The Possibility of Physical Education as Semantic Generation*

Masaaki Kubo

Research Institute for Sport & Leisure, Professor Emeritus, Tokai University
247-9 Kitada, Nakai-machi, Ashigarakami-gun, Kanagawa, 259-0143

*Original article published in Japan J. Phys. Educ. Hlth. Sport Sci. 63: 33-48, 2019 (in Japanese)

This study examined the possibility of regarding Physical Education as “Semantic Generation”. First, the educational theory of Yano was examined, in order to consider the concept of the body. And this study considers the advisable body in the Physical Education as “Semantic Generation”.

Second, the special experience of the general physical movement (i.e. “melting into the world”: yokai taiken) was examined. It was argued that the sympathetic and interconnected relationship between one’s own body and that of another (intecorporéité) can give rise to a special experience (yokai taiken).

The results of this examination were as follows:
1) Yano claimed that Physical Education was not a means of treating the activity of the body as an educational subject. The body is not a physiological or corporeal object. He considered the living body to have existential identity and that it interacted with the world, and that this type of existence was an essential experience for humans. The body that takes place the special peak experience is hoped in the Physical Education as “Semantic Generation”.
2) The general physical movement of the same body creates a special experience (“melting into the world”: yokai taiken). In the practice of general physical movements, the body schema synchronizes with the movements of others’ bodies. This body schema synchronization represents resonance, sympathy and interaction with the bodies of others: in other words, special experience.
3) The resonant and interactive relationship between an individual body and the bodies of others is known as “intecorporéité”. Behavior matching and interactional synchrony appear in this relationship. This matching and synchrony of bodies deepen interactive mutual understanding. The resonant and interactive movement of the body, for example, creates “the experience of connection by the body”, and this represents the special experience (yokai taiken).
4) Physical Education as “Semantic Generation” can aid in development of educational potential through nurture of the body that creates a special peak experience and resonance, as well as sympathy and interaction with the bodies of others. That is to say, Education in bodily experience of relations between a subject and an object (i.e. “intecorporéité”) is important.
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Introduction

It was the educational philosopher Kenji Yano who first discussed physical education as semantic generation. Yano announced a semantic generation theory in his 1998 education studies book under the title “The Body and Education” (trans.) in Human Life and Education: New Naturalist Essays on Education (trans.). He subsequently reintroduced the theory in the third chapter, “The Living Body and Education” (trans.), of his 1995 A Philosophy of Children (trans.). In that chapter, Yano discussed “physical education” as semantic generation, approaching the “body” in the context of physical education. He stated the importance of examining physical education from the perspective of the “living body,” and he opposed physical education that uses the body’s activity as a means, stating that the aim of a physical education curriculum, in a general sense, should be to help people attain “open embodiment” that can be called “healthy.”
Later on, in 1998, Yano gave a presentation on “physical-education” as semantic generation at a symposium of a specialized subcommittee for the philosophy of physical education at the 49th Conference of the Japan Society of Physical Education, Health and Sport Sciences where physical education and sport researchers had congregated. The content of Yano’s presentation was published under the title “Physical Movement as Non-Savoir Experience” (trans.) in the 29th issue of the subcommittee’s journal, Principles of Physical Education (trans.). This was the starting point for the spread and development of theories about the semantic generation of physical movement in academic fields that are related to physical education and sports. Yano’s presentation centered on “yokai-taiken” (the experience of melting into the world), which departs from the framework of utility. Yano criticized the current situation in which physical movement is always understood and evaluated as a means to an end. He stated that this situation is controlled by the “logic of development” and the “principle of utility.” He argued that, in contrast, “yokai-taiken” is a non-savoir, physical experience in which the boundaries between the self and the world disappear—in other words, a physical experience of semantic generation that transcends both the “principle of utility” and the “logic of development.”

Thereafter, physical education as semantic generation, as discussed by Yano, spread and developed through research, chiefly in the academic fields of physical education and sport philosophy. Prior studies on this topic include Kubo’s (2006, 2009a, 2009b, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2015), Fukazawa’s (2016; Fukazawa & Ishigaki, 2010), Ishigaki’s (2014; Fukazawa & Ishigaki, 2010), Tōru Takahashi’s (2011a, 2011b), and Morita’s (2014). However, there remain areas that have not been thoroughly discussed through research on physical education as semantic generation, making the nature of this education unclear. Specifically, ambiguity exists in the concept of “open embodiment” that is considered “healthy,” which Yano designated as the goal of physical education as semantic generation, since the state of body is unclear. Another ambiguity concerns physical experience and the context in which it exists. Studies have discussed “yokai-taiken” through the physical movement or “sports movement” of “sports (competitive sports).” However, these studies have not thoroughly examined physical experience in the context of general, non-sport physical movement. One more ambiguity is related to mutual interaction between bodies. Studies have discussed responses to the movement of others and “things (e.g., a ball).” However, sufficient discussion has not taken place regarding the nature of interactions between the bodies of the self and others, and what such interactions generate. Therefore, the present study will discuss the possibilities of “physical education” as semantic generation while seeking answers to the following questions:

i. How should we understand the “body” in the context of “physical education” as semantic generation?

ii. What occurrences does “physical movement” cause?

iii. What is the nature of a sympathetic, mutual relationship between the bodies of the self and others, and what does it generate?

1. The “body” in the context of physical education

1.1. “Education of the body” and “education by the body”

How has the “body” been understood, until now, in the context of physical education? Yano criticized physical education curricula as having merely provided “education of the body” and “education by the body.” Yano said that “education of the body” understands the mind and the body as separate, making the “body” the object of the physical education curriculum. Thus, the body has been trained for utility as a thing based on various indices, especially strength. The perspective of the “living body,” which Yano presented for the purpose of assessing physical education, is absent in this picture. Instead, the body is understood as “body as the object” or an object within an objective world. Yano criticized this “education of the body,” saying that it is “a training-centered physical education curriculum” that “disallows giving consideration to anything other than the body as defined by the framework of training and discipline for docility toward the nation” (Yano, 1995, p. 61).

Meanwhile, “education by the body” understands the human mind and body as unified, thus opening the possibility of intellectual, character-related education through the experience of physical activity. In this way, “education by the body” overcomes the training-centered education that is “education of the body.” However, conventional physical education the-
ory understands the phrase “learning through experience” as “learning through physical activity,” thus treating physical activity as a means for education. Therefore, as Yano said, it preoccupies itself with “development attained through physical activity” while denying the value that exists in physical activity itself. In this picture, the body is not understood as a “living body” that has mutual relations with the world and others, and consequently, Yano criticized such educational theory as “lacking in thought related to the rich, semantic generation experienced by the body in the context of physical activity itself” (Yano, 1995, pp. 61-62).

Yano criticized how “education of the body” and “education by the body” both treat physical activity as a means in the context of physical education curricula, disallowing semantic generation. In agreement with this criticism, Higuchi said, “As Yano points out, today’s educational subject called physical education does not necessarily have a position as a subject that can directly focus on the body as a locus of rich, semantic generation.” Higuchi added, however, that “Direct acceptance of the body’s semantic generation—al properties would directly lead to the orientation of the study of body politics; so, it would have to dismount or deconstruct the pre-existing curricular system to some extent;” Yano’s criticism of the physical education curricula is an important perspective, but “the theory of the body as a locus of semantic generation is not merely a matter of physical education theory as Yano facilely expects it to be” (Higuchi, 1997, p. 280).

This “education by the body” approach often appears in theories of “character formation through physical education.” In the past, “character formation” in this context has “signified the formation of humans’ psychological and mental aspects based on clues from physical formation” (Kubo, 2001, p. 2). In the context of “education by the body,” sport, exercise, and such physical activities of the body are evaluated in terms of their effectiveness as means for forming a certain kind of psychology or mentality. The pedagogical practice of the educational subject that is called “physical education” has thus revolved around aims to achieve certain goals through physical activity.

This is because, as Yano indicates later in his discussion, education has been understood through the “logic of development” modeled on labor. The “logic of development” is characterized by the principle of utility, and it rearranges everything into means-purpose relations. Similarly, the objective of “education by the body” is the “acquisition of body culture or the improvement of athletic abilities or physical strength,” and the body’s activity is the means for such development. The body is therefore evaluated in terms of its utility (Yano, 1999, pp. 108-109), and in this context, semantic generation of the body is unthinkable. Thus, in the context of curricula that are labeled “physical education,” “education by the body” is “education through physical activity,” and its goal is to produce certain results; a body and its activity that effectively produce those results are useful means. It is based on these conditions that the curricula are currently accepted and therefore continue to exist. As Higuchi pointed out, rejecting that would lead to dismantling the system of the curricula called “physical education.” As such, it would be difficult to significantly modify the system of the curricula called “physical education” based on Yano’s criticism. Nevertheless, Yano’s “theory of the body as a locus of semantic generation” is an important perspective. Even if applying it to the modification of the curricula called “physical education” is impracticable, it still calls for additional examination as a body theory in the context of a more general area of education called “physical education.” How should one think about it?

1.2. The “living body” perspective

Yano discussed the possibilities of “physical education” as semantic generation from the perspective of what he calls the “living body.” He said that the human body has socially and historically undergone segmentation and that such a body can be called the “body as the object” or a body seen from the outside. Yano added, however, that such bodies are our own bodies, living bodies, and “bodies as subjects.” He said, “The body is my body that is lived by me” (Yano, 1995, pp. 55-60).

Kameyama pointed out that phenomenology has continuously presented viewpoints for understanding the “living body” (Kameyama, 2012, p. 34). This is represented by Merleau-Ponty’s body theory. The term, “living body,” is also used in Ikuta’s statement regarding Merleau-Ponty’s “views on the body.” Ikuta stated that Merleau-Ponty’s “views on the body,” which oppose an understanding of the human body as an object within an objective world, is a shift of perspective from the “objectified body” to the “living
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Yano said, “When existence means the body, education of the body must relate to the entire being of the human that exists as a body” (Yano, 1995, p. 90). He argued for the importance of considering the body as a “living body” in the context of physical education. As mentioned earlier, the body is not a physiological, material thing that is the object; rather, it should be considered a body as a subject that has intentionality and is open to the world. Yano proposed physical education that is oriented toward “open embodiment.” He stated that the expression “open embodiment” refers to the state of being of “a body that can have sufficient physical experience,” emphasizing “a body as an open condition that allows self-experience and world-experience.” Yano proposed a form of education that is oriented toward a mode of existence of the body that allows for essential experiences as humans through fusion with the world (embodiment). Yano said that physical education curricula should include, in addition to their pre-existing aims, an “orientation toward open embodiment that allows sufficient physical experiences, as these are more essential than the pre-existing goals of the curricula, which are physical development, physical skills, and the development of sociality and intellect through physical activity” (Yano, 1995, p. 74). However, the nature of this body that Yano described as being “open” and this “open embodiment” that is called “healthy” remains unclear.

Inagaki, who used a sport studies approach to discuss the body, described states of the body using many terms such as “open” or “being opened.” He explained that an “open” body is a body that manifests itself in a “state in which nature and the self fuse together as one” (Inagaki, 2004, p. 24). He explained the term “open” as being open in the face of relation, cooperation, and compositeness with others; the “open” body is a “body that affirms others,” departs from the “body that is controlled by the modern subject centered on rationality,” and is in a state that is open to the “environmental world that is the other” (Inagaki, 2004, p. 150). He further pointed out the “possibility of a body that is being opened to a world in an area bordering the conscious and the unconscious” (Inagaki, 2004, p. 154). As such, there are commonalities between the modes of existence of the body described, on the one hand, as the “open” body that Inagaki discussed in relation to the “sporting body” and, on the other, as “open embodiment” that Yano advised as an objective of “physical education curricula (physical education).” Moreover, these modes of existence of the body that Inagaki and Yano called “open” are described as leading to the attainment of the same experiences, namely “yokai-taiken,” “experience as ‘non-savoir,’” and “l’expérience intérieur” (the internal experience).

1.3. Open embodiment

Yano also said that, as an existence, the body is a “subject granted with meaning” that takes part in a “dialogue (interaction) with the world;” the body “extends beyond the space it occupies as a physiologic body = flesh,” and its interaction extends not only to things but also to others. The reason, according to Yano, is because intercourse with others is not direct intercourse of the mind; it is based on the embodiment that already mediates between the self and another. Yano said that this is the “living body,” a clear form of which can be observed in children (Yano, 1995, p. 59).

As the concept of the “living body” suggests, it is necessary to consider the human body as a body as a subject, having intentionality and interacting with the world. The body has mutual relations with the bodies of others. (The present study will later discuss “inter-corporeité” (inter-corporeality).) Overall, as Yano pointed out, educating the human body “involves a task that is twofold: the formation of the body in terms of tool-like functions and the openness of the body as pertains to semantic reception and semantic generation” (Yano, 1995, p. 60).

1.4. The aim of the “open” body

Yano explained that “open embodiment” brings about “yokai-taiken.” In the context of physical education, Yano argued for the importance of “yokai-taiken,” which is an experience of becoming. He said that this should be added to the formation of the body in terms of tool-like functions. In his discussion on
“yokai-taiken” and education, Yano made a distinction between “keiken” (conscious experience) and “taiken” (physical experience). He said that, on one hand, “keiken,” like the experience of labor, “involves a future-oriented sense of purpose, and it segmentizes the world in terms of purpose-means relations, thereby creating a world.” However, he said that this makes involvement with the world partial. He said that in “taiken,” in contrast, “The boundaries separating the self and the world melt away, and one attains total involvement with the world itself, lives in the world, and physically experiences continuity with the world” (Yano, 2013, p. 15). In contrast to “keiken,” which brings about development, “taiken” is a moment of self-forgetting rapture or ecstasy, and it is an event that can be expressed only by non-word sounds such as “ohh” or “ahh,” according to Yano, it does not improve any particularly useful ability or produce any new knowledge. Yano said that taiken are events of becoming that the intellect cannot segmentize and elucidate to incorporate into the self, so it is difficult to describe them in any way other than as “yokai-taiken” (Yano, 2013, p. 26).

Inagaki referred to Bataille’s “extase” (ecstasy) and “l’expérience intérieur” to describe a horizon that an “open” body ultimately reaches (Inagaki, 2004, p. 157). Thus, Inagaki’s “open” body is a body attained by opening the body that has turned in on itself because of the modern “subject” (Inagaki, 2004, p. 171); this “open” body is the major premise for entering a state Bataille called “l’expérience intérieur,” and Bataille’s concept of “non-savoir” applies to the state in which the reason of existence of the self is not rationality but “extase.” According to Inagaki, this is “to consider the impersonal state, which has neither any conscious sense of the self nor any intrinsic emotions, as the base point of the self.” Thus, “in effect: ‘the body in the state of extase’ = ‘the body in a state of ecstasy’ = ‘the impersonal body’ = ‘the open body’” (Inagaki, 2005, p. 61).

Likewise, Yano referred to Bataille’s argument. He said that a distinctive characteristic of Bataille’s study of humans lies in “negation der negation” (negation of negation). According to Bataille, humans “negate” their animalistic nature to begin the process of becoming human. This is to negate dependency on natural and given conditions and, instead, enter a world that is controlled by the principle of utility and obey the given conditions that are cultural norms and laws. Thus, a “negation of negation” is to negate such a utility-centered way of life. Yano’s perspective of the “living body” is also a “negation of negation” in the sense that it negates the body that is a “physiological and material thing as an object” that has occurred by negating animalistic nature. Yano’s concept instead considers it a “body as the subject” (Yano, 2000, p. 31). Yano indicated that this physical experience (“taiken”), which, like “negation of negation,” is attained through infringement on order, is what Bataille called “l’expérience intérieur,” which is a physical experience at the far edge of absolute knowledge and therefore a “non-savoir” experience (Yano, 2000, p. 36). Yano used “education as development” to refer to this “first negation,” which is the humanization process that is carried out through the negation of animalistic nature; meanwhile, he used “education as becoming” to refer to the “physical experience (‘taiken’) that recovers souveraineté (sovereign nature) through ‘negation of negation,’ that is, through negating the utility-centered way of life” (Yano, 2000, p. 40). Yano further asserted that, in this “non-savoir” physical experience, the subject melts away, so the distance to the object disappears, and only pre-word voices, making sounds such as “ahh” or “ohh,” can express such an experience. Physical exercise, he said, produces such moments of the melting of the self, and the value of movement as becoming lies in this difficulty of verbalization and the impossibility of semantic fixation (Yano, 2008, pp. 225-228). Kameyama described this state that Yano called “shutai no yokai” (melting of the subject). He said, “When a human internalizes itself into the world and perceives from deep within, the human that is the subject loses the boundaries of the self=body, and the self=body and the world are totalized.” He also said, “This is the state that Bataille calls the state of souveraineté” (Kameyama, 2012, p. 113). Moreover, Yano stated that Sakuta’s “yokai-taiken” – in which the subject melts and which is the foundation of education as becoming – and Bataille’s “l’expérience intérieur” refer, in principle, to the same state (Yano, 2000, pp. 54-55).

As such, Yano’s and Inagaki’s thoughts on Bataille’s “expérience intérieur” overlap: “open embodiment” and the “open” body are modes of existence capable of attaining “yokai-taiken” or “l’expérience intérieur.” Furthermore, “education as becoming” is education that is oriented towards this “open body,” and it is the attainment of a physical experience of semantic generation by such a body.
2. The occurrence of conformity-sympathy with the body of another through physical movement

The previous chapter discussed how the “body,” in the context of “physical education” as semantic generation, could be considered an “open body” whose subject has melted, and which is capable of recovering “souveraineté.” The present chapter will discuss conformity-sympathy and the interactions between the bodies of the self and another that occur through “physical movement.”

2.1. “Physical movement” that generates meaning

Kubo stated that the significance of the physical experience of “sports movement” as semantic generation lies in the fact that “sports movement” produces “yokai-taiken” (Kubo, 2009b, pp. 183-196). He further argued that this “yokai-taiken” occurs through conformity of the “body schema.” During the practice of “sports movement,” the “body schema” is an unconscious operation that conforms to the “bodies of others,” “things” (e.g., a ball), and the “body of the self.” This conformity-sympathy of the “body schema,” at the level of “the unconscious,” transcends to an “eco-system,” bringing about a “yokai-taiken” in which the boundaries between the self and the world disappear (Kubo, 2015, pp. 625-627). This “sports movement,” in Lenk’s (1979, p. 50) terms, comprises “sports (competition),” and it is the “physical movement” that is practiced in such competitive contexts.

The “physical movement” that is practiced in the context of “sports (competition)” is governed by rules, and it is practiced in situations where there are clear objectives. For example, a “shoot” is a movement that has an objective of accurately moving a “thing,” namely a ball, to a specific area that the rules designate as a “goal;” the method (using hands or feet, carrying or striking, etc.) for moving this “thing” also adheres to the rules of the given sport. Another example is the “physical movement” that is called “running” in the context of “sports (competition).” Running, in this sense, is a movement from one place to another in accordance with limitations and objectives, such as “more accurately” or “faster.” These movements produce results, such as “success” or “failure,” and the degree to which they fulfill their objectives determines whether a performance is “good” or “poor.” In this way, the practice of “physical movement” in the context of “sports (competition)” is goal-oriented, and it strives for a result called “success (achievement of goal)” that is significantly related to a victory-defeat dichotomy. In such a context, according to Yano’s criticism of “physical movement” as mentioned in this paper’s Introduction, physical movement is therefore at risk of becoming subject to the control of the “logic of development” and the “principle of utility” that understand it as a means. Thus, there are cases in which the practice of “physical movement” in the context of “sports (competition)” becomes a means for attaining victory and not a “taiken” (physical experience) of semantic generation.

Moreover, such “physical movement” that is constrained by rules and focuses on achieving goals requires high-level practice. High-level conformity of the “body schema” to “things (e.g., a ball)” and the “body of the self” is crucial for the practice of this “physical movement” in the context of “sports (competition).” In addition, discussions on this type of “physical movement” likewise center on the “self-body” performance of the person who practices it while aiming for a goal; discussions on conformity to the “body of another” are less common. Furthermore, discussions tend to handle even the “yokai-taiken,” which occurs through the conformity of this “body schema,” as a physical experience, like “experiencing flow;” the occurrence of which presupposes advanced athletic skills. Some have accurately pointed out that Kubo’s, Yano’s, and others’ discussions on “yokai-taiken” “do not discuss enough about relations with the bodies of others” (Fukazawa & Ishigaki, 2010, p. 99); “There is still space to further explore ... whether yokai-taiken occurs only between the body and tools of the outside world or, if it occurs with other humans, how are such phenomena ...” (Fukazawa, 2016, p. 119).

Therefore, the present study, which examines “physical movement” that generates meaning, will not limit its scope to the “physical movement” called “sports movement,” which is constrained by rules and has aims to achieve goals. This study will also avoid focusing on conformity that aims to perform advanced athletic skills (conformity to “things (balls, etc.)” and to the “body of the self”). As an enquiry into what “physical movement” brings about, this study needs to examine “physical movement” that conforms not only to “things (balls, etc.)” or the “body of the
self,” but also to the “body of another;” it needs to include in its scope “physical movement” that is not influenced by the result called “success (achievement of goal).”

### 2.2. Conformity of the “body schema” in the context of “physical movement”

Through “physical movement,” humans sometimes bring about conformity between the bodies of the self and another. This can be considered conformity of the “body schema” in the context of “physical movement.” As Tanaka and Yuasa (2001) pointed out, the “body schema” “has an aspect as the principle of becoming of the entire world of physical experience that contains others and the environment” and therefore is “open to the interaction with others and the environment and partakes in mutual impact” (Tanaka & Yuasa, 2001, p. 27). Therefore, the “body schema” can be considered conforming in the context of various types of “physical movement.” For example, there is the word “shindoku.” It means to “read by ‘mi’ (mental and physical being).” Komuro used this concept of “mi” as a clue to discuss the issue of embodiment. “Mi” is a concept proposed by Ichikawa, and “shindoku” could be considered a technique “in conformity with the mi.” Komuro said that this “conformity” is a “sympathetic identification that occurs between the workings of another’s mi [and one’s own],” and it concretizes into what Ichikawa called “conformity with body schema” (Komuro, 2003, p. 27). Komuro said that “shindoku” is to perceive a writer’s experience as if it was expressed as the words of the “mi” and to take over those words as one’s own; “The external, anonymous problems become one’s own problems through a slight and subtle overlaying of the body through [the control of] breathing and posture,” and bodily acts of “correcting the posture, controlling the breathing, controlling the mi, and then reading” are required to perform “shindoku.” Komuro further said that it is necessary to gain “conformity with body schema,” which is to “listen with the entire mind and body to the recountal of the writer’s mi, trace the writer’s experience, and walk along with the writer” (Komuro, 2003, p. 30). As such, “shindoku” is a technique “in conformity with the “mi” through “physical movement” such as correcting one’s posture or controlling the mi, and this brings about “conformity with body schema.”

Meanwhile, Sekiguchi and Kusaka discussed the “body schema in context of experiencing nature.” They asserted that the “formation of a suitably complicated body schema is essential to education, especially physical education” (Sekiguchi & Kusaka, 2011, p. 211). According to them, the “contact with nature, feeling nature with the body,” is a “direct” physical experience that makes the body and nature directly “contiguous;” it is a “kyoushin” (“kyoumei” or “sympathy” in the present study) with nature, and through this experience, people regenerate their own natural laws and forces of life (Sekiguchi & Kusaka, 2011, p. 212). They further discuss the conformity of “body schema” as follows: During an experience of nature, children “use their senses as mediums to conform to nature and interact as they discover their own bodily life (nature);” the “inner nature” of the self begins to become clear through this conformity to nature (Sekiguchi & Kusaka, 2011, p. 220). This conformity of the body schema in the context of the experience of nature is not carried out through intense, physical exercise – only movements of the body, such as “sitting, walking, searching, or operating.” Furthermore, the “body schema” in this context conforms to the “things” and “bodies of others” that constitute nature – not just the “body of the self.” As such, “conformity with body schema” occurs through “physical movement” in the context of experiencing nature.

Ichikawa used the term, “conformity,” to describe what he called “a type of sympathy occurring in the relation with a unity of another’s mi.” He said this is a sympathetic identification that occurs between the operations of oneself and another’s mi (Ichikawa, 1984, pp. 52-53). Ichikawa used the term, “conformity-sympathy” (or “kyoushin phenomenon” or “kyoumei phenomenon”) to refer to this identification, and he further divided it into what he called “isomorphic conformity” and “responsive (role-related) conformity.” In the former, one performs the same gestures, behaviors, or facial expressions as the other, while in the latter, one uses gestures, behaviors, or facial expressions that respond or adapt to the gestures of the other (Ichikawa, 1986, pp. 280-281). (The present study uses the term “conformity-sympathy” to refer to Ichikawa’s “sympathy-conformity,” which refers to the kyoushin and kyoumei phenomena). Ichikawa said that these two types of conformity can be further classified into “explicit conformity” and “latent conformity;” the latter is an immanent conformity that concretizes into “conformity with body...
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schema” after going through ideational, imaginative phases (Ichikawa, 1984, pp. 54-55). Conformity in the aforementioned “shindoku” “controls until the level of body schema” (Ichikawa, 1986, p. 285) and “body-schema-related conformity is summoned” (Ichikawa, 1984, p. 56). Thus, this type of conformity can be considered as concretizing from an ideational level into “conformity with body schema.” Conformity to nature in the context of the “experience of nature” similarly aims for conformity at a bodily level. Thus, it can be considered a rather tangible “conformity with body schema.” As such, “conformity with body schema” occurs through general “physical movement,” and this is related to “conformity-sympathy.”

2.3. Conformity-sympathy and interaction between bodies of the self and another

This “conformity with body schema” in the context of “physical movement” occurs often as a kyoumei, kyoushin, or interaction between the bodies of the self and another. Tanaka noted that, in the field of neuroscience since the 1990s, the role of mirror neurons have been pointed out in relation to such interaction between the bodies of the self and another. He said, “A distinct characteristic of mirror neurons is the fact that, in some cases, they become active both when one is moving and when one is watching another perform the same movements” (Tanaka, 2011, pp. 4-5). Mirror neurons have “gained the attention of researchers in a wide range of fields, such as psychology and philosophy, as neurons that see oneself and others as the same and are related to the understanding of others’ actions and the emotions that can be read from those actions” (The Japanese Society for Cognitive Psychology, 2013).

Endo, who investigated trends in research on mirror neurons, indicated that studies on mirror neurons have been conducted not only by neuroscientists but also by philosophers such as Sato and Shibata who discussed the nature of understanding others (Endo, 2015, pp. 41-42). In his philosophical discussion on understanding others, “kyoumei,” and mirror neurons, Sato brought attention to Merleau-Ponty’s assertion that “Body schema guarantee direct correlation between what one sees another do and what oneself does” (Merleau-Ponty, 1967b, p. 219). Sato then asserted that “body schema” “should be understood as something that guarantees correspondence between the mode of existence of a visible other and the mode of existence of myself; ... it is because of this correspondence that the muscles of my leg contract when I see a soccer player kicking a ball” (Sato, 2011, p. 27). He added that mirror neurons respond to the “mode of existence” that is represented in another’s actions or facial expressions (Sato, 2011, p. 32). In his later research, Sato used the term “taisei” (perceptual attitude) to refer to “body schema,” and he said that he used this term “taisei” to refer to kyoumei with “others” and “things” (Sato, 2014, pp. 135-136). This kyoumei, according to Sato, is the same as Merleau-Ponty’s “sympathizer” (‘to sympathize’)” (Sato, 2014, pp. 216-217), and it is a “synchronization” of the rhythms of action (Sato, 2014, p. 222). Sato thus stated that mirror neurons summon “conformity with body schema,” which is an interaction between the self and another.

In a philosophical discussion concerning mirror neurons, Shibata brought attention to the word “shared space” as mentioned by Gallese, who was one of the discoverers of the mirror neuron (Shibata 2011, p. 107). Shibata said that Gallese used the term “shared space” in the sense that the existence of mirror neurons makes interaction with an object shareable with another, thus “opening a space in which the meaning of the object is shared with another” (Shibata, 2011, p. 114). Sinigaglia and Rizzolatti, who discovered the mirror neuron along with Gallese, also used this term “shared space” in what they called the “shared space of action” in which “Each act and chain of acts, whether ours or ‘theirs,’ are immediately registered and understood without the need of any explicit or deliberate ‘cognitive operation’” (Sinigaglia & Rizzolatti, 2009, pp. 148-149). Shibata said that this “shared space” is “a space that mirror neurons have spread between multiple bodies” and that “subjectivity emerges within such an intersubjective space.” He argued that, in such a context, the object’s meaning “is not deliberately learned upon the premise of distinguishing between the self and others; rather, others’ interaction with the object directly becomes the self’s way of interacting with the object” (Shibata, 2011, p. 115). The discoverers of the mirror neuron introduced various post-discovery experiments and said that “The role of mirror neurons might have evolved as an important ability not only for understanding the actions, intentions, and emotions of others but also for learning advanced cognitive skills through observation.” They concluded that “It is because of the mirrors in
the brain that humans can effortlessly communicate in various forms with others” (Rizzolatti et al., 2007, pp. 25-26). Thus, conformity-sympathy and interaction between the bodies of the self and others, which take place in a “shared space” created by the existence of mirror neurons, is an “experience as non-savoir” that does not require deliberate “cognitive operations.”

Tanaka pointed out that understanding others occurs through embodied interaction between the self and another, and he said that “considering the sympathetic relationship between the self and others during early stages of development and the activity of mirror neurons,” it is possible to think that there exists a situation between the bodies of the self and another in which “perception of actions of the other brings about the same (latent) actions in the body of the self; likewise, when the other perceives actions of the self, the same (latent) actions take place in the body of the other.” Tanaka said that Merleau-Ponty used the terms “intersubjectivité charnelle” or “intercorporéité” to refer to this relationship between the bodies of the self and another (Merleau-Ponty, 2001, pp. 175-176), concluding that “Basically, understanding another is to sympathize within inter-corporality” (Tanaka, 2011, pp. 4-6). In order to discuss this physical experience of conformity-sympathy and interaction between the bodies of the self and others, it is necessary to examine the nature of “inter-corporality” and what becomes in it.

3. “Inter-corporality” and the physical experience of becoming

The present study has indicated, so far, that through the practice of “physical movement,” the “open body” brings about “conformity with body schema” and this is tied to conformity-sympathy and interaction between the bodies of the self and others. The present study will now explore the nature of the relationship between the bodies of the self and others and discuss “yokai-taiken,” which is a physical experience of becoming through “physical movement.”

3.1. “Inter-corporality”: sympathetic, mutual connection between bodies

Ichikawa stated that the poise of the mi and conformity to a world with shared body schema brings about the “formation in society of what could be called inter-corporal body schema” (Ichikawa, 1986, p. 285); that is, unconscious, inter-corporal conformity takes place among a group of people, becoming a shared, inter-corporal conformity schema. Ichikawa asserted that this schema, which could be called “social conformity schema” “builds a common foundation that allows preconscious, mutual understanding” (Ichikawa, 1984, pp. 57-58). It is possible to consider this an occurrence of unconscious “conformity with body schema” in what the discoverers of mirror neurons called a “shared space” that does not require “deliberate cognitive operations,” thus leading to “preconscious mutual understanding.”

Tanaka said that an “intersubjectively shareable meaning emerges through nonverbal, bodily interaction” as a type of interaction between the self and another, and he said that this functions in the basic dimension of understanding others through verbal communication (Tanaka, 2015, p. 143). He further asserted that the “sympathetic or mutual relations that latently spread between the body of the self and another,” which Merleau-Ponty called “intercorporéité,” emerge in two patterns in scenes of communication between the self and others, namely “behavior matching” and “interactional synchrony.” This matching and synchrony are, respectively, a “phenomenon in which the behaviors of the self and another become similar (match) as if mirroring each other” and “a concept referring to a temporal synchrony of physical actions that do not have bodily manifested isomorphism” (Tanaka, 2015, pp. 145-147). (As mentioned earlier, Ichikawa separated this sympathetic, mutual relation into “isomorphic conformity” and “responsive (role-related) conformity.”) Tanaka said that when the self and another meet as “living bodies” and interactively coordinate, something that is shared “in between” the self and the other through this matching and synchrony forms the core of understanding others. Tanaka said that this is, importantly, mutual understanding. Take as an example an experience of a meaningful chain of sounds occurring in a jazz performance. Tanaka said that “An experience of intersubjectively shared meaning is produced through intercorporal matching and synchrony [emphases added].” Since Merleau-Ponty used the term “inter-corporal subjectivity” to refer to the “inter-corporality” of the self and another, Tanaka stated that “bodily interaction” generated “in between” the self and another can generate the sharing of experiences of meaning (Tanaka, 2015, pp. 148-149). Tanaka said that this “bodily interaction” generates “various emotional
tones through conformity and synchrony,” providing the background that is necessary to carry out conversations using words. He also said that, more importantly, at this point, “The self and the other continuously create shared meanings in the form of a narrative” (Tanaka, 2015, p. 151). Thus, Tanaka placed importance on interaction. As such, “inter-corporality” signifies sympathetic, mutual connection between bodies.

3.2. “Inter-corporal” education in the context of physical education

One of Ishigaki’s studies discussed “physical education” in relation to “inter-corporality.” Ishigaki focused on “bodily feeling,” which is a gestalt of the “feelings” of the “body of the self,” the “body of another,” and “things.” According to Ishigaki, what he called “bodily experience” signifies the experience of “bodily feeling” while “bodily dialogue” signifies “kakawari” (involvement/relational) with others with “bodily feeling” at its core (Ishigaki, 2014, pp. 486-488). This “kakawari” could be considered “conformity with body schema” and “bodily interaction” in the same sense that has been discussed in the present study. Ishigaki stated the necessity of the experience of “bodily feeling” (bodily experience”) for the development (structuration) of “embodiment,” which, he said, is education’s task to promote. He argued for the importance of nurturing an “embodiment” that can allow one to experience various everyday events as “bodily feelings.” He said that “bodily experience” and “bodily dialogue” are crucial for nurturing rich “embodiment” in the context of today’s physical education classes in Japan, which place importance on “mind-related experience (or intellectual experience).” Ishigaki said that the practice of physical movement in the context of school education contributes as “bodily feeling” to the “interconnection” of humans, that is, an “inter-corporal us.” He said that this education of inter-corporality directed toward others is crucial (Ishigaki, 2014, pp. 491-493). Thus, the educational development of “embodiment” that can be experienced as “bodily feelings” is educational development of the “open body,” and Ishigaki suggested that it is possible to restructure “inter-corporality” through the “bodily interaction” occurring in sympathetic, mutual relations between the bodies of the self and others and through the “bodily feelings” attained through those relations.

In addition, Okui discussed the pedagogical significance of “inter-corporality.” Bringing attention to Merleau-Ponty’s words—“The body is our lowering of the anchor into the world” (Merleau-Ponty, 1967a, p. 242) —Okui stated that the body has a formative function of “life” and that the body in the context of physical education is not an “object of education” but rather an existence that precedes it. Okui said that, for this reason, it is necessary to move away from understanding physical education merely as an “operation to bring out the abilities of the body” (Okui, 2011, pp. 111-112). Okui noted how Merleau-Ponty re-understood Husserl’s “life-world” as a “living world” in which the body works, entering into a detailed discussion centered on the experience of the body. Okui then stated that it is necessary to explore “inter-corporality” as an experience of the body. He said that, for this purpose, an education of the body should direct its interest toward clarifying the workings of the body rather than seeking “education through the body” or learning norms through physical movement. He said that it is uncertain, however, whether interests in “embodied knowledge” and “practical knowledge” can fit the experience of the body into the framework of “knowledge” to grasp the experience of the body in its entirety. He therefore proposed a discussion on the workings of the body in a framework that does not use “knowledge” as a metaphor (Okui, 2011, p. 113); that is, he proposed a discussion on “physical movement” as an “experience as non-savoir” that transcends the “principle of utility” and the “logic of development.” Okui then wrote about the pedagogical significance of “inter-corporality.” He stated that by re-questioning the experience of the body, it is possible to “doubt the obviousness that has been concealing that experience, thereby acquiring a new experience that is open to the world,” this is a way to relive the world with “surprise.” He said that, in the context of the education of the body, “It is a given that the content to learn and the effect after learning have been predicted beforehand” and no importance is placed on feeling “surprise” towards the experience of the world. He said that, on the other hand, allowing one to feel “surprise” towards “experience that is constantly being felt in the body” is one of the possibilities of an education of the body. Okui ultimately asserted the importance of “picking up the richness of experience in the body” for the purpose of constructing physical education (Okui, 2011, p. 120).

This pedagogical significance can be considered as
lying not in attempts to achieve educational goals through one-sidedly “working to bring out the abilities of the body,” but rather in the creation of interactive relations that allow for the possibility of feeling “surprise” due to the “experience” that is felt by the body; that is, the significance lies in the creation of “inter-corporality.” As is evident in his use of the phrase “feeling by the body,” this “surprise” is not in a figurative relationship with “knowledge.” Therefore, it would be more precise to call it “physical experience” (“taiken”) instead of “experience” (“keiken”). “Keiken,” in the sense of “conscious experience,” segmentizes and creates the world in terms of purpose-means relations, but “taiken” is a physical experience in which the boundaries separating the self and the world melt away, bringing about continuity with the world. It is possible to clearly describe the process of “keiken” while only sounds such as “ohh” or “ahh” can express surprising, moving “taiken” experiences. Thus, the distance between the subject and the object ceases to exist in “taiken,” resulting in the feeling of “surprise” that Okui discussed (refer to footnote 5). This “taiken,” which is a feeling of non-savoir “surprise” with the body in the context of “inter-corporality,” is indeed the “yokai-taiken” for which “physical education” as semantic generation aims.

Ishigaki’s proposal to restructure “inter-corporality” through “bodily feeling” in such a way that it contributes to an “interconnection” of humans called the “inter-corporal us” similarly aims for the creation and restructuration of a relation called “inter-corporality” in the context of physical education. This, as Okui put it, is not something that can be discussed in a framework that uses “knowledge” as a metaphor for the workings of the body, and neither is it the segmentization and production of a world in terms of purpose-means relations based on the “logic of development.” In the context of physical education, the importance of “inter-corporality” lies in the generation of “experience as non-savoir,” which does not require deliberate “cognitive operations” and is based on the relation of the bodies; that is, it is a “picking up” of the “richness of taiken (keiken) in the body,” and it is a bodily experience of non-savoir “surprise” (Okui, 2011). Its importance can be considered as lying in the attainment of “yokai-taiken,” which is a physical experience of becoming for which the “open body” aims. Therefore, “inter-corporal” education is an education of what the present study has discussed. That is to say, it is an education of the “open body” that is capable of melting the subject and recovering sovereignty; it is an education of the occurrence of “yokai-taiken,” which is a physical experience of conformity-sympathy and interaction between the self and another carried out through the unconscious “conformity with body schema” that is brought about by the “physical movement” of the “open body.” In addition, this education is a creation and restructuration of sympathetic and mutual relations (“inter-corporality”) between the bodies of the self and another to bring about “yokai-taiken.” This leads to “physical education” as semantic generation.

### 3.3. “Yokai-taiken” caused by “physical movement”

The following discussion on physical experiences, which took place at physical expression workshops, helps us understand “inter-corporality” as sympathetic, mutual relations between bodies. In an attempt to qualitatively explore “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body,” Kasahara and Yamamoto held two workshops (a chiropractic bodywork workshop and an improvisational dance workshop) to conduct fieldwork. They explained that these apparently different activities both provide the physical experience of the orientation of pleasure at an unconscious level from the self toward another, which, in the final stages, brings about a “pleasure of living inter-corporally” and a pleasure of “heading to a yokai-taiken and [a] relationship with another;” the two workshops ultimately share a “physical experience of feeling (living) together with another [as] a pleasure at an unconscious level felt inside the self – a physical experience of producing and sharing this pleasure through interaction” (Kasahara & Yamamoto, 2013, pp. 14-18). Kasahara and Yamamoto used the term “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” to refer to a relationship that involves what they observed through this fieldwork, including what they called “inter-corporal feeling,” “momentary sympathy with the movement of another,” and the “melting away of the distance between the self and another.” This can be considered an occurrence of a sympathetic, mutual relationship between bodies brought about by the formation and sharing of Ichikawa’s “inter-corporal body schema” between humans in the unconscious. At the same time, “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” is also a physical experience of feeling
shared meanings that were created by “bodily interaction” in the context of the “inter-corporality” Tanaka discussed.

This “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” is not accompanied by performance improvements as in the case of the “yokai-taiken” that is analogized by “experiencing flow” or “peak experience,” both of which occur principally in the practice of “physical movement” in the context of “sports (competition).” Nevertheless, it is a “yokai-taiken” occurring by the “inter-corporal conformity schema” of “physical movement.” In a case study of a bodywork for parents and children called “Dance to the Sound of the Drum” (trans.), Kasahara and Yamamoto noted that the participants reached a state that might be called what Yano referred to as “yokai-taiken” in which mutually independent but synchronized dancing led to a loss of the sense of distance and separation between the self and others (Kasahara & Yamamoto, 2013, p. 13). Regarding this, Kasahara and Yamamoto said that “Relationship is an interaction in the semi-conscious, intermediate range between, on one hand, the physical experience of the pleasure and joy that the body or the axis of the self desires, and on the other hand, the accompanying bodily consciousness that is a transformation of consciousness entering a level of the unconscious; these two feel pleasure from each other while producing pleasure for each other; this is relationship, and it is the (dynamic) state of relationship” (Kasahara & Yamamoto, 2013, p. 16).

“Yokai-taiken” is a “physical experience in which the walls separating the self from the outside world are removed and the self as though [sic] melts toward the object” (Yano, 1996, p. 217), and it is to “be involved with the world itself with the whole body, begin to live in the world, and feel continuity with the world” (Yano, 2006, p. 115). Based on Yano’s interpretation of “yokai-taiken,” it is possible to consider the “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” from Kasahara and Yamamoto’s fieldwork as a “yokai-taiken.” Yano did not discuss “sympathetic and mutual connection of bodies” in detail, but he said that “The body, which has various rhythms, sympathizes (kyoumei) with external rhythms, and this sympathy strikes down the boundaries between the self and the object” (Yano, 1996, p. 219), suggesting that “yokai-taiken” occurs through inter-corporal sympathy between bodies. Yano took a ball as an example of “media producing physical experiences of becoming,” and said that the ball not only triggers a transformation of physical skills or tactile sensations but also “opens up a non-ordinary world that is a co-bodily world formed by roles and responses toward others.” He said that a mutual connection between bodies allows a “world-experience beyond utility,” thus bringing about a “yokai-taiken” (Yano, 2013, p. 21). In this way, through the melting of the boundaries of the self, “yokai-taiken” allows the self to “melt into a large system of life (eco-system) that is beyond the self” (Yano, 1996, p. 221) or “transcend from a social system to an eco-system through conformity of the body schema” (Kubo, 2015, p. 628). In either case, “yokai-taiken” brings about a “physical experience of awakening” (Yano, 2000, p. 85), a “physical experience of a sense of [the] brimming fullness of life” (Yano, 2006, p. 120), and a “physical experience of life that transcends the worldly order’s principle of utility” (Yano, 2008, p. 48). As such, “physical movement” can bring about “yokai-taiken” in the context of “physical education” as semantic generation.

4. Conclusion: The nature of “physical-education” as semantic generation

This study has centered on the following three questions: i. How should we understand the “body” in the context of “physical education” as semantic generation? ii. What occurrences does “physical movement” cause? iii. What is the nature of a sympathetic, mutual relationship between the bodies of the self and others, and what does it generate? As a result of these enquiries, this study concluded that the “body,” in the context of physical education, can be considered an “open body” from which the subject has melted away and which is capable of recovering sovereignty. Furthermore, through practice of this “physical movement,” the “open body” is capable of bringing about an unconscious “conformity with body schema,” a physical experience of conformity-sympathy, and interaction between the self and others, all of which might be considered as activating mirror neurons. The sympathetic, interactive relationship between the self and others that brings about this physical experience is “inter-corporality,” and what generates there is a “taiken in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” or “yokai-taiken” (the experience of melting into the world). Based on these discursive results, this study will provide a conclusion as to the nature and possibility of “physical education” as semantic generation.
“Semantic generation” means to produce (generate) new meanings of the world, and “physical education” as semantic generation means producing new meanings in the context of an area of education that is called “physical education.” In this area of education, it is necessary to understand the body not as an object that is a physiological and material thing, but rather as an existing subject as the term “living body” implies. This body has a mutual relationship with the world, and it reflects a mode of existence called “open” that is capable of attaining “yokai-taiken,” which is a “non-savoir” experience. “Physical education” as semantic generation aims for educational development that is oriented toward this “open body.”

Humans’ “body schema” can be considered as conforming in the context of various kinds of “physical movements.” Therefore, “conformity with body schema” occurs in the context of “physical movements,” and conformity-sympathy and interaction between the bodies of the self and others occur as an “experience as non-savoir” that does not require deliberate “cognitive operations.” This sympathetic, mutual relationship between bodies is called “inter-corporality.” “Physical education” as semantic generation entails striving toward the creation and restructuring of this sympathetic, mutual relationship between the bodies of the self and others (“inter-corporality”).

Humans bring about “yokai-taiken” in the context of this interaction of bodies or “inter-corporality.” “Yokai-taiken” is a “physical experience in which [a] relationship is felt by the body” and in which a sympathetic, mutual relationship between bodies occurs in the unconscious. It is also a physical experience involving the perception of the shared meaning that is created by “bodily interaction” in the context of “inter-corporality.” “Physical education” as semantic generation is oriented toward bringing about “yokai-taiken” through the practice of such “physical movements.”

Notes
*1 Kubo used Yano’s semantic generation theory to criticize the “human formation in context of physical education” theory, discussing a setting of a dimension of “generation” (“becoming”) that is different from “formation” (Kubo, 2006, p. 11-17). He stated that this “education as becoming” is different from “forming” by “teaching-learning” (Kubo, 2009a, pp. 1-9). Kubo further argued that the “yokai-taiken” that Yano discussed is an experience of melting from the system of “society” into the “world (eco-system).” He then stated the importance of composing an “educational body-space” in which instructors and children have “mutuality” in the context of “education as becoming” (Kubo, 2010, pp. 1-9). Kubo further argued that there are important, physical experiences of semantic generation in moments of the practice of the “sports movement” that constitutes sports (Kubo, 2009b, pp.183-196), stating that it is necessary, in this context, to pay attention to the present of the children’s physical activity—the physical experience of the children’s moment itself—while utility as a means related to the future is unimportant (Kubo, 2013, pp. 13-22). Kubo also argued that “yokai-taiken” occurs through the conformity of body schema with the body of others, things, and the body of the self in the context of “sports movement.” He argued that this “yokai-taiken” transforms the relationship between the existences of the self and another from “Ich-Ex” to “Ich-Du,” and he stated that that is the composition of “semantic generation” (Kubo, 2015, pp. 617-633).

Fukazawa focused on the concept of “expanding experience,” which is similar to “yokai-taiken,” and he discussed its semantic generation, arguing that the foundation for nurturing social attitudes lies in communication mediated by physical movements (Fukazawa & Ishigaki, 2010, pp. 97-110; Fukazawa, 2016, pp. 117-132). Ishigaki discussed “bodily experience” in sports and says that an “inter-corporal us” forms in such context; he explored the possibilities of physical education curricula as an education of inter-corporality (Ishigaki, 2014, pp. 483-495). In an attempt to reevaluate Dewey’s concept of experience, Takahashi discussed the interaction between the body and the environment in the context of the “experience of sports” based on Yano’s concept of “world of becoming;” Takahashi then discussed the education of such interaction and the experiential value of sports (Takahashi, 2011a, pp. 297-311, 2011b, pp. 91-105). Based on Yano’s concept of “education as becoming,” Morita discussed and explored new possibilities of physical education curricula that affirm “the body as it is” (Morita, 2014, pp. 1-12). In addition, outside of the area of research on physical education and sports philosophy, there is also Moriyama’s study that examined the possibility of applying the concept of “semantic generation” to experience in the context of Japanese martial arts (Moriyama, 2013, pp. 225-241).

*2 Yano’s discussion included no direct reference to Merleau-Ponty, but Yano listed Merleau-Ponty’s literature in a note for a statement that the “living body” could be called the “body as the subject.” Yuasa also pointed out that Merleau-Ponty used the term “living body” to explain his thoughts on the subjective body; Yuasa said that this is the same as the psychological body that Yuasa himself proposed (Yuasa, 1997, p. 138). In addition, sports sociologist Kiku (2008) argued that sports research inspired by the phenomenological concept of “living body” has the potential to demonstrate the value of sports (Kiku, 2008, p. 68).

*3 Yano did not introduce the source of the term “open.” However, the fact that Yano discussed “becoming” suggests that the term “open” is related to Bergson’s terminologies “closed society,” “open society,” “closed moral,” and “open moral.” Kirita, who engaged in a discussion that was oriented toward a theory of becoming for human formation, presented ideas of “closed education” and “open education” based on Bergson’s “closed society” and “open society.” Kirita said that “open education” is characterized by “affect that is more than intellect” and is “education as becoming” (Kirita, 1994, p. 187). In addition, Sakuta, who also discussed becoming, mentioned Bergson as a thinker who clarified the distinction between Sakuta’s own ideas, namely “expanding experience” and
“yokai-taiken;” Sakuta argued that a “closed society” is one case of “expanding experience” while “open society” is related to “yokai-taiken” (Sakuta, 1995, pp. 7-8). Bergson’s term “open” signifies the creative freedom of an individual escaping from strong, pressure exerting constraints, and its use is therefore appropriate in discussions about “becoming.”

*4 Inagaki also did not introduce the source of the term “opened.” He wrote about “a rather unfamiliar-sounding expression called ‘body being opened’” (Inagaki, 2004, p. 60). One of the possible sources is Takeuchi’s expression “the body hiraku (cleaves, as in ‘cleaves open’).” In his discussion on the body of a “sarugaku actor” and the “dancing body,” Inagaki used the term “hirakareru (cleave)” and introduced it as a compelling idea that Takeuchi thought out (Inagaki, 2004, p. 70). (Takeuchi himself noted, “I do not spell the term ‘body’ in the same way as ‘shintai,’ like most others do.”) Takeuchi used the expression “the body cleaves (hiraku)” to refer to “the body’s transcendence beyond the self toward the world.” He said that “The body authentically works when it is forgotten and becomes empty, and this may be called ‘extase’” (Takeuchi, 1988, p. 27). Inagaki shared this idea in his body theory, which designated the “open” body as a major premise for “extase.” Takeuchi also introduced a therapeutic acting lesson, which he conducted himself as “an experiment to cleave (hiraku) the closed, ill, and deformed body toward others,” and he explained how the Japanese word for “human” is spelled with one character meaning “person” and another meaning “between,” saying that “This understands a person not as an individual unit but as something that implies relations between the self and others—between the myself and the world; I think this is a way of thinking that is very close to what Merleau-Ponty calls ‘intercorporeité.’” Hikaku, in that sense, is to recover the meaning of ‘human’” (Takeuchi, 1988, pp. 178-179). Regarding the meaning of Takeuchi’s “hirakareru” (cleave), Inagaki explained that “The cleaving of the body is the re-opening, through meeting a non-self other, of the ego that has closed by meeting a non-self existence that is not in the ego” (Inagaki, 2003, p. 96). From this, it is possible to think that Inagaki converted “cleave (hirakareru)” into his own argument as “open.”

*5 Yano discussed the difference between “keiken (conscious experience)” and “taiken (physical experience)” in a study that predates the essay that is quoted here. As a lecturer (presenter) at a symposium on “relationship” in the context of human formation (the 60th Annual Conference of Japanese Educational Research Association), Yano discussed the crisis of relationship in the context of education. In this lecture, he discussed the existence of “taiken” that is an experience, like the physical experience of play, that one can neither incorporate into the self nor express using ready-made words; he distinguished this “taiken” from “keiken,” which, in contrast, brings about development by incorporating various events into the self based on the “logic of development.” Yano then asserted that “yokai-taiken” brings about a dimension of “becoming” (Yano, 2002, pp. 49-51). Sakuta, who first discussed “yokai-taiken,” also designated the term “taiken” to describe “experience preceding consciousness,” and he asserted that, in “taiken,” “The entirety of the experience is continuous and impossible to divide;” taiken occurs in the world of becoming, and it cannot be recounted using the words of the intellect that follow the “logic of division” or “logic of stabilizing” (Sakuta, 1993, p. 28). In his paper, Kubo, who discussed “yokai-taiken” in the context of sports, introduced the differences between “keiken” and “taiken” that Yano and Sakuta pointed out, and he discussed the meaning of the term “taiken” in accordance with their views (Kubo, 2009b, p. 194). Similarly, Fukazawa, who compared “yokai-taiken” with “expanding experience,” understood the differences among the words and developed his discussion while renaming Sakuta’s “expanding experience” from “kakudai-taiken” (“expanding physical experience”) to “kakudai-keiken” (“expanding conscious experience”) (Fukazawa, 2016, p. 123).

*6 Bataille himself said that “By inner experience I understand that which one usually calls mystical experience: the states of ecstasy, of rapture, at least of meditated emotion.” However, he followed that by saying that this is not a “confessional” experience and that, for this reason, he does not prefer to use the word “mystical” (Bataille, 1970, p. 19). He further said that “inner experience” is ecstasy and is “communication, which is opposed to the ‘turning in on oneself”’ (Bataille, 1970, p. 38). This appears to be related to the situation that Inagaki described as “opened.”

*7 For example, in his discussion on the “body that becomes,” Kameyama said that athletes’ “yokai-taiken” are the same as “experiencing flow” in the sense that they are “pure experiences related to [the] creation of movements of the body” (Kameyama, 2012, p. 34). Kameyama further argued that “experiencing flow” is a mystical, physical experience, such as when “the ball appears to stop in midair;” it is a physical experience in which the “boundaries separating the body and the outside world melt away,” and it is a “physical experience of the outside of the world” (Kameyama, 2012, pp. 139-140). Such “yokai-taiken” occurring through “sports movement” is often discussed as physical experiences that are accompanied by performance improvement. Kubo pointed out that, in the world of sports, experiences, such as “experiencing flow” or “peak experience,” are discussed in relation to “yokai-taiken,” especially with psychological approaches. Kubo said that “Despite the fact that such experiences are often discussed (especially when discussed in relation to sports movement) as a certain psychological state related to improved performances, “yokai-taiken” signifies a state of existence of humans.” He then pointed out that “yokai-taiken” is not exclusively experiences in which highly-skilled, athletic performances take place (Kubo, 2009b, p. 194).

*8 Takizawa said that, through the practice of movement, one lives in the world as a “body.” In order to do so, he said, activity as the “body” that is not an objective body is necessary, but many people do not realize this. He stated that everyday life is a continuous series of practicing movements to fulfill intentions by tangibly interacting with things or others (Takizawa, 2016, p. 4). The “physical movement” dealt with in the present study does not mean only the “physical movement” practiced in the context of “sports (competition);” it also implies the “practice of movement in daily life” and the general “physical movement” that Takizawa discussed.
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