

DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY IN JAPAN

By YOSHIO FUJII

Professor of Philosophy

Introduction

It is a well known fact that since the 6th century Japanese philosophy has been formed on the national spirit and moral sentiments of the country, by combining Buddhism and Chinese philosophy, especially Confucianism, as the most important ingredients, just as modern European philosophy has been fostered by Greek philosophy and Christianity. Consequently, traditional Japanese philosophy was in many cases synonymous with Japanized Buddhism and Confucianism.¹ It was only since the latter part of the 19th century that European philosophy began to have serious influence and to gradually take the place of the former two ways of thought. Christianity was introduced to Japan by Francis Xavier, a Spanish missionary, in 1549, and being welcomed by the upper classes and general populace of the period, became a powerful religious movement. However, it was soon suppressed because of political reasons, and after dreadful tragedies with many martyrs, it completely disappeared in 1638.² Therefore, Scholastic philosophy which was the doctrinal support of Christianity in Europe of that period, hardly became known to this country. Since that time, only technical knowledge such as surveying, navigation, shipbuilding and the natural sciences such as astronomy, physics, chemistry, and especially medicine and pharmacy were brought into this country from Europe by merchants from Holland which was the only country permitted to trade with Japan at that time.

The coming of M.C. Perry, the American commodore, in 1853, of which the centenary was celebrated in great splendour this year, forced the

¹ Cf. T. Inoue; *Die japanische Philosophie in Die Kultur der Gegenwart*. Teil 1, Abs. 1. Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie. hrsg. v. P. Hinnberg. Berlin und Leipzig 1909. M. Anezaki; *Quelques Pages de l'Histoire Religieuse du Japon*. Paris 1921. W. E. Griffis; *The Religions of Japan from the Dawn of History to Meiji*. New York 1895. P. L. Conchoud; *Japanese Impression, with a Note on Confucius*. London 1921. G. L. Dickinson; *An Essay on the Civilization of India, China and Japan*. London 1914. P. S. Reinsch; *Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East*. Boston 1911. K. Rothgen; *Staat und Kultur der Japaner*. Leipzig 1907. I. Nitobe; *Japan, Some Phases of Her Problems and Development*. London 1931.

² Cf. C. Otis; *History of Christianity in Japan*. 2 Vols. 1915. E. W. Clement; *Christianity in Modern Japan*. Philadelphia 1905. H. Haas; *Geschichte des Christentums in Japan*. Tokyo 1902. Henrion Baron; *Histoire Generale des Missions Catholiques depuis le XIII^e siecle jusqu'à nos Jours*. Paris 1847.

Tokugawa shogunate, then dictating Japanese politics, to abandon its policy of seclusion. As the result of this change in the political situation, *Bansho Chōsho* (the Institute for the Western Studies) was established in 1856, for the study of Western culture and the translation of scientific books in all fields, which later became the foundation of Tokyo University. At the same time, Yukichi Fukuzawa and other brilliant scholars accompanied diplomatic missions which were sent to Europe and America, deepened their understanding of European civilization and introduced it to Japan, thus contributing to its dissemination.

The first great contribution in introducing Western philosophy to Japan was made by Amane Nishi (1829–1896).³ As assistant professor at *Bansho Chōsho*, he went to Holland together with his colleague, Shindō Tsuda, (1829–1903) and studied jurisprudence, economics, philosophy etc., under S. Vissering (1818–1888), professor of Leyden University. He was also influenced by the famous philosopher C.W. Opzoomer (1821–1892), and bringing his positivistic, utilitarian philosophy to Japan, became the forerunner of philosophic enlightenment in Japan. This tendency of thought was in harmony with the ethics of democracy and liberalism which aimed at *the greatest happiness of the greatest number*, and it provided the theoretical basis for the political movement which overthrew the feudal Tokugawa shogunate and made the Meiji restoration successful. Nishi not only translated J. Haven's *Mental Philosophy* and J.S. Mill's *Utilitarianism*, but created many appropriate Japanese words for the vocabulary of Western philosophy.⁴ Also in his encyclopaedic *Hyaku-ichi Shinron* (Theory of All-is-one Philosophy) 1874, written in the form of dialogue, he explains that "all theories are one in the end," and clearly sets forth the conceptual differences and significant inter-relationships between *Morals* in Oriental philosophy and *Politics* in Western philosophy, also *a priori* and *a posteriori*, *mental* and *physical* law.

Yukichi Fukuzawa (1834–1907)⁵, the enlightened thinker who is well-known as the author of *Gakumon no Susume* (Encouragement of Learning) 1871–76 and many other writings, made known "Western affairs" to the Japanese people which had been in the dark because of the long period of the seclusion, and by asserting the civil rights and freedom of the people, contributed to the spread of utilitarian thought in his age. Another scholar of the same period, Hiroyuki Katō (1836–1916), developed utilitarianism with an evolutionary tendency, following the thought of Darwin and Haeckel, and introduced this new theory from the standpoint of egocentrism and

³ *Nishi Amane Tetsugaku Chosaku-shū* (The Philosophical Works of Amane Nishi), edited by Y. Asō, with introduction by T. Inoue, Tokyo 1933.

⁴ For instance, the creation of the new Japanese word "tetsugaku" meaning "striving for learning" or "love of wisdom", for the Greek word *φιλοσοφία* is due to him.

⁵ *Fukuzawa Yukichi Zenshū* (The Complete Works of Yukichi Fukuzawa) Vols. 10, Tokyo 1926. Supplement Vols. 7, Tokyo 1933.

materialism with special emphasis on "the right of the strong".⁶ Chōmin Nakae (1847-1901), a radical materialist, belongs to the same school of thought, and while Fukuzawa mainly studied in England, and Katō in Germany, Nakae went to France and endeavoured to introduce French thought.

In Japanese, the word "Meiji" means, "peace after enlightened manner", and the so-called "Meiji period" (1868-1912) was, as its literal meaning, a *period of enlightenment* in Japan. The major thinkers of Europe who dominated the first half of this period were J. Bentham, J.S. Mill, H. Spencer, H. Sidwick, E. Darwin, E. Haeckel, J. J. Rousseau, A. Comte, Ch. de Montesquieu, whose ideas were characteristically utilitarianism, naturalism, individualism, and materialism. They were studied not only by university professors but also by statesmen and journalists, for they were directly connected with the political movement to extend civic rights and freedom.⁷

On the other hand, idealism had been cultivated even in ancient Japan by Confucianism and Buddhism as a practical attitude and religious outlook in life. The first scholar who added to this theoretical reconsiderations and systematized it after the method of Western philosophy was Shigeki Nishimura (1828-1902). In the preface of his *Shingaku Kōgi* (Lectures on Mental Philosophy) 1885, he says, "in this age, be it law, economics, ethics or political science, without the knowledge of *mental philosophy*, they are as a tree without roots or a river without source. Particularly, education which has recently become the subject of learning has made *mental philosophy* a necessary element. Since these are, as everyone knows, all *metaphysical* sciences, the mind should be their basis. But, even for *physical* sciences, such as mathematics, chemistry, physics, natural history and biology, it has become impossible to be conversant with them without knowing the gist of *mental philosophy*."

The establishment of independent *mental philosophy*, not merely as a psychology from the empirical point of view, but as the fundamental of all sciences, naturally reminds us of Kant, and at the same time suggests that the road to German idealism, making Kant a cult, was opened. Translations or expositions of various histories of philosophy attempted in this period helped to make German philosophy understood, which had until then sorely been neglected in comparison with English and French philosophy. (Thus, *Doitsu Tetsugaku Eika* (Essentials of German Philosophy), Tokyo 1884, by Yosaburō Takekoshi, *Rigaku Kōgen* (Keys to Philosophy), Tokyo 1886, by Chōmin Nakae, and *Tetsugaku Kenteki* (A few Drops of Philosophy),⁸ Tokyo

⁶ H. Katō; *Der Kampf ums Recht des Stärkern und seine Entwicklung*. Berlin 1894.

⁷ Y. Asō; *Kindai Nippon Tetsugaku-shi* (History of Modern Japanese Philosophy) Tokyo 1942. H. Shimoiide; *Meiji Shakai Shisō-shi Kenkyū* (Studies in the Social Thought of Meiji) Tokyo 1932.

⁸ The author of this book explains the meaning of this title as follows; "It is said that Thales, the founder of Western philosophy, made water the principle of the Universe. Accordingly, I hope that this book will become a *few drops of that water*."

1889, by Yūjirō Miyake, were all summarized translations from the histories of German and French philosophy, in which the systems and development of German philosophy from Kant to Hegel were rendered. They were useful in bringing the profound transcendental philosophy of Kant and the abstruse dialectic method of Hegel closer to the philosophical world of Japan.

Further, Ernest Francesco Fenollosa (1853–1908), an American—well-known as the introducer of Japanese fine arts—and the first professor of philosophy at Tokyo Imperial University which was established in 1877, delivered lectures on Kant and Hegel, as well as on Mill and Spencer, and endeavoured to synthesize the empiric philosophy with the rationalistic, viz. English philosophy with German philosophy on the basis of the evolutionary theory. Also, Ludwig Busse (1862–1902), successor of Fenollosa, who later became professor at the University of Königsberg, having a passion for Kant and Lotze, emphasized the necessity of research in the history of philosophy for students in the faculty of philosophy at Tokyo University from 1877 on. In 1894, Raphael von Koeber (1848–1923), a Russian of German lineage, was appointed as successor to Busse. He was deeply influenced by Schopenhauer and Eduard von Hartmann,⁹ and was a strongly religious and mystical character, teaching for about twenty years at the university. Greek and German philosophy were his favourite topics, and by his learning and personality he aroused the sincere interest of the students which became an important element in deciding the philosophical direction of Japan from that time on. The shifting of interest of Japanese philosophers from the English utilitarian philosophy of Mill and Spencer towards German idealism centering around Kant and Hegel, and further towards the Greek philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, was made decisive by Koeber. This was a general tendency of the Japanese philosophical world in the latter half of the Meiji period. Since the Meiji restoration, as the above outline shows, Japan endeavoured to absorb the spiritual culture of Europe, especially philosophy which was the core of it, as well as Western mechanical civilization, and this brought about gratifying results. In the history of the transplantation of European philosophy to this country, however, the 19th century was substantially a *period of enlightenment*, while the 20th century is the *period of research and assimilation*, during which time remarkable progress has been made. At the present moment, when the first half of this century is over, one dares say that the understanding of the Japanese people of European philosophy has reached the highest level that could be expected.¹⁰

We already have reliable Japanese translations of the complete works

⁹ R. v. Koeber; *Das Philosophische System E. v. Hartmann's* Breslau 1884. *Die Philosophie A. Schopenhauer's*, Heidelberg 1888. *Jean Paul's Seelenlehre*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Psychologie, Leipzig 1893. *Lectures on History of Philosophy*. 3 Vols. Tokyo 1894. *Kleine Schriften*. 3 Vols. Tokyo 1918 ff.

¹⁰ K. Tsuchida; *Contemporary Thought in Japan and China*. New York 1927.

of Plato, Kant and Nietzsche, and the publishing of those of Aristotle, Hegel, Kierkegaard is in progress. As for Descartes, Pascal, Spinoza, Leibniz, Fichte, Schelling, Schopenhauer, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, almost all the principal writings of these classical philosophers are already translated in Japanese, and many excellent studies on them have been published. The same can be said of such contemporary representative philosophers as H. Cohen, P. Natorp, W. Windelband, H. Rickert, H. Bergson, G. Simmel, E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, K. Jaspers, W. James, and J. Dewey. These translations and studies far surpass those of other countries in the East, in both quantity and quality, and it is not an exaggeration to say that they can be compared with those of European countries. However, it is not easy to impart in detail the philosophical works achieved by Japanese scholars during this half a century. In order to understand the present situation of research in European philosophy, I believe, it is necessary to differentiate at least the three fields which were mentioned above.

(i) The study of Greek philosophy, especially Plato and Aristotle.

(ii) The study of modern German philosophy, especially from Kant to Hegel.

(iii) The study of contemporary European philosophy, especially Neo-Kantianism, Phenomenology and Existentialism.

In this article, I wish to make several observations on the first subject.

I

The study of Greek philosophy in Japan may be considered as having passed through three stages, corresponding to the general tendency of research in the modern European philosophy in this country. First, the stage of using histories of philosophy written by eminent European scholars as manuals and understanding Greek philosophy second-hand. We may call this the *period of enlightenment*. Second, the stage of direct understanding from original texts. This may be called the *period of translation* and philological research. Third, the stage of philosophical study on the basis of such philological research in Greek philosophy. We may call this the *period of criticism* in the truest sense of the word and philological-philosophical study.

It is difficult to exactly determine at what period the *names* of Plato and Aristotle were first introduced to the Japanese; it may have been at quite an early period, for, as above related, with the coming of Christianity to Japan, it is quite probable that these esteemed names were known among Christians in this country.¹¹ However, even though this may be a fact, it is another thing to have knowledge of their philosophical ideas. Greek

¹¹ Y. Asō; *Kindai Nippon Tetsugaku-shi* (History of Modern Japanese Philosophy) Pp. 15-20.

philosophy was first introduced to Japan from Europe in the latter half of the 19th century, together with Western thought, for Greek philosophy is the fountainhead of Western thought, and it is impossible to discourse on the latter without referring to the former. Thus, it is quite natural that Nishi and other early scholars should often refer in their discussions to Thales and other Greek philosophers. But this was chiefly due to the narrative habit and convenience of explanation after the manner of Western scholars, and does not mean interest in ancient Greek philosophy itself which was still remote in their time. Their standpoint, as stated already in the introduction, was none other than utilitarianism and liberalism as the theoretical background for the political movement of the Meiji restoration and the following period. For instance, Nakae refers to Plato's theory of Ideas in his *Rigaku Kōgen* (Keys to Philosophy) in a political rather than philosophical sense.¹²

In 1882, Kenchō Suematsu delivered a lecture at a meeting of Japanese students in London under the title of *Girisha Kodai Rigaku Ippan* (Outline of Ancient Greek Philosophy), which he published the following year in Tokyo. Here, the theories of the Presocratic philosophers are briefly introduced and interpreted in terms of thought and diction of Chinese philosophy, comparing Socrates to Confucius, Plato to Tsu Su and Aristotle to Mencius. We may say, however, this is the characteristic and generally accepted way of interpreting Greek thought by the people of this period who had been reared by Chinese classics in their youth. Nevertheless, this could be called a *story* at most, but never a *history* of Greek philosophy.

The scholar who tried an academic approach to Greek philosophy and who first wrote a history of it was Hajime Ōnishi (1864–1899). In *Tetsugaku Zasshi* (Journal of Philosophy)¹³ Vols. VII–IX, 1892–94, he contributed a treatise entitled *Socrates-zen no Girisha Tetsugaku* (Presocratic Philosophy of Greece), in the preface of which he writes, “Among the works on the Presocratic philosophy of Greece written in Japanese, I believe my treatise is the most accurate and most detailed.” We may assert that this treatise of his is noteworthy not only for its accuracy and detail, but also for its academic attitude in research; he takes up Greek philosophy as an object worth arduous study. With all these merits, the treatise is not free from the disposition of this period as will be seen from the author's statement;¹⁴ “What I describe is not from a close study of original texts, but is mainly based on the results of scientific research and investigation of historians of European philosophy to the present day. The scholar I have referred to most is E. Zeller. But without idly following one historian I have compared the

¹² C. Nakae; *Rigaku Kōgen* (Keys to Philosophy) Pp. 177–195.

¹³ The first issue of *Tetsugaku Zasshi* (Journal of Philosophy) was made in 1887, providing place for philosophical debate of leading philosophers and philosophical symposium of young talented scholars, and still now it is one of the most important philosophical magazines in Japan.

¹⁴ *Tetsugaku Zasshi* (Journal of Philosophy), Vol. VIII. p. 127.

theories of many and have stood by the one considered most reliable."

Later, Ōnishi wrote an enlarged and well-arranged *Seiyō Tetsugaku-shi* (History of Western Philosophy) 2 Vols. Tokyo 1895, from early Greek to modern philosophy, based on his lectures at the university. This was not a mere translation or adaptation of Western books, but a most reliable and detailed history of philosophy written by a Japanese, and it had many readers for a long time. However, the methodic standpoint which he took in his former treatise is also asserted here; the authorities preferred in his interpretation of the theories of the various schools are, so far as Greek philosophy is concerned, E. Zeller, P. Überweg, W. Windelband etc., not the fragments of the Presocratic philosophers, the dialogues of Plato or the "works" of Aristotle. The same criticism may be applied to Seiichi Hatano's otherwise well written *Seiyō Tetsugaku-shiyō* (Short History of Western Philosophy), Tokyo 1901, which has had many editions and is still often used by university students today.¹⁵

I must particularly dwell here on two other works which symbolize the enlightening character of this period. One is *Platon Zenshū* (the Complete Works of Plato) translated by Takatarō Kimura, 1930 ff.,¹⁶ the other is *Aristoteles Rinrigaku* (Ethics of Aristotle) with a running commentary by Genyoku Kuwaki, 1900. Kimura was the very first scholar in Japan to undertake the fascinating task of translating the dialogues of Plato into Japanese. In the preface to the work, Kimura enumerates his motives for translation, viz.: "that Plato's dialogues are of great use in promoting the knowledge and morals of our people, that they are extremely valuable to train our national spirit, that the learning of our people should become independent from subordination to foreign languages, that it is necessary to translate the classics of foreign countries into our language, and finally that they make possible the fundamental study of Plato from the original source." These reasons mentioned by Kimura, who was famous as a philosopher of national characteristics, are quite understandable from the enlightenment currents of thought of the period, but among them, the last is the most important. He says that, "I eagerly wish that our people would not merely be satisfied with piece-meal and make-shift books of narrow scope, such as short histories, summaries and outlines of philosophy by various writers, but casting off the attitude of having carried on research by means of such material, regard this as rubbish, and study the great thinkers directly from their original sources".¹⁷

¹⁵ *Hatano Seiichi Zenshū* (The Complete Works of Seiichi Hatano) Vol. 1, Tokyo 1949.

¹⁶ *The Complete Works of Plato*, translated into Japanese with introduction, analyses and running commentary by T. Kimura. 5 Vols. Tokyo 1903-1911. Vol. I. *Charmides, Lysis, Laches, Protagoras, Euthydemus, Io, Meno, Euthyphro, Apologia Socratis, Crito, Phaedo, Symposium*. 1903. Vol. II. *Respublica, Timaeus, Critias*. 1906. Vol. III. *Phaedrus, Gorgias, Theaetetus, Sophista, Politicus*. 1908. Vol. IV. *Leges*. 1909. Vol. V. *Cratylus, Parmenides, Philebus, Hippias minor, Alcibiades I, Menexenus, Alcibiades II, Eryxias*. 1911.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* Vol. I. Pp. 7-8.

Needless to say, his advocacy to understand Plato through his own writings and not through reports and summaries of other is quite correct. But his translation betrays his intention, because the text he used was B. Jowett's English translation (3rd edition) and not the original text of Plato. This English translation may have been "the newest and most correct" of that period, as understood by Kimura, but it is well known to be rather a free and not literal translation. To retranslate this into Japanese risks many dangers. In fact Kimura's Japanese translation contains many mistranslations and erroneous interpretations. Even if this were left out of consideration, what Kimura could impart by his translation was the Plato of Jowett and not Plato himself. In this respect, the complete works of Plato of Kimura reveals to us a merely enlightening character.

Kuwaki's *Aristoteles Rinrigaku* (Ethics of Aristotle) was written as one of the *Commentary Series of Representative Works on Ethics in Europe*. Among the three Ethics attributed to Aristotle, he took only the *Nicomachean Ethics* as the philosopher's own work, and attempting to comment on it, made a perfunctory explanation on the supreme good, ethical virtues, free will, intellectual virtues, justice, continence, friendship and pleasure. But the position of this Ethics in the development of Aristotle and the philological-philosophical difficulties contained in it were mostly disregarded. This is nothing less than proof that Kuwaki's book is a work representative of the enlightenment period.

II

In 1921, Tsutomu Kubo, a devoted disciple of the Philhellenist R. von Koeber, cooperating with Jirō Abe, both emeritus professors of Tōhoku University, translated Plato's *Apologia Socratis* and *Crito* from the original texts into correct and fluent Japanese, attaching a running commentary. This fact meant not only that a translation of Plato had happened to be published but also that the period of authentic translation had begun in the study of Greek philosophy in Japan. For following this publication, a translation of Plato's dialogues from the original was attempted with sufficient philological scrupulousness by many young proficient scholars, so that at the present time, we have come to possess trustworthy Japanese translations of all of Plato's works.¹⁸ Some of these can be ranked with those of the fore-

¹⁸ The important Japanese translations of Plato's works, with introduction and commentary are as follows: *Apologia Socratis* and *Crito*, by T. Kubo and J. Abe. Tokyo 1927. *Protagoras*, by K. Kikuchi. Tokyo 1927. *Gorgias*, by E. Inatomi. Tokyo 1930. *Meno* and *Euthyphro*, by T. Soejima. Tokyo 1948. *Euthydemus*, by M. Yamamoto. Tokyo 1942. *Phaedo*, by K. Kikuchi. Tokyo 1924. *Symposium*, by T. Kubo and J. Abe. Tokyo 1934. *Respublica* I-IV, by N. Nagasawa. Tokyo 1949-1952. *Theaetetus*, by M. Tanaka. Tokyo 1938. *Parmenides*, by N. Nagasawa. Tokyo 1944. *Sophista*, by J. Shikano. Tokyo 1932. *Philebus*, by K. Gotō. Tokyo 1932. *Leges* I-VI, by M. Yamamoto. Tokyo 1946-1949. *Epistulae*, by M. Yamamoto. Tokyo 1944.

most European scholars in regard to textual exactitude, and scrupulosity of comment and expression. It is impossible to dwell on these in detail here. I wish to mention particularly, as representative of this period, the publication of the complete works of Plato by Shōzō Okada.¹⁹ He made a correct and readable translation using mainly *Platonis opera* rec. J. Burnet (Oxford classical texts), as the original. As with almost all translations of the classics—especially those of Plato and Aristotle—it may be possible to discern in Okada's translation mistranslations and omissions due to carelessness. However, we cannot appreciate too much his admirable efforts and passionate enthusiasm for Plato during twenty long years, starting with the *Meno* in 1933 and ending with the *Leges* and the *Epinomis* in 1952. This gigantic work contributed greatly to the infusing of Socratic vigour and wisdom as well as Platonic soul and method into the Japanese spirit.

The translation of Aristotle's writings is far behind Plato's. The first translation of Aristotle in Japan, as far as I know, is that of the *Poetica* by Kaichi Matsuura in 1924. Unfortunately this is far from a reliable translation.²⁰ The publication of the complete works of Aristotle in Japanese, based on the *Aristotelis opera* ed. I. Bekker (edition of the Berlin Academy), under the editorship of Tokuryū Yamanouchi and Takashi Ide, was planned in 1937,²¹ but till the present only about one third, that is, the *Topica*, the *De Caelo*, the *De Anima*, the *Parva Naturalia*, the *Ethica Nicomachea*, the *Politica*, the *Atheniensium Respublica* and the *Oeconomica*, have been published, while the translation of the other works is now in preparation, including the *Organon* which I am in charge of, and which will be

¹⁹ *The Complete Works of Plato*, translated into Japanese by S. Okada. Vols. 12. Tokyo and Kyoto 1942–1952. Vol. I. *Euthyphro*, *Apologia*, *Crito*, *Phaedo*, *Euthydemus* 1942. Vol. II. *Protagoras*, *Meno*, *Cratylus*. 1942. Vol. III. *Phaedrus*, *Lysis*, *Laches*, *Charmides*, *Hippias minor*, *Io*, 1943. Vol. IV. *Symposium*, *Gorgias*, *Menexenus*. 1943. Vol. V. *Parmenides*, *Theaetetus*, *Hippias minor*, 1944. Vol. VI. *Philebus*, *Sophista*, *Alcibiades II*. 1944. Vols. VII–VIII. *Respublica*. 1948. Vol. IX. *Alcibiades I*, *Politicus*, *Amatores*, *Hipparchus*, *Theages*. 1949. Vol. X. *Timaeus*, *Critias*, *Minos*, *Cleitophus*, *Epistulae*. 1951. Vols. XI–XII. *Leges*, *Epinomis*. 1951–1952.

²⁰ The revised and enlarged edition of this translation published in 1949 is greatly improved and quite readable.

²¹ *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, translated into Japanese with running Commentary, by many scholars, 20 Vols. Tokyo (The starred volumes still remain unpublished). *Vols. 1–IV. *Organon*, by Y. Fujii. (*Topica* already has been translated by T. Yamanouchi and Z. Taga 1944). *Vol. V. *Physica*, by T. Kaneko. Vol. VI. *De Caelo*, by Y. Muraji 1952. *Vol. VII. *De Generatione et Corruptione*, *Meteorologica*, *De Munde*, by T. Tanaka. Vol. VIII. *De Anima*, by C. Takahashi 1937. Vol. IX. *Parva Naturalia*, by T. Soejima 1939. *Vol. X. *Historia Animalium*, by S. Shimazaki. *Vol. XI. *De Partibus Animalium*, *De Motu* and *De Incessu Animalium*, *De Generatione Animalium*, by K. Masuda and S. Shimazaki. *Vol. XII. *Metaphysica*, by T. Ide. Vol. XIII. *Ethica Nicomachea*, by S. Takata. 1937. *Vol. XIV. *Ethica Eudemia*, *Magna Moralia*, by S. Ishiyama. Vol. XV. *Politica*, by M. Yamamoto. 1951. Vol. XVI. *Atheniensium Respublica*, *Oeconomica*, by K. Murakawa, 1947. *Vol. XVII. *Rhetorica*, by T. Iwakura. *Vol. XVIII. *De Poetica*, by M. Kinoshita. *Vol. XIX. *Problemata*, by T. Ide. *Vol. XX. *Fragmenta*, by M. Tanaka. Besides the *Complete Works of Aristotle* and K. Matsuura's translation of *De Poetica*, I must also mention here the translations of *Categoricae* and *De Interpretatione*, by T. Ando, Tokyo and Osaka 1949, *Metaphysica* by T. Iwasaki, Tokyo 1942 and *Politica*, by I. Aoki, Tokyo 1937.

finished before long. Besides the translation of the original texts of Plato and Aristotle, the fact should be noted that many excellent studies of famous European philosophers, historians of ancient philosophy and classical philologists since the 19th century, for instance, H. Cohen, V. Brochard, H. Bonitz, C. Prantle, F. Brentano, and so on, have been translated and collected in *Tetsugaku Ronsō* (Philosophical Study Series).²² The translation of so many special studies on Greek philosophy into a foreign language is rarely heard of even in Europe and America. Though this is the result of the special circumstances of an East Asian country like Japan, where it is difficult to become acquainted with documents because of their scarcity, even in this respect one can perceive the zeal of this period.

The year 1921 became a memorable one by the publication of Seiichi Hatano's *Seiyō Shūkyō Shisō-shi* (History of Western Religious Thought), Vol. 1. (Greece). Hatano is generally recognized as the foremost philosopher on Religion and also a talented historian on philosophy in contemporary Japan. Being strongly influenced by R. von Koeber, he has been a constant admirer and lover of Greek thought all his life. The above work deals with Greek religious thought from Homer to the Sophists, and may be regarded as a history of Greek thought treated from the religious standpoint centering on the idea of God. For the history of early Greek philosophy is the development "from *mythos* to *logos*," in which the religious and philosophic were indiscriminately combined and of which the upholders were none other than poets and philosophers. This is evidently shown by the double meaning of *λόγος*.

In consideration of this, one may assert that this book is one of the most worthy histories of ancient philosophy written in Japanese until the present time. However this evaluation of Hatano's work applies not to the *conclusion* it draws, but rather to the *method* or *process* taken to draw this conclusion. To be more particular, this book does not offer a new theory differing from the views already asserted by European scholars. For example, according to Hatano, the relativism of the Sophists does not signify, as commonly interpreted, a denial of the recognition of absolute truth or destructive nihilism and pessimistic scepticism, relinquishing the pursuit of knowledge (*φιλοσοφία*), but on the contrary, an optimistic pragmatism and traditionalism of common sense. Therefore, they were actually "professors

²² *Tetsugaku Ronsō* contains the translations of the following treatises. No. 17. H. Cohen; *Platons Ideenlehre und die Mathematik* (1878), by S. Takata 1928. No. 20. V. Brochard; *Le devenir dans la philosophie de Platon* (1900), by Y. Kōno 1929. No. 24. Lutoslawski; *Sur une nouvelle méthode pour déterminer la chronologie des dialogues de Platon* (1896), by Y. Kōno 1929. No. 28. V. Brochard; *Sur le Banquet de Platon* (1906), by Y. Kōno 1929. No. 31. H. Bonitz; *Über die Kategorien des Aristoteles* (1853), by Y. Fujii 1930. No. 39. C. Prantl; *Über die Entwicklung der Aristotelischen Logik aus der Platonischen Philosophie* (1853), by Y. Fujii 1930. In addition to these series, the translations of the following works must be cited H. Bergson; *Quid Aristoteles de loco senserit* (1889), by T. Igarashi. Tokyo 1944. F. Brentano; *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden nach Aristoteles* (1862), by T. Iwasaki. Tokyo 1933. J. Burnet; *Platonism* (1928), by T. Ide and K. Miyazaki. Tokyo 1941.

or public 'teachers' who trained people to be active and practical. His assertion attracted the attention of people in this country and gained their approval, but this interpretation had already been fundamentally established by Grote in his well-known book, *History of Greece*. Hatano's chief achievement, however, consists in the fact that he arrived at this conclusion himself in virtue of his study of the original materials of Plato, Aristotle and other Doxographers. To appreciate this more fully, one should compare this book with his *Seiyō Tetsugaku-shiyō* (Outline of History of Western Philosophy) written by himself just 20 years ago, or the above referred treatise of Ōnishi, *Socrates-zen no Girisha Tetsugaku* (Presocratic Philosophy of Greece).

In the same way, the proof of progress can be discovered by comparing the two complete works of Plato by Okada and Kimura.

Several years later, *Seiyō Tetsugaku-shi* (History of Western Philosophy) Vol. 1, 1929 by Takashi Ide and *Kodai Tetsugaku-shi* (History of Ancient Philosophy) Vol. 1, 1935 by Takezō Kaneko were published. The former, based on lectures at Tokyo University by the writer, deals with the biographies and theories of philosophers from the dawn of Greek thought to the Atomists. Though his description is rather vapid and prosaic, it seems to aim at being a faithful doxography as far as possible from the historical standpoint, much after the manner of Überweg's work. The latter is also a handy history of philosophy, endeavouring to interpret systematically the philosophical theories from Thales to Plato from the ontological point of view. However, as with Hatano's work, it is regrettable, that only volume 1 has been completed whilst later volume remain yet unpublished.

III

Wilhelm von Humboldt in the last passage of his *Über das Studium des Altertums, und des Griechischen insbesondere* 1793, makes the following assertion in regard to translation as one of the most useful means for the study of ancient Greece.²³ "For the writer who is translated, translation can have a threefold advantage: 1. Anyone who can not read the original by himself can learn about the writer; 2. It is useful for anyone who can read the original in understanding it; 3. It makes known the original previously to anyone who is going to read it and confides its manner and spirit to him. If one were to determine the importance of each of these advantages, according to the standpoint here taken, the first is the most insignificant; the second is more important but still small, for translation is a poor means for this very purpose; but the third is the most important

²³ *Wilhelm von Humboldts Gesammelte Schriften*. hrsg. v. A. Leitzmann. Berlin 1903. Bd. 1. Pp. 280 f.

advantage, because translation stimulates one to read the original and gives the reader support of the higher order." "The gaining of this last advantage must lead to esteem for the original, and so the highest advantage of translation is one which destroys the value of translation itself."

These three advantages of translation as cited by Humboldt are sufficiently convincing even though they are in fact indistinguishably blended together. He further goes on to say that "the describability of translation accordingly depends on these three advantages. Thus, as regards the first, the adaptation of the translated ancient writer to the minds of modern readers, the purposeful deviation from faithful translation is often required; as regards the second, faithfulness to word and letter is required and as regards the third, faithfulness of spirit and if I may say so, of the dress he is wearing."

These assertions by Humboldt are not without meaning for our study. The three stages in the study of Greek philosophy in our country correspond to the three advantages mentioned above. The enlightenment period required deviation from the original, the period of translation with philological research required the faithful rendering of words, and the period of criticism, coordinating philological and philosophical research, *inter alios*, the faithfulness of spirit. It goes without saying that these three stages of development, being so cited for convenience sake, the correspondence of these to the three advantages of translation is hypothetical. For, as the enlightenment period cannot be separated from the translation period by periodic divisions, the latter cannot be strictly distinguished by years from the period of criticism. However, in order to better understand the intentional development and the direction of the study of Greek philosophy in Japan, the present age, at least the past decade or so, may be called the period of criticism. Since the 20th century, Greek philosophy, together with German philosophy, has enchanted the minds of our young philosophers and has become their favorite subject of study. Thus, the study of Greek philosophy has made rapid progress, and rising beyond the level of mere introduction, adaptation or translation, many treatises and works worthy of the name of professional research have come to be published.

Greek philosophy which had been first transplanted to this country in the middle of the 19th century took root through the assiduous efforts of scholars extending over one whole century, grew into a foliated tree and at last, I dare say, its branches are beginning to bear fruit. As it is impossible for me to discuss all the writings on Greek philosophy which have been made public to date, I wish to limit myself to commenting on several representative works which suffice to show the present stage of study.

On the Sophists and Socrates

At the regular meeting of the Philosophical Society of Kyoto on Novem-

ber, 1918, S. Hatano gave a lecture on the Sophists and Socrates, emphasizing the similarity rather than the difference of the two on the very point that the Sophists were "public teachers" who promoted the enlightenment of the Athenians, while Socrates was a *practical man* taking care of the souls of the Athenian youth, rather than a *theoretical man* as the forefather of the new "Begriffsphilosophie."²⁴ As already said, the same point of view was repeated in his *Seiyō Shūkyō Shisō-shi* (History of Western Religious Thought) 1921.

Since then the only monograph on the Sophists is Michitarō Tanaka's *Sophist*. Tokyo 1941. Tanaka, professor of Kyoto University, is one of the most able and leading figures among historians of ancient philosophy in contemporary Japan, and is wellknown by many writings in this field. At the beginning of his book, he says that "it aims at making clear what kind of persons they actually were who were branded with the bad name of Sophists in ancient times, what kind of age it was, and what kind of work they did, as seen directly by the author on the basis of original materials." No one can deny the historical significance and requisite role played by the Sophists in the enlightenment movement of Greece, with Athens as a centre, in the latter half of the 5th century B.C. Much has already been written about them by various historians of philosophy, but a historically correct and established valuation is hard to find. Why was the word σοφιστής which had been originally a term of respect, as examples used by the Seven Sages and early philosophers confirm, converted into a notorious name as seen in the use by Plato and Aristotle? Why did these persons who had prided themselves as teachers of virtue become sophistic and eristic? What was the relationship between rhetoric or eristic as methods of the Sophists and dialectic as the method of Socrates? These questions are discussed in his book quite clearly and convincingly, despite the modest announcement of the author.²⁵

As Socrates was first and foremost in contributing to the building up of the unrivalled position occupied by ancient Greece in the history of philosophy, a large number of treatises and books on this Athenian philosopher have been written by many scholars, according to their own views, in both Europe and America. Japan is not an exception. Among the various works on this subject written in Japanese,²⁶ here I wish to mention *Girisha no Tetsugaku to Seiji* (Philosophy and Politics of Greece), Tokyo 1934 by Takashi Ide, former professor of Tokyo University. This book is a collection of 7 articles, namely—the theoretical character of ancient physics; the

²⁴ *The Complete Works of S. Hatano*. Vol. III. Pp. 239-258.

²⁵ See my article, *Sophist Antiphon*, in *Shakai to Bunka no Shosō* (Some Aspects of Society and Culture) ed. by S. Uehara, Tokyo 1953.

²⁶ E.g. K. Miki; *Socrates*. Tokyo 1939. K. Gotō; *Socrates*. Tokyo 1936. E. Inatomi; *Socrates no Benshōhō* (Dialectic of Socrates) Tokyo 1948. M. Abe; *Socrates Kenkyū* (Studies in Socrates) Tokyo 1940, etc.

origin of *philosophia*; *theoria* and Socrates; the philosophy of Socrates and his death; what destroys philosophy; the politics and thought of Greece; the ethical thought of *kosmopolites*—written with the focus on Socrates, from 1931 to 1941, a period of agitation and confusion ending with the outbreak of the fatal Pacific War. The author himself says, “these articles are not so much professional studies as reviews with a more or less cultural background intended for the general public.” Therefore, we cannot look for any new interpretation or theory of Socrates here. What the author consistently asserts in these articles is, “In acting or in making, without *theoria* to discern and perceive the truth as is involved in the object itself, nothing will come of it.” In other words, “without the guidance of philosophical *theoria* of high exactness, *praxis* becomes powerless and ends in no policy, while, on the other hand, real statesmen should improve their government by practising and promoting *theoria*.” That is to say, this book is a kind of *Προτρεπτικός Λόγος* which advocates and exhorts the politicizing of philosophy and the philosophizing of politics, and in this sense the author's attitude is most appropriate as regards Socrates.

On Plato

Plato has been honoured, recited, translated and discussed as the eternal teacher of mankind, not only by philosophers but even by poets and men of letters in Europe for more than 2,000 years. Likewise in Japan, since the introduction of Greek philosophy, research has centered on this philosophical master of Athens. This is sufficiently proved by the facts that all of Plato's works have already been translated, and are yet continuing to be translated, and that treatises and writings on Plato are numerous in comparison to other philosophers of either ancient or modern times. Indeed, Plato and Kant have been the two idols that reigned the philosophical world of Japan during the past fifty years. Therefore, it is difficult to report comprehensively and in detail on all the studies of Plato in this country.²⁷ Setting aside popular and introductory works, I only wish to touch upon a few representative works worthy to be recommended as professional studies.

It can be said that J. Stenzel's epoch-making book, *Studien zur Entwicklung der Platonischen Dialektik von Sokrates zu Aristoteles*, Berlin 1917 shows in a sense the chief direction of study on Plato during the last half century, as it was appropriately evaluated and located by W. Jaeger.²⁸ That is to say, the result in deciding the order and chronology of the dialogues of Plato which the philological study of Plato discovered by mobiliz-

²⁷ E. g. N. Nagasawa; *Platon*. Tokyo 1936. A. Tanaka; *Platon to Aristoteles* (Plato and Aristotle) Tokyo 1944. T. Abe; *Platon*. Tokyo 1939. *Platon Kokkaken* (The Republic of Plato) Tokyo 1936, and many articles, essays and dissertations on Plato.

²⁸ Cf. W. Jaeger; *Platos Stellung im Aufbau der griechischen Bildung*, in *Humanistische Reden und Vorträge*. Berlin und Leipzig 1937. Furthermore, see W. Jaeger's memory of J. Stenzel, in *Gnomon* Bd. XII 1936. Heft 2.

ing many superior minds in the latter half of the 19th century and the work pursuing the system of Plato's philosophy, which has been proposed by philosophers—e.g. H. Cohen and P. Natorp—are successfully unified to a high degree in Stenzel. In other words, one may say that in Stenzel, by harmonizing the philological and philosophical studies on Plato, the tracing of his development in the truest sense became possible for the first time. Accordingly, persons who plan a study of the Platonic theory of Idea must first take account of Stenzel's interpretation. In case they can succeed in overcoming it, then it may be possible for them to frame a new theory on Plato.

This is exactly what Kumatarō Kawada, professor of Tokyo University intended in *Platon Benshōhō no Kenkyū* (Study in the Dialectic of Plato), Tokyo 1940. According to him, the complete dialogues of Plato are divided into four groups, centering around the *Apologia*, the *Respublica*, the *Sophista* and the *Philebus*.²⁹ Furthermore, the methods characterizing each group throughout are respectively elenctic, synoptic, analytic (or dividing), and causal (or mixing). The two former groups form the early theory of Plato, the latter two groups the later theory. Though Stenzel has made clear the development and philosophical meaning of the dialectic of the later Plato by penetrating observations on the *δόξα-ἐπιστήμη*-problem in the *Theaetetus* and the *διαίρεσις*-method in the *Sophista* and the *Politicus*, his treatment of the *Philebus* is quite insufficient. This dialogue can not be understood merely by the logical interpretation of the *διαίρεσις*-method as in the *Sophista*. For, in this case the fundamental dialectic of causes rather than the dialectic of Ideas dominates. Of course, in the early period also, the theory of Idea sometimes implies the theory of cause, but the latest ontological standpoint of Plato maintained by the *Philebus*-group is explicitly distinguished from the *διαίρεσις*-theory emphasized by Stenzel and should be the *αἰτία*-theory which observes the various causes of the Idea and genesis of existence. Thus Professor Kawada scrutinizes the causal theory, from the angle of "dynamism of *παντελὸς ὄν*," using the ontology of the *Philebus* as a clue. The strong influence of L. Robin can be seen in his interpretation.³⁰ I am not always in agreement with his conclusions. Especially, I cannot help expressing dissatisfaction in regard to the fact that sufficient attention is not paid to the *Timaeus* and the *Leges* which, I believe, have the most important significance in Plato's causal theory. However, the value of this work should be fully recognized in promoting the study of Plato in the right direction.

²⁹ 1, (Apologia-group) *Io*, *Hipp. minor*, *Prot.*, *Apol.*, *Crito*, *Euthyphro*, *Lach.*, *Charm.*, *Lysis*. *Resp.* I. 2, (Respublica-group) *Gorg.*, *Meno*, *Menex.*, *Euthyd.*, *Cratyl.*, *Symp.*, *Phaedo*, *Resp.* II-X. 3, (Sophista-group) *Phaedr.*, *Parm.*, *Theaet.*, *Soph.*, *Polit.* (the former half). 4, (Philebus-group) *Polit.* (the latter half), *Tim.*, *Crat.*, *Phileb.*, *Epistl.* 7. *Leg.*

³⁰ I.e. L. Robin; *Platon*. Paris 1935. *La Théorie Platonicienne des Idées et des Nombres d'après Aristote*. Paris 1908.

A work which recently contributed with great success to this subject is *Girisha no Tetsugaku* (Greek Philosophy) 2 Vols, 1944–1948, by Tokuryū Yamanouchi, emeritus professor of Kyoto University, a respected teacher to whom I am greatly indebted. He is better known as a systematic philosopher rather than as a historian of philosophy, being the author of various outstanding works on phenomenology, ontology, and philosophy of existence. In his book which deals with ancient philosophy, he endeavours to trace systematic unity rather than solve the various philological problems involved.³¹ The whole second volume is devoted to Plato, in which, as may be expected, the various subjects such as the life of the philosopher, his works, the theory of Idea, dialectic, the theory of numbers, the soul and God, politics and statesmen and aesthetics are treated after the manner of general history of philosophy. What distinguishes this book from other commonplace books on Plato is the keen interpretation of the theory of Idea. Following the commonly recognized opinion, he divides the development of Platonic philosophy into two periods, viz. from the Socratic dialogues to the *Respublica*, and from the *Phaedrus* to the *Leges*. In the early period, the static and synoptic theory of Idea, that is contemplation of the hypostasized Idea meaning heavenly, eternal existence, while in the later period the dynamic and diairetic theory of Idea, that is generation leading of earthly, realistic existence (*γένεσις εἰς οὐσίαν*) are the central subject. *γένεσις* here used does not mean physical *generatio* but rather artistic *formatio*. And so far as *formatio* is concerned with things human, being distinguished from Christian *creatio*, forms the essence of the later theory of the Platonic Idea. Professor Yamanouchi seeks the basis of this characteristically defined *formatio* chiefly in the idea of *δημιουργός* of the *Timæus*. Accordingly, emphasis is placed more on the *Timæus* than on the *Philebus*, giving the Idea of Plato a wider and deeper foundation than the causal theory of Professor Kawada. Regrettably, I must refrain in this brief report, from an attempt to convey in detail the logical provisions of Yamanouchi's interpretation.

The author of *Sophist*, M. Tanaka, wrote two books, *Logos to Idea* (Logos and Idea) in 1947, and *Zen to Hitsuzen to no aidani* (Between the Good and the Necessary) in 1952. These are both collections of treatises, the former including the different themes of reality (*παρὸν πάθος*), future, past, time, logos, misologos, nomina and Idea, the latter with the various headings of the minimum state (*ἡ ἀναγκαιότατη πόλις*), between the good and the necessary, art, and the meaning of the good. Therefore, these do not directly deal with Plato as subject but rather with eternal philosophical problems. But Professor Tanaka endeavours to interpret correctly these vari-

³¹ The contents of the first volume are philosophical thoughts of Greece from the Milesian school to the lesser Socrates with "disposition of logos" as their introduction. The whole construction and interpretation of this volume remind us of K. Joël's *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, Bd. 1. Tübingen 1921.

ous problems from the standpoint of Platonism. And, with his philological erudition and philosophical keenness, highly convincing conclusions are given. For this reason, these books are symbolic of the period of criticism and philological-philosophical research which is the present stage in the study of Greek philosophy in Japan.

On Aristotle

Just as J. Stenzel made a decisive contribution to the study of Plato in this century, Professor W. Jaeger cultivated the indestructible royal way in the study of Aristotle by establishing "the fundamentals of the history of Aristotle's development." His brilliant work on Aristotle is already well known throughout the world, and it is unnecessary to repeat it here, even though many improvements and alterations may be made by further study.³² Therefore, anyone who wishes to express something new on Aristotelian philosophy must start out with the image of Aristotle superbly carved by Jaeger, as long as one sufficiently reflects upon the history and tradition of Aristotle's interpretation, believing in the constant progress of learning. Professor Jaeger's *Aristotle* is certainly the *terminus ad quem* and at the same time the *terminus a quo* in Aristotelian study of this century.

With this conviction, I wrote two books, *Aristoteles Kenkyū* (Studies in Aristotle) 1940 and *Aristoteles no Rinrigaku* (Ethics of Aristotle) 1950. The former is composed of four headings; on the theme and composition of the *Metaphysics*, the development of ἀλήθεια-concept in Aristotle, on the two περὶ φύξης of Aristotle, and the development of Aristotelian epistemology. Therefore, the title that runs through this book may be replaced by "from the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle to his epistemology." What I intended in this book was to build up the developmental history of the "epistemology of Aristotle" following the Jaeger method, as F. Solmsen and R. Walzer has accomplished in both the logical and ethical fields.³³ It is an undisputable fact that such German scholars as F.F. Kampe and J. Geyser had made large contributions to this difficult problem through their famous writings under the same title.³⁴ At the same time, however, we can not fail to point out their non-historical character coming from their preoccupation with the traditional "system of Aristotle," disregarding his development. In consideration of their rather out-of-date interpretations, my book aims at making it possible to form a theory on the cognition of the Stagirite with historically greater truth. This not only reconstructs

³² Cf. P. Wilpert; *Die Lage der Aristotelesforschung*, in *Zeitschrift für Philosophische Forschung*. Bd. 1. 1946.

³³ F. Solmsen; *Die Entwicklung der Aristotelischen Logik und Rhetorik*, in *Neue Philologische Untersuchungen*, hrsg. v. W. Jaeger, Jft 4, Berlin 1929. R. Walzer; *Magna Moralia und Aristotelische Ethik*, in *Neue Philol. Unters.* Heft 7, Berlin 1929.

³⁴ Cf. F.F. Kampe; *Die Erkenntnistheorie des Aristoteles*. Leipzig 1870. J. Geyser; *Die Erkenntnistheorie des Aristoteles*. Münster 1917.

epistemology but also anticipates a new concrete system of Aristotle.

The latter, likewise guided by the studies of Jaeger and Walzer, using the development of the *φρόνησις*-concept which played an important role in ancient philosophy as a clue, establishes the inter-relation of the three ethical works attributed to Aristotle. It attempted to clarify the meaning and position within practical syllogism or moral judgment by close analysis of this idea which is especially manipulated in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the *résumé* of this book, entitled *Aristotle's Theory of Practical Wisdom* was contributed to this Annals in 1951.³⁵ If fortunately these books of mine should add something to the study of Greek Philosophy in Japan and if they can claim their *raison d'être* in the present stage of our philosophical world, it will be due to a very evident and natural attitude, sometimes neglected in this country that philosophical theories and interpretations of Greek thought must be built upon a strict philological and correct historical foundation.

Keiji Nishitani, who is professor at Kyoto University and successor to S. Hatano, in his book *Aristoteles Ronkō* (Treatise on Aristotle), Tokyo 1948, endeavours to gain a systematically unified understanding of Aristotelian philosophy from *logical* and *physical* research in regard to the three problems of sense-reception (*αἰσθησις*), imagination (*φαντασία*) and reason (*νοῦς*). He is one of the deep-minded and leading philosophers in contemporary Japan, and in his work gives an interpretation full of suggestion about the various difficult passages of the Stagirite. However, these all presuppose the possibility of a traditional "system of Aristotle," and he seems to be attempting to understand Aristotle philosophically rather than historically, in other words, more from a standpoint close to St. Thomas and Hegel than Aristotle himself. This seems to be the characteristic of his book on Aristotle.³⁶

No works worth while mentioning have been prepared in relation to Hellenistic philosophy, with but a few exceptions.³⁷ This reveals the shallowness and narrowness of the basis of study of Greek philosophy in Japan which is a task assigned to the future.

³⁵ See my article, in Annals of the Hitotsubashi Academy. Vol. II, No. 1, Oct. 1951.

³⁶ In addition to these three, the following works on Aristotle may be cited here: *Selected Works of Aristotle*, translated by T. Ide, Tokyo 1947. I. Aoki; *Aristoteles*, Tokyo 1927. K. Miki; *The Metaphysics of Aristotle*, Tokyo 1935 and *Aristotle*, Tokyo 1938. (The Complete Works of Kiyoshi Miki. Vol. IX, Tokyo 1947).

³⁷ For instance, Cicero, *Laelius de amicitia*, translated by N. Nagasawa and *Cato maior*, tr. by T. Saito. Tokyo 1943. Epictetus, *Dissertationes*, tr. by K. Haranō. Nara 1949. Plutarchus, *Parallelae Vitae*, tr. by Y. Kōno. Tokyo 1952 ff. (in progress). *Moralia*, selected and tr. by I. Aoki, Tokyo 1948. Plotinus, *Enneades*, V, 1 (On the three Hypostases), VI, 9 (On the Good or the One), tr. by M. Tanaka. Osaka 1948. Proclus, *Institutio theologica*, tr. by T. Igarashi. Tokyo 1944. Boethius, *De consolazione philosophiae*, tr. by T. Hatakenaka. Tokyo 1938. J. Shikano; *Stoa no Tetsujin-tachi* (the Stoic Philosophers). Tokyo. do.; *Plotinus* Tokyo 1939. T. Ide; *Plotinus Enneades*. Tokyo 1936.

In order to arouse interest for ancient philosophy, I had planned the publishing of *Tetsugaku-shi Kenkyū* (Study of History of Philosophy) in 1949, in cooperation with Professor Yamanouchi, and really published a first volume, but was forced to postpone the work because of the publisher's convenience. However, the *Classical Society of Japan* has been organized by almost all classical philologists and scholars of ancient philosophy in Japan, and its organ, *Seiyō Kotengaku Kenkyū* (Journal of Classical Studies) was published early this year. This is an epoch-making event, because we can safely say that a new lodestar has appeared in the development of the study of Greek philosophy in Japan, promising steady and rapid progress in the future.

— Written in November, 1953 —