
Rebels or Conventionalists?

Source Critic Scholarship in Early-Modern Japan[‡]

Eiji Takemura
竹村 英二

The author intends to give in this paper a brief picture of scholarly development in Tokugawa Japan that preceded the modern era, with which to show the intellectual climate prevalent there then. The evidential scholarship in early-modern Japan, with the utmost inner sanctity of conscience, went into the root of matters through independent enquiries into the ideas and thoughts as well as the surroundings of the ancient world. This mode of scholarship had ‘emancipated’ Confucianism from dogmatism, and laid a solid methodological platform for the nation’s modern ‘scientific’ scholarship, including historiography. The c.17th and c.18th Japan also saw the flourish of methodological variety that contributed to enlarge the scope of scholarship.

History study remained highly evidentially-oriented in Japan right into the twentieth century, but, the evidential scholarship, once the ‘protagonists’ of the academe, has become conventional exclusionist. Attempts will be made toward the end of this paper to apply different methodologies to tackle this problematic.

Old Habits Die Hard

The Revolution (‘Restoration’?) of 1868 has also been perceived as the “great dividing range” of academic systems in Japan: regarded as the start of its ever-progressing, irreversible drive of “Westernisation” in both institutional and methodological terms, whereas the old ‘Confucian’ academies, once the educational core of the elite population then, had all the sudden been labelled as the “college of useless knowledge”; *Doctor Mirabilis* (dr. marvellous) taught at those schools, preoccupied almost solely with interpretive and commentary work of Confucian classics, suddenly lost their jobs.*¹

Notwithstanding, one must *not* ignore the very existence of the underlying ‘proto-’ or ‘quasi-scientific’ methods that emerged *within* that old, dull, and monotonous Confucian scholarship in the c.18th and c.19th Japan; the ‘evidential Confucianism’ as it is briefly termed provided the scholars of the new era with a solid methodological ground for ‘scientific’ development of modern subjects in Japan.*²

In the c.19th it was the forefront method that had made a great range of field of study, including history, to a truly ‘professional’ one.*³ In East Asia, evidential scholarship emerged within the realm of Confucian study.*⁴ It involved an objective textual criticism grounded on a detailed editorial and variant studies, historical chronology, grammar, phonetics, prosody and lexicography and other notable academic tools.

Evidential Scholarship: The ‘Rebels’, Not the ‘Ancien Conventionalists’

a) *Confucianism and the evidential scholarship in c.17th and c.18th Japan*

Confucianism had been more or less the ‘pillar thought’ in East Asia for two millennia or more, though the degree of its actual influence on the real life of the people there varied from one another within the region. So-called ‘Neo-Confucianism’ loomed as the Song Dynasty emerged (960-1276), which culminated in the thought of Chu Hsi (1130-1200). That Chu Hsi Neo-Confucianism had been endorsed by the successive dynasties since then, and dominated the scholarly scene in and around China from the c.12th onwards^{*5}, and imposed high moral and ethical teaching on the society (like Catholic “official” thought did at times). The criticism of which was rare in China. In Korea accusers were often executed. In Tokugawa Japan (1603-1867), in contrast, the situation was a bit different.

Ito Jinsai (1627-1704) was a Confucian scholar born to a wealthy merchant family of Kyōto. His meticulously detailed study of the difference of style of writing and the use of terms between the Canons of pre-Han (before BC206), Han-precepts, and Chu Hsi’s account has culminated in the unveiling of *logos*-centric “deconstruction” of Confucianism by the hand of Chu Hsi.^{*6} Jinsai also denounced Chu Hsi for his inclusion of Buddhist thought within the realm of Confucian cosmology and practise; through these Jinsai denounces Chu Hsi for his total alteration of the nature of ‘original’ Confucian thought.^{*7}

He also attacked *Doctrine of the Mean* (中庸) as a mere extract chapter of the *Book of Rite* that appeared in Early Han (BC206-AD8), and was *not* the account written by Confucius (552-479BC) himself.^{*8} Jinsai’s affirmation as such stunned the East Asian intellectual world, for Song Neo-Confucianism had long been the ‘official’ thought endorsed by the successive monarchies, and the *Mean* was recognised as one of the Canons in the thought, and which author was believed to had been Confucius himself.

Ogyu Sorai (1666-1728) also conducted a strict source criticism of Confucian texts, and fiercely attacked Neo-Confucianism for the involvement of important elements of Buddhist thought despite Song Neo-Confucians’ criticism of it at superficial level, and restored the status of the old ‘Six Cannons’ (*Rikkei*: 詩、書、礼、樂、春秋、易) above the *Four Books*, the Canons which were then regarded as the most important in Neo-Confucianism.^{*9}

Nakai Riken (1732-1817)’s denunciation of the forged texts of *Shangshu* (尚書) was one of the foremost example of the standard of source criticism of the day; it was the highest not only within East Asia but the entire world.^{*10}

The three raised above are only a few examples of the works by Japanese Confucians of the age. Noteworthy here is that their denunciation of Canons were grounded on meticulously detailed source criticism, the equivalent of which could be found only in *Annales Ecclesiastici* by Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609)’s historical chronology^{*11}, and the works by English classical philologists such as Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626) and Richard ‘Dutch’ Thomson (1569-1613). Nowhere in the world, there existed evidential scholarship that

openly denounced the forged texts, even those of the Canons, except in the early c.17th and c.18th Europe (mostly ‘Western’ Europe) and Japan; Not in other parts of Europe to my knowledge, nor in India or in the Islamic World.*¹²

Behind the emergence of those ‘rational’ and ‘free-thinking’ academics there was an extensive growth of a nation-wide market economy in c.18th Japan, that gradually and steadily eroded the static social system of the *Ancien* system that prevailed the first-half of the Tokugawa period*¹³; and the academics incubated in that environment had, in turn, contributed to generate the intellectual temperament for free-thinking. In fact, there emerged a bunch of Confucian-derived none-the-less free thinkers, whose thought had not been restrained by the hard-line Confucian ideological ‘fettters’, that had often constrained the Chinese literati of the similar age.

b) Medical studies and the ‘nativist’ school

Not only Confucianism, Japanese medical study in the Edo period (1603-1867) showed an extensive development of evidential and/or empirical elements; traditionally, the nation had long adopted the Chinese medicine, *Kanpo*, but the body examination and experimental treatment became the chief ingredient of the Japanese medicine particularly after 1700. At the time when the body examination was strictly prohibited in East Asian states for ethical reasons, *Koito* (古医方) medical specialists in Japan, being acquainted also with Western (mainly Dutch) medicine, went to convicts concentration camps, and vigorously pursued body examination of those executed convicts. Such a medical practice had become a substantial trend in Japanese medical scene.*¹⁴

Roughly from the second half of the c.17th we see the emergence of the so-called ‘nativist’ school in Japan, that focussed on the study of the “origins” of Japan and the legitimacy of the imperial lineage. Often too busy with the uncovering of the legitimacy of the imperial family of Japan, and how “mystical”, wonderous, and special the ‘native’ developments in Japan were, and thus necessarily quite often maintained hardline stance to wipe off evidences that might undermine the ‘fine and clear’ imperial legitimacy, they were nonetheless extensively evidential.*¹⁵

Their attitude may be termed “evidential-ideological”, and comparable to the attitude of the French Catholic priests/scholars who edited the monumental works such as *Acta Sanctrum* in seventeenth century France. One might also point out their resemblance to August Boeckh’s philology that covertly but vigorously advocates German ‘nationalistic’ temperament.*¹⁶

As thus, we identify a strong trend geared toward evidential scholarship not only in Confucianism but in medical study, and the Tokugawa nativists, though the “objectiveness” of that nativist school is under question. They all represent the scholarly sentiment (or temperament) of the Japanese academe of the time, of the ‘early-modern’ Japan, that, in turn, altogether consortedly contributed to the development of highly-evidential nature of Japanese

scholarship in the following modern period.

c) Varieties of scholarship in c.18th Japan

The Japanese society in the c.18th also saw a much stronger and “wilder” critique of the dominant conservative approaches, that triggered a fundamental shift of the mode of thought: The abovementioned Sorai was virtually the first to have positively recognised diachronic progression of time in textual criticism as early as in the late c.17th, advocating the awareness of the time lapse in the study of the past. His notion of time had also led him to make an important linguistic contribution that eventually improved the standard of textual study dramatically. So conscious of the difference between the past language (古語、古言) and that of the present, he attempted, though immature the trial was, a keen investigation into the old language and the surroundings (environment) that constructed it.

He was also the pioneer in scrutinising the fundamental difference of text comprehension between the native Chinese and that of the non-natives^{*17}: The notions of ‘source language’ and ‘target language’, and on which the weight of translation to be posed, are the key elements of translation studies of today. At Sorai’s time nobody was concerned with them. Chinese characters are not simply the phonetic symbols but ideogram that visual form carry meanings. This fact poses a much more fundamental and complicated problem than a simple centre-vernacular and/or *langue/parole* problems. Every single letter carries meanings, and each character is often much more complicated in form than Roman and other European signs. To comprehend the Chinese texts of this nature, scholars outside China practised peculiar form of reading, often involved different pronunciation and different literal order that had evolved in each region and practised there. Japanese Scholars read the Chinese texts in Japanese *kundoku* method, in which the pronunciation was considerably different, and order of words changed to native order.

This is convenient for non-natives, but, is alien to the original (or ‘source’) linguistic mode. At Sorai’s time, scholars were busy to ‘translate’ the text written in the source language ‘properly’ to their native language, and, to the *native code*, which was, in other words, the *appropriating* of the original into the *vernacular code*.^{*18}

In an academic circumstance like this, Sorai went to the opposite direction: Virtually, he was the very first to have ‘invented’ the methods of comprehension for a more thorough and genuine understanding of nuances and meanings of the foreign text written in ‘source language’, that led him to ‘discover’ also the epistemological propensities inherent in different linguistic mode. Such a high concern of Sorai with the language of old and foreign had brought about a total change in comprehension through deconstruction of methods; all these had hardly been noticeable even for ‘native’ Chinese scholars.

All these approaches devised by Sorai discussed above had dramatically renewed the methodologies for text reading, and, through which, the understanding of the past. Sorai’s

notions of time and his high linguistic awareness is already exposed in his account in 1690s, and his disciples elaborated it in the first half of the c.18th.

The late c.18th to c. 19th saw a further renewal of old academic culture. Yamagata Bantō (1748-1821) was an ex-merchant Confucian, a disciple of Nakai Riken. He demonstrates his 'rational' and evidential attack on the early mythical Shintō constructs in his book, *Yume no shiro*. Tominaga Nakamoto (1715-1746) was a predecessor of Bantō and Riken at *Kaitokudō*, an independent school of higher learning in the merchant city of Osaka. He stunned the Buddhist monks in the early c.18th by advocating that there existed *no* account written by Buddha himself; all Buddhist texts available to this day were written by his successors, he argued, and denounced the authenticity of the thought system. This necessarily generated a hard-line rebuttal by Buddhists on Nakamoto, which caused, at least partially, his early death at 31.

Ando Shōeki (1703-1762) expands his thesis of the agrarian based egalitarian society, and, though in covert mode, denied the existence of the 'ruling class' in the society. Miura Baien (1723-1789)'s theory of economy was one of the foremost of the age.

Like in other areas, there existed the 'conservative' intellectuals in Japan, that might have constituted the 'majority' of the intellectual scene. But, as above, due in part by the ever-advancing economy of the society, the 'rationalisation' of the intellectual climate progressed substantially in Japan in the c.18th onwards, that functioned to cast away dogmatism that often prevailed the thoughts of Confucianism and Buddhism in other areas of East Asia.

d) Evidential scholarship and 'modern' historiography

Kume Kunitake (1839-1931) was a modern historian of Meiji whose academic foundation was the evidential Confucianism. He harshly denied the existence of the early Japanese emperors. In an article published in 1892 he labelled the first five emperors, usually recognised by Shintoists as the 'founding fathers of Japan', as mere 'mythical creatures'.^{*19} Tsuda Sōkichi (1873-1961) also dismissed *Kojiki*, the 'Canon' of Shintoists, as an account with a considerable amount of forgeries. Kume was attacked severely by ultra-Shintoists for lese-majesty, and later forced to leave Tōkyō University eventually. A similar denunciation was inflicted on Tsuda in pre-war Japan, which resulted in his resignation of Waseda professorship.^{*20}

As such, there existed 'rebellious', and/or 'protagonist' scholars of new methods in early-modern Japan for the sake of the truth. They eradicated the scholarship of the stubborn 'Neo-Confucians' and nativists who remained blindly obedient to the assigned ethical teaching based on forged texts. Similarly, at the start of the modern Meiji period (1868-1911), the evidential scholars of Japanese history fought against historical works that were grounded on untrustable myths, and attempted to established a 'modern' historiography.

Academic institutions, the ‘agents’ of professional historiography, and the methodological development

Tōkyō University was founded in 1877, ten years after the commencement of the new Meiji government; it later became Tōkyō ‘Imperial’ University with multi-faceted faculty system, which became Tōkyō University again after the WWII (1945). History study programme was introduced at its very start (in 1877), but it was under the ‘Philosophy and Politics Department’. It was led not by a professional historian, but by Toyama Shōichi, a scholar of the realm of study that may be termed “civilisational” history^{*21}; the programme was in many ways alien to historiography, and, inadequate as ‘professional’ subject.

Indeed, the first decade of the Meiji era (roughly, 1868-1889) did not see a substantial development of professional historiography; only the works of the likes of Francois Guizot, Henry Thomas Buckle, and G.Zerffi, usually categorised as the ‘enlightenment thinkers’ (and/or “civilisational historians”), were introduced.

It was not until 1889 when that Tōkyō University expanded substantially and added the term ‘Imperial’, equipped with the Department of History within the College of Literature, that the Japanese historiography acquired a firm ground on which the subject was set to develop as a truly systematic, professional subject.

Important to note here is that the ‘agents’, the scholars who engineered the professionalisation of historiography at the early stage of its development in Japan were the Confucians, or, more specifically, the ‘evidential Confucians’ who substantially succeeded the methodological core of the objective textual criticism, historical chronology, lexicography and other notable academic tools of ‘modern’ scholarship that may be seen on a par with the ‘Rankean’ source criticism.^{*22}

As stated the two centuries prior to the West approaching the Japanese archipelago (approx. ca. 1650-1850) saw a massive and innovative evolution of textual criticism among the Japanese evidential Confucians, that had marked the departure of the subject from being rhetorical or literary *per se*. The textual criticism of Jinsai and Sorai was furthered by their disciples, namely by Dazai Shundai (1680-1747), Nemoto Bui (1699-1764), Yamanoi Kanae (1690?-1728), and Jinsai’s sons. Their works were received vigorously by Qing China scholars and literati, and duly had a substantial impact on the direction and quality of evidential scholarship there.^{*23}

The scholarly dynamism was also fuelled in part by the looming ‘Western knowledge’ in the first half of the c.18th, but I must stress here that the influence was ‘partial’; for the early-modern reception of the so-called ‘Western knowledge’ was virtually limited in Japan to that of medicine; military and other scholarship also arrived, some directly and some via China, but in many cases that effect was extremely marginal. Nonetheless, the scholars within the Japanese archipelago began to work across disciplines far more intensively than ever before, in much “freer” mode, that eventually nurtured new methods to approach old texts: they began to shift to highly empirical approaches to texts, and employ a strikingly new discursive idiom and

present their ideas in what were often new genres of scholarly writing.

It was on this firm evidential background that the scholars of the new era of Meiji (1868~) started to work on the renewal of the scholarship: the three ex-Confucian evidential scholars, Shigeno Yasutsugu (1827-1910), Kume Kunitake (1839-1910), and Hoshino Hisashi (1839-1917), had simultaneously become the first history professor of Tōkyō Imperial University. Shigeno and Kume were both disciples of Yasui Sokken (1799-1876) and Shionoya Tōin (1809-1867), renowned evidential Confucians in the closing years of the Edo period (1603-1867). Those two ex-Confucians and Hoshino, another disciple of Shionoya, had all contributed to establish highly-empirical, evidence-based historical scholarship during the years of their service at the University. Present Historiographical Institute (史料編纂所) of the University of Tokyo duly succeeds this tradition, and their mode of historical research has still been the methodological stereotype shared among the vast majority of scholars at history department of Japanese universities.*²⁴

The peculiar path of development

This ‘continuity’ appears quite contrastive to the situation of a nation or a region with long scholarly tradition of a different kind: For invariably the c.18th and c.19th saw a massive refurbishment, or, more specifically, the destruction of scholarly tradition that had by then constituted a long and solid cultural heritages of the world. The Sanskrit tradition, for instance, went through a substantial change; Sheldon Pollock argues in *Sanskrit Knowledge System on the eve of Colonialism*, 2001, that

‘Concurrent with the spread of European power in the mid-eighteenth century, ‘the tradition of Sanskrit systematic thought - which for two millennia or more constituted one of the most remarkable cultural formations in world history - had more or less vanished as a force in shaping Indian intellectual life, to be replaced by other kinds of knowledge based on different principles of knowing and acting in the world.’*²⁵

Pollock apparently suggests here that that ‘other kinds of knowledge’ that were based on ‘different principle’ was that of the West, namely, the philology that saw an extensive and continuous development from the Renaissance and culminated in German philology of the nineteenth century. Indeed, the present-day history study in India has been dominated by distinguished Indian historians educated in Oxford or Cambridge. Not only the Sanskrit tradition, many scholarly traditions went through an “all-change” situation, that necessarily inflicted changes also on historical writing.

In contrast to the abovementioned picture of Indian philology, one could argue that the evidential scholarship of early-modern Japan not only ‘survived’ but gave a solid platform for the development of modern historiographical study. It may also be added that this trend

of Japanese scholarship of the c.17th to c.19th was quite distinct from Chinese and other East Asian development.

The dominance of evidential scholarship and Japanese historiography

Shibata Michio argues that the dominance of evidential historiography was just temporary, lasted roughly just for a decade only, from 1882 when the editorial project of the famous *The Chronological History of Japan* (『大日本編纂史』) had started to 1893 when that was stopped. He proclaims that the evidential historiography gave way to the emergence of other historical methodologies. *²⁶ Surely economic history was introduced by European educated historians such as Uchida Ginzō, and Fukuda Tokuzō who studied under Lujo Brentano. German historical philosophy was introduced by Uchida, Inoue Tetsujirō, a philosopher, and other scholars who studied in Germany and France in late-nineteenth century. Miura Shin'shichi studied at Leipzig from 1903-1911, and contributed substantially to the founding of Faculty of Social Science at Hitotsubashi University, which strong aim was the introduction of alternative historiography to the 'orthodox' programme practised at Tōkyō University and other major historical institutions. *²⁷

They all “imported” historical methodologies available in Europe by then, and attempted to institutionalise methods in university faculties and other academic circumstances.

The author (I), however, do not believe that the case was not that simple: The school that overtly practise almost exclusively the evidential historiography was dominant even after the 1890s in major academic institutions. An almost unnecessary meticulousness of textual criticism and other evidential methods have been overly emphasised in the scholarship, recognised not only as the ‘primary’ method but the ‘sole’ element to be excessively and exclusively concerned and practised by historians. It had indeed been dominant in Imperial Universities right into the twentieth century and today, and has been taught at the Japanese *ecole normale* (‘shihan gakkō’) that produced history teachers who were scattered all over Japan and taught the subject in schools nationwide. “Major” historical journals such as *Shigaku Zasshi* and *Nihonshi Kenkyū* are predominantly evidential, and have “covert” agreement that turns down articles that are not evidentially orientated: even evidentially ‘sufficient’ theoretical papers were often rejected for the lack of style common among ‘orthodox’ historiography.

In 1940 Tsuda Sōkichi, a distinguished intellectual historian, advocated the importance of multi-disciplinary approach to history, involving social, political, and legal studies, ethnographic study of the ‘real’ life of the people, the natural and geographical environment that surround the people (society), peculiar linguistic situation, and even psychology that to jointly enlarge the scope of the subject. *²⁸ Such words of his may illustrate an element of methodological diversity and maturity of history study in Japan by the first quarter of the 20th century, and, indeed, might sound identical with Lucien Febvre's desperate call for the effective intermingling of disciplines, and the scholarship shared among *Annales* members. But,

in reality, that trend for the renewal of historiography then was marginal.

Evidential Scholarship: Not the ‘Rebels’, but the ‘Ancien Conventionalists’?

In France, for instance, academic journals that decisively triggered the enlarging of the scope of disciplines came one after another in the late c.19th; *Annales de geographie* (1891), *Revue de synthese historique* (1900), and Emile Durkheim’s *L’annee sociologique* (1898) are a few examples. The movement started by Henri Berr, and flourished in Febvre and Marc Bloch that culminated in the publication of *Annales d’histoire economique et sociale* in 1929 was surely the key cornerstone of the methodological renewal of the day. In Japan, in contrast, the ‘individual’ effort made by the abovementioned scholars had never been consolidated into a massive wave of renewal; rather, it remained singular move, and did not last long enough to lay a substantial platform for a drastic change.

On the other hand, the evidential scholarship continued to dominate historical scene, though it had by then become more or less a dull, monotonous, repetitive and too predictable conservatism. They remain indifferent to methodologies available, and often “gently” reject every possibility for disciplinary intermingling and/or merger, confining themselves with textual works. Why, and how, have they become so conservative? Why has the situation that surrounded history study in Japan stagnated in such a way?

Sectionalism, ‘Otherness’ and Alienation in History Study in Japan

Here we may have to distinguish the ‘institutional’ elements in the development of historiography on the one hand, and, on the other, more or less an ‘habitual’ or normative heritages that determine, or, ‘covertly dominate’ the trend of scholarly activities. It is indeed the problem centred around evidential scholarship, but to tackle the abovementioned problematic, we need a different approach.

Anthropologists point out a rigid sectionalism in Japanese society in general that surely has root to the ‘insular’ *mentalité* attributable to her geographical and geo-political situation. Sociologists advocate the existence of strong ‘family-orientation’ that impose normative enforcement for social submission. Those theses may still have a certain applicability in present day in explaining the behavioural patterns of scholars and the mechanism of their action, but those are *cliché*. The author is strongly motivated to carry out the analysis of the peculiar pattern of interactive processes between the individuals, the mode of analysis that may involve elements of psychology, and, even phenomenology.

The publication of Edmund Husserl’s *The Phoenomenology of Intersubjectivity* (1929) had for the first time brought the concepts of ‘other-awareness’, and intersubjectivity into central concern of philosophical problematic, and has since then been used or referred to extensively when analysing the problems of thought and action of individuals that are in many phases determined by normative and societal factors.

The notion of, or ‘conception’ of, intersubjectivity was much more fundamental than a mere note that human beings react reciprocally and/or mutually. Husserl inquires into how a specific state of affairs comes about, how selves and others inter-act to create a shared world, and, in an ultimate sense, the “cultural” world.

Intersubjectivity involves communication of verbal and non-verbal sorts, interactions between experiences and knowledges of both actual and imaginative, a dialectic cycle of change of notions, all of which are combined to generate a certain commonsense and societal beliefs within self also. One of Husserl’s chief concerns was the inquiry into the potential existence of motivations of sense that create the sense of others *within* the (my)self.

How the historians in Japan “interact” among themselves? What are the determining factors that dictate master-pupil correspondences in creating historiography? What peculiar mode of inter-human exchanges are identifiable in the light of Husserl’s assumptions? The exploration of those elements with the involvement of various “non-historiographic” methodologies would be the chief problem to be tackled shortly.

‡ This paper grew out of the lecture text that was presented by the author at the International Study Meeting of the International Commission for the History and Theory of Historiography (ICHTH), held at Tallinn University, Estonia, 24-25 August, 2018. The Meeting was sponsored by EU Regional Development Fund, and by Tallinn University. The author is thankful to useful comments of the participants of the Meeting, especially to Professors Ewa Domanska, President of ICHTH, Herman Paul of Leiden, and M. Sato.

Notes:

- * 1 Unfortunately not much detailed study of this subject is available in English literature. In Japanese much detailed study of educational reform, the subjects taught at schools, and the evolutionary process of higher educational and research institutions exist in abundance in the field of historical and educational studies. Apart from individual research, good overview of the subject could be obtained from, i.e., *Kyouiku no Taikei* (vol. 6 of the series volume of *Nihon Kindai Shiso Taikei*, Iwanami Shoten, 1990), and several landmark monographs by Tsujimoto Masashi. On Confucianism and Confucian scholars in their difficulties in 1870s, Miura Kanae’s *Meiji no Kangaku* (Kyuuiko Shoin, 1998) provides a good overview. For the evolution of Kangaku, chapters of Yasui Kotaro’s classic work, *Nihon Jugakushi* (Fusanbo, 1939) is still useful.
- * 2 The importance of this scholarly foundation has been utterly pointed out already in the pre-war period by such preeminent scholars as Yoshikawa Kōjirō, Kanō Naoki, and Takeuchi Yoshio. See for instance Yoshikawa (1969), *Yoshikawa Kōjirō Zenshū* (Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō). Takeuchi (1939). *Rongo no kenkyū*; also his ‘Enkyō Dokushoki’ (1948). Both are later compiled in vols.1 and 10 of his *Takeuchi Yoshio Zenshu* (vols. 1-10, 1978-79) (Tōkyō: Kadokawa Shoten). The detailed study of the methodological elements of evidential

Confucianism that functioned as crucial for modern human science subjects in Japan is discussed in the author's *Edo Ko'ki Jusha no Filologi'i* (Kyōto, Shibunkaku Shuppan, 2016).

- * 3 Sheldon Pollock, 'Introduction', *World Philology*, 2015.
- * 4 For this development in China, see Elman, Benjamin A. (2009), Elman (2002), and his monumental *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China* (1984).
- * 5 Numerous books on the development of Confucianism for centuries, and on Chu Hsi Neo-Confucianism exist in Japanese. To name but a few recent works: Tsujida Kenjirō, *Jukyo Nyumon*, University of Tōkyō Press, 2011, Watanabe Yoshihiro, *Jukyo to Chyugoku*, Kōdansha Press, 2010.
- * 6 Insightful study of this element of Jinsai's thought is unveiled in several works. Recent works include Koyasu Nobukuni, *Jinsai-gaku Kōgi: 'Gomō Jigi' wo Yomu*, Perikan-sha, 2015.
- * 7 Yoshikawa Kōjirō was probably the first who highlighted this, which illustrate an element of intellectual openness and forefrontness of Confucian thinkers particularly in Kinai region (centred around Kyōto and ōsaka. See Yoshikawa (1969).
- * 8 Jinsai's unveiling of this was pointed out initially by Yoshikawa also (1969).
- * 9 See for instance Kanō (1927).
- * 10 For the standard of Nakai's textual criticism, see Takemura (2016).
- * 11 See for instance Grafton, A. (2009), *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press). For detailed textual criticism of the *Ecclesiastici*, see A. Grafton and Joanna Weinberg (2011), *I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue: Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- * 12 A grandois work of comparative philology is Pollock, S., B. A. Elman, *et.al.* (eds., 2015), *World Philology*.
- * 13 Literature on economic history of the Tokugawa period, especially that of the c.18th and onwards exists in abundance in Japanese: Iwanami Koza series is still particularly dependable on this subject.
- * 14 Machi Senjuro, Peter F. Kornicki, and Benjamin Elman produce important articles on Japanese medicine. See for instance Machi's 'Yamawaki Toyo and the School of Sorai--On the Reprinting Waitai Miyaofang' published in Vol. 50 『日本中國學會報』 (1998).
- * 15 Literature do exist in abundance on *kokugaku* subject, though the readers need to be conscious of those with fanatic and/or ultra-nationalistic nature. Maeda Tsutomu's bulky book *Edo Koki no Shiso Kuukan* (Perikan-sha, 2009) is not concerned solely with *kokugaku*, but provides a grandois view of the state of the thought in the era.
- * 16 See Eto Hiroyuki (2013), 'Kokugaku as "Philologie": Reception and Understanding of "Philologie" of Tsunetsugu Muraoka and Yaichi Haga', *Kokusai Bunka Kenkyuuka Ronshu* (21).
- * 17 The first person who highlighted this element of Sorai's perception was, yet again, Yoshikawa Kojiro. See his account on *Yakubun Sentei* (譯文筌蹄) compiled in his *Zenshū* (Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō).
- * 18 *Yakubun Sentei* (譯文筌蹄), Suharaya, 1715 (kept by the author). The introductory part of this indicates that this was first accounted for by Sorai himself as early as in the mid-1690s.
- * 19 Kume, *Shinto wa Saiten no Kozoku*, first published in 1891 and reprinted in *Shikai* in the following year.
- * 20 A merciless attack on such purely historiographical, objective, and, in many respects, 'scientific' studies by those scholars illustrate how complicated the process of "modernisation" of the scholarship from the late-Meiji to early-Showa Japan was.
- * 21 For the developmental process of history study department in early Japanese universities, see *The Supplementary of Iwanami Koza Sekai Rekishi*, Iwanami Shoten, 2000.
- * 22 Kume, Shigeno, and Hoshino all argue that the Confucian study method formed their disciplinary foundation. Shigeno even argues that the Confucian methodological foundation was "superior" to Rankean textual criticism. See Shigeno (1938-39), *Shigeno hakase sigaku ronbunshū* (Tōkyō: Yuzankaku). Tanaka

Sui'ichiro is another example for this.

- * 23 See Kanō Naoki (1927), *Shinagaku bunsō* for the trans-East China Sea scholarly exchanges, and the impact made by the works of Japanese Confucians mainly through the book transport.
- * 24 See *The Supplementary of Iwanami Koza Sekai Rekishi*, op.cit., for the develop- mental processes.
- * 25 The proposal article that includes this passage is available on the web:
<http://www.columbia.edu/itc/mealac/pollock/sks/proposal.html>
- * 26 Shibata in *The Supplementary of Iwanami Koza Sekai Rekishi*, op.cit.
- * 27 See Saito Osamu (2015), 'A Very Brief History of Japan's Economic and Social History Research' (Paper presented for XVIIth World Economic History Congress, August, 2015).
- * 28 Collected Works of Tsuda, v.21, pp.347-8. Here Tsuda refers especially to the study of Chinese history and classics, but his strong concern with the enlarging of the scope of approaches has been manifested everywhere.

Bibliography:

(Japanese names are listed in native order: surname first, given name second)

- Elman, Benjamin A. (2009), 'One classic and two classical traditions' *Monumenta Nipponica* Vol.64-1, Tokyo: Sophia University.
- _____ (2002), 'The search for evidence from China', Joshua A. Fogel (ed.), *Sagacious Monks and Bloodthirsty Warriors* (CT (US): EastBridge).
- _____ (1984), *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Grafton, Anthony and Joanna Weinberg (2011), *I Have Always Loved the Holy Tongue: Isaac Casaubon, the Jews, and a Forgotten Chapter in Renaissance Scholarship* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Grafton, A. (2009), *Worlds Made by Words: Scholarship and Community in the Modern West* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- _____. (1991), *Defenders of the Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Haga Yaichi (1928), *Haga Yaichi Ichō. Nihon bunkengaku, bunpōron, rekisimonogatari* (Tokyo: Fuzanbō).
- Hamaguchi Fujio (1994), *Shindai kōshōgaku noshisouteki kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kokusyokankokai).
- Hōgetsu Keigo, Takahashi Masahiko (Eds.) (1986), *Nihon kobunshogaku no tenkai*. Vol. 1 of *Nihon kobunshogaku ronshū* (Tōkyō: Yoshikawakōbunkan).
- Iggers, G.G. (1997), *Historiography in the twentieth century: from scientific objectivity to the post-modern challenge* (Hanover, NH, 1997).
- Imai Toshiki (1939), "Seiyō shigaku no honpō shigaku ni ataetaru eikyō". Shigakukai (Ed.) *Honpō shigaku shi ronsō, gekan* (Tōkyō: Fuzanbō).
- Inoue Susumu (2011), *Min shin gakujutsu hensen shi: Syuppan to dentou gakuzyutu no rinkaiten*. (Tōkyō: Heibonsha).
- Kanō Naoki (1927), *Shinagaku bunsō* (Kyōto: Kōbundō).
- _____ (1984), *Shinchō no Seido to Bungaku* (Tōkyō: Misuzu Shobō).
- Kinoshita Tetsuya (1996), *Shindai Kōshōgaku to sono Jidai* (Tōkyō: Sōbunsha).
- Kōda Shigetomo (1979), *Shoshigaku no Hanashi* (Tōkyō: Seiidō Shoten).
- Kojima Tsuyoshi (1999), *Sōgaku no keisei to tenkai* (Tōkyō: Sōbunsha).
- Kondō Mitsuo (1987), *Shinchō kōshōgaku no kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Kenbun Shuppan).
- Kornicki, P. F. (2014), 'The Vernacularization of Buddhist Texts: From the Tangut Empire to Japan, B.A.Elman (ed.),

- Rethinking East Asian Languages, Vernaculars, and Literacies, 1000-1919* (Leiden: Brill)
- Kume Kunitake (1890), Later compiled in *Kume Kunitake Rekishi chosaku shū* (Tōkyō: Yoshikawakōbunkan).
- Kurita Mototsugu (1928), *Sōgō Nihonshi Gaisetsu* (Tōkyō: Chubunkan Shoten).
- _____ (1935-36), *Sōgō Kokushi Kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Dōbun Shoin).
- Lepper, Marcel (2012), *Philologie zur Einführung* (Hamburg: Junius).
- Lin Ching-chang (1983), *Mingdai Kaojuxue Yanju*, (Taipei: Xuesheng Shuju).
- Lin Ching-chang (1990), *Qingchu Qunjing Bianweixue* (Taipei: Wenjin Chuban She).
- Maeda Tsutomu (2009), *Edo kōki no shisō kūkan* (Tōkyō: Perikansha).
- McMullen, I. J. (2001), 'Ogyu Sorai and the definition of terms' (review article), *Japan Forum* 13-2
- Mehl, Margaret (2003), *Private Academies of Chinese Learning in Meiji Japan: The Decline and Transformation of the Kangaku Juku* (Copenhagen: NIAS).
- _____, (1998), *History and the State in Nineteenth Century Japan* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
- Miyaji Masato (2003), 'Shiryo Hensanjiyo no Rekishi to sono Kadai' in (ed., 2003) *Rekishigaku to Rekishi Kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Yamakawa Shuppansha).
- Motoori Norinaga / revised by Muraoka Tsunetsugu (1934), *Ui-yama-bumi / Suzuya toumonroku* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten).
- Muraoka Tsunetsugu (1928), *Motoori Norinaga Zōhoban* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten).
- _____ (1930), *Nihon shisōshi kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten).
- _____ (1940), *Zoku nihon shisōshi kenkyū* (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten).
- Najita, Tetsuo (1987), *Visions of virtue in Tokugawa Japan* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Nishimura, Sey. (1987). First Steps into the Mountains, Motoori Norinaga's *Uiyamabumi*. *Monumenta Nipponica: Studies on Japanese culture past and present* 42: 4, 449-494.
- ōkubo Toshiaki (1988), *Nihon kindai shigaku no seiritsu*. Vol. 7 of *Okubo Toshikane rekishi chosakushū* (Tōkyō: Yoshikawakōbunkan).
- Ooms, H. (1996), 'Review: Tokugawa texts as a playground for a postmodern romp', *The Journal of Japanese Studies* Vol.22-2.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. (1982). *Geschichte der klassischen Philologie* (München: Beck).
- Pollock, S., B. A. Elman, et.al. (eds., 2015), *World Philology* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP).
- Pomata, G. and N.G. Siraisi (2005), *Historia: Empiricism and erudition in early modern Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press).
- Saitō Osamu (2015a), 'A very brief history of Japan's economic and social history research' (Paper prepared for XVIIth World Economic History Congress, held in Kyōto, Japan, August, 2015).
- _____ (2015b) in Ikeda Yukihiko and Komuro Masamichi (eds., 2015), *Kindai Nihon to Keizaigaku* (Tōkyō : Keiō University Press).
- _____ (2010) 'Akira Hayami: a historiographical appraisal' in Hayami, A., (2010) *Population, family and society in pre-modern Japan* (Leiden: Brill).
- Satō Masayuki (2004), *Rekishi Ninshiki no Jikuu* (Tōkyō: Chisen Shokan).
- Shigeno Yasutsugu (1938-39), *Shigeno hakase sigaku ronbunshū* (Tōkyō: Yuzankaku).
- Takemura Eiji (2016), *Edo Ko'ki Jusha no Filologi'i* (Kyōto, Shibunkaku Shuppan).
- Takeuchi Yoshio. (1939). *Rongo no kenkyū*; also his 'Enkyō Dokushoki' (1948). Both are later compiled in vols.1 and 10 of his *Takeuchi Yoshio Zenshu* (vols. 1-10, 1978-79) (Tōkyō: Kadokawa Shoten).
- Tsuboi Kumezo (1926), *Shigaku Kenkyū-ho* (Tōkyō: Kyōbunsha).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. (1921). *Geschichte der Philologie* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Wolf, Friedrich August. (1831-35). *Vorlesung über die Encyclopädie der Alterthumswissenschaft*. Hrsg. V. J. D. Gürtler (Leipzig: August Lehnhold).

Yoshida Jun (2007), *Shinchō kōshōgaku no gunzō*. (Tōkyō: Sōbunsha).

Yoshikawa Kōjirō (1969), *Yoshikawa Kōjirō Zenshū* (Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō).