness and the verification of experiences or evidences therein. They have not only an epistemological aspect, but also an ontological one.

From both standpoints, first an objective ontological methodology, and then a subjective ontological one are to be led out.

The reflexive method ends at the former. Next the communicative method begins with the latter. (The latter will be still more divided into many grades, too.)

To be continued.

Essai sur la philosophie morale et religieuse de H. Bergson et M. Blondel

Natsumi Mikumo

H. Bergson et M. Blondel sont les deux sources du spiritualisme français de notre temps. Ils sont comparables par un même goût à la vie intérieure, par la puissance avec laquelle ils ont lutté contre le positivisme, l'idéalisme et le rationalisme étroit du temps. Ils ont montré un analogue retour au réel, en élargissant la notion d'expérience humaine, Et ainsi ils ont introduit l'un et l'autre, une originale nouveauté dans la tradition spiritualiste française.

Mais quoi que leur affinité soit très profonde, d'en autre côté on ne peut cependant pas minimiser la différence essentielle entre ces deux philosophies.

A nos yeux, dans les écrits du philosophe de la durée, il y a une discontinuité remarquable, qui se traduit par un changement de la méthode entre ses divers écrits consacrés à des recherches sur l'expérience humaine naturelle et Les deux sources dans lequel il a étudié l'expérience des mystiques. Ju-