

EXPERIMENTAL POSITIVISM IN MOTOORI NORINAGA: In Comparison with French Philosophy

Nakako MIYAKE

CONTENTS

Preface

Chapter 1. Karagokoro (Chinese Thought) and Yamatogokoro (Japanese Thought)

1. Kokugaku and Norinaga
2. The Chu Hsi School
3. The main theme of *Uiyamabumi*

Chapter 2. Norinaga's Medicine

1. Document given to Fuji Bunyo
2. Suzunoya Tōmonroku No. 45
3. Attempting to unite Yamatogokoro and the European Modern Science

Chapter 3. The Three Discoveries

1. The Meaning of Norinaga's Discovery
2. The Meaning of Descartes' Discovery
3. "Descartes of the nineteenth century" Claude Bernard

Conclusion

Preface

I would like to begin this article by quoting the following three passages:

We can talk and prate, Cicero says thus, These are Plato's customs, These are the very words of Aristotle; but what say we our selves? What do we?.....we take the opinions and knowledge of others into our protection, and that is all: I tell you they must be enfeoffed in us, and made our own. We may very well be compared unto him, who having need of fire, should go fetch some at his neighbour's chimney, where finding a good fire, should there stay to warm himself, forgetting to carry some home, what avails it us to have our bellies full of meat, if it be not digested?¹⁾

I should not, however, on this account have ventured at once on the examination of all the difficulties of the sciences which presented themselves for me, for this would have been contrary to the order prescribed in the method, but observing that the knowledge of such is dependent on principles borrowed from philosophy, in which I found nothing certain, I thought it necessary first of all to endeavour to establish its principles. And because I observed, besides, that an inquiry of this kind was of all others of the greatest moment, and one in which precipitancy and anticipation in judgment were most to be dreaded, I thought that I ought not to approach it till I had reached a more mature age (being at that time but twenty-three), and had first of all employed much of my time in preparation for the work, as well as by eradicating from my mind all the erroneous opinions I had up to that moment accepted, as by amassing variety of experience to afford materials for my reasonings, and by continually exercising myself in my chosen method to increased skill in its application.²⁾

‘In life, there are many routes to pursue learning.’ I refer here to the study of things indigenous to our Imperial Land. Since olden times, the term ‘learning’ has meant classical Chinese studies. To distinguish between the two, it has been the custom to call the study of things of our Imperial Land ‘Japanese studies’ or ‘national studies’, but these are highly inappropriate expressions. Since it is our own country, the study of things of our Imperial Land should be referred to simply as ‘studies’, and studies of Chinese topics should be pointedly called ‘Chinese studies’. In some areas where confusion may occur with Chinese studies, it should be termed ‘the study of our Imperial Dynasties’, and so on.

To be so careless and always call it ‘Japanese studies’ or ‘national studies’ is to treat our Imperial Land as a side-stream. True, from the point of view of foreign countries such as China, Korea, or Holland, it might be regarded so, but there is no need on our own accord to consider our country as foreign.

After all, China is a foreign country, and everything about that nation pertains to an alien land. Being clear on this point, we should designate Chinese things as matters pertaining to the Han Dynasty or to the Tang Dynasty, and so forth. Since the affairs of our Imperial Land are of a domestic nature, the name of our country need not be specifically mentioned.

Since the ancient past, however, the custom has been to regard Chinese as principal;

in all discussions, our people treat China as part of themselves while regarding our Imperial Land as foreign. This is a misconception that does great harm. I state this here since it undermines the Japanese Spirit.³⁾

What is common to these three passages is the antagonism against the authorized traditional thinking. The first one belongs to *Essays*, Volume I, Chapter 25 (hereafter quoted as I-25) written by Michel de Montaigne (1533–1592), the second one was quoted from *A Discourse on Method*, Part II, by René Descartes (1596–1650), and the last one was from *Uiyamabumi* (The First Learning) by Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801). The first one was already quoted in my own article “Impermanence and Uncertainty”⁴⁾

It was in about 1575, that Montaigne met that important book of Sextus Empiricus *Outlines of Pyrrhonism* in the Latin translation. After a few years, Montaigne seemed to write that passage quoted above. Asking himself what he should do as a person living in the age of Renaissance, Montaigne found the answer that discovery of MYSELF and describing in detail the inside of MYSELF are the most pivotal of all. This discovery was depicted in his *Essays*, which played a leading role in thinking of the modern world.

Descartes, following the suggestions of Montaigne, marched to another discovery, of the first principle of philosophy for establishing a new science. For those who intend to study a new science, Descartes writes a “guidebook”, the title of which is “A Discourse on Method”.

It was in 1798, that Motoori Norinaga (hereafter simply Norinaga) wrote *Uiyamabumi*, which was nothing but a “guidebook” for the beginners of learning. Rejecting the traditional way of studying the learning of the Chinese scholar, Chu Hsi (朱子), Norinaga discovered “the way of Kami (God)”, and succeeded in establishing “Kokugaku (National Studies 国学)” after exhaustive research of the text of *Kojiki* (The Ancient Chronicles) (712 A. D.). In 1798, the same year as *Uiyamabumi*, after devoting 34 years to research, Norinaga completed *Kojiki-den* (古事記伝) of 44 volumes.

It was with the intention to study medicine (medical science), that Norinaga left his hometown Matsuzaka for Kyoto. Norinaga was a physician or children’s doctor before becoming anything else. He was also successful as a medical doctor. I have cherished for a long time the wish and hope to make it clear that the theme of *Uiyamabumi* and his “discovery” have something to do with his research and practice of medical science.

And besides, among important thinkers, it was not only Norinaga, that practiced medicine, or showed considerable interest in it. Sextus Empiricus is said to have had his patients as his clients, while Montaigne had much interest in maintaining good health as

well as Descartes, who studied medicine in the medical faculty of the University of Poitiers. It might be helpful for understanding Norinaga's medicine, that we have such predecessors in the Western world and that we can refer to all such cases.

The time was approaching near, when Tokugawa government collapsed. The ocean surrounding Japan could not have been calm all days any longer. The waves of scientific revolution of the 17th century, on which Montaigne exerted prominent influence, and in which Descartes played a leading role, began to reach Nagasaki, the only window of Tokugawa Japan to the Western world. Norinaga's medicine was forced to be influenced by these waves.

The purpose of this article consists in pursuing Norinaga's knowledge and practice of medical science, by comparing the method of learning shown in Norinaga's *Uiyamabumi* and in Descartes' *A Discourse on Method*.

Chapter 1. Karagokoro (Chinese Thought) and Yamatogokoro (Japanese Thought)

1. Kokugaku and Norinaga

Norinaga explained Karagokoro in his work *Tamakatsuma*, which W. G. Aston translated into English. Aston begins his description of Norinaga as follows:

The greatest of the Wagakusha (Students of Japanese Antiquity), and one of the most remarkable men whom Japan has produced, was MOTOORI NORINAGA. He was born in 1730 at Matsuzaka, in the province of Ise. There can be no doubt that the proximity of his native place to the famous shrines sacred from antiquity to the worship of the Sun Goddess and the Goddess of Food, had a considerable influence on his career.....At the age of twenty-one he was sent to Kiōto by his widowed mother to study medicine. There he became acquainted with the works of Keichiu, which he read with avidity. In 1757 he returned to Matsuzaka and set up in practice as a physician. Soon afterwards his attention was drawn to Mabuchi's writings.....

Motoori's life was from this time forward a very busy one. In addition to his medical practice, which was in a flourishing condition, he was engaged in collecting material for his great commentary on the *Kojiki*, and in giving instructions to hundreds of pupils whom the fame of his learning had attracted to him. Eventually he was taken into the advices of the Daimio of Kishiu, who was a great admirer of his writings. Late in life, Motoori resigned his official position and removed to Kiōto, where he gave lectures

which were attended by audiences drawn from the highest classes of society in that city. He died there in 1801, in the seventy-second year of his age.....

Motoori was a prolific writer. He brought out fifty-five distinct works in over one hundred and eighty volumes. His fame as a scholar and writer rests chiefly on his *Kojiki-den*, a commentary on the *Kojiki*, the sacred book of the Shinto religion. Before his time the study of the *Kojiki* had been much neglected, the very language in which it is written being well-nigh unintelligible even to educated Japanese. In this monumental work, which fills no fewer than forty-four good-sized volumes, he brought to bear on the elucidation of a very difficult text a vast store of erudite knowledge, derived from a long study of the *Manyōshū* and other books of the old literature. It occupied him for many years. Begun in 1764, it was not completed until 1796, and the final volumes were not issued from the press till long after his death.

The *Kojiki-den* is not only valuable for its prodigious learning; it was a vigorous blow aimed at the supremacy of the Chinese school of ethics and philosophy. No opportunity is lost of girding at everything Chinese, and of exalting the old Japanese customs, religion, and language, in a spirit of ardent and indiscriminating patriotism. The *Kojiki-den* had no small share in producing the reaction against Chinese ideas and institutions which had become so pronounced a characteristic of modern Japan.....

The *Tamakatsuma* (in fifteen volumes, published posthumously in 1812), may be called "Motoori's Note-book." It is a collection of jottings of a very miscellaneous character, comprising notes on Shinto ceremonial, on the old literature, on grammar and spelling, on poetry, on ancient customs, on the iniquity of Chinese principles and institutions, &c., &c. It is a mine of instruction to all students of Japanese antiquity, but has little except perhaps a few autobiographical memoranda which will interest others.

Another miscellaneous work, the *Suzunoya no Bunshū*, also contains some interesting personal reminiscences. I should like to transcribe from it a delicately drawn description of how the great author spent a very hot day in the society of some congenial friends. It is unfortunately too long for quotation.

Before Motoori's time there was no Japanese grammar, one or two dictionaries of the *Tenwoha* or particles being hardly an exception. Although he did not produce a systematic grammar of the Japanese language, Motoori did much to throw light upon its structure.....

All the *Wagakusha* considered themselves bound to compose poetry in the old style. Motoori acquitted himself of this obligation more creditably than most of his fellows.

The following Tanka is much admired:

“If one should ask you
What is the heart
Of Island Yamato —
It is the mountain cherry blossom
Which exhales its perfume in the morning sun.”

In other words, “The Japanese are instinctively and naturally noble and virtuous — not like the Chinese, who require a clumsy and artificial system of ethical philosophy for the cultivation of their moral natures.”

Motoori’s anti-foreign and patriotic prejudices go far to explain his antipathy for the Kangakusha (students of Chinese learning) with their extravagant admiration for everything Chinese. But there was a deeper cause for his dislike to their philosophy. As already stated, the Chinese nation has a strong bias against the conception of power which rules the universe as a personal being. The *Ten* (Heaven) of Confucius and Mencius, and the *Tao* (Way) of Laotze, not to speak of the *Taikhi* and other metaphysical conceptions of the Sung schoolmen, all fall short of this idea. The main bent of the Japanese mind is in the same direction. But there is evidence in both countries of a contrary current of thought. Here, too, there are men born with a craving which refuses to be satisfied with abstractions in the place of personal God (or gods) to whom they can look up as the Creator and Ruler of the universe, and as exercising a providential care over mankind. Motoori was one of these. He professed not even to understand what the Sung schoolmen meant by their *Taikhi* and their *Yin* and *Yang*, and stoutly maintained that these were fictions. But whatever may be the case with philosophical notions, no one can evolve a God from his inner consciousness. He must accept the God or gods whom he finds already acknowledged, whether by his own or by other people’s fathers. Motoori’s intensely patriotic temper compelled him to seek at home for his satisfaction of his inborn religious instincts. He turned naturally to Shinto. But in his time Shinto had fallen on evil days. It had suffered grievously from the encroachment of Buddhism.....

The mythological record begins with the bare names of a number of gods who seem to have been provided merely in order to form a genealogy for Izanagi and Izanami, the male and female creator deities of Japan.....

After his return to earth, Izanagi bathed in the sea in order to wash away the pollutions which he had contracted during his stay in Hades, and in doing so generated

various deities, among which were the Sun Goddess, produced from his left eye, and the Moon, produced from his right eye. A third deity, named Susa no wo (the Rain-storm), was at the same time born from his nose. Izanagi conferred on these three the dominion of the Plain of Heaven, of Night, and of the Sea respectively....¹⁾

2. The Chu Hsi School

Now follows Norinaga's vehement criticism on "Karagokoro" (Chinese opinion), which Aston translates into English. This passage is the translation of a part of Norinaga's work *Tamakatsuma*.

In China all good and bad fortune of men, all order and disorder in the State — everything, in short, which happens in this world — is ascribed to the action of Ten (Heaven). Using such terms as the Way of Ten, the Command of Ten, and the Principle of Ten, they regard it as a thing to be honoured and feared above all. China, however, is a country where the true way generally has not been handed down. There they do not know that all things are the doing of the gods, and therefore resort rashly to such inventions. Now Heaven is nothing more than the region where the gods of Heaven dwell. It is a thing destitute of sense, and it is unreasonable to talk of its 'command' and the like. To fear and honour Ten, and not fear and honour the gods, is like yielding an idle honour and awe to the Imperial Palace, and showing no reverence or honour to its sovereign. Foreign countries, however, not having attained to the knowledge that everything is the doing of gods, may be pardoned for believing this Doctrine of the Way of Ten or the Principle of Ten. But what is to be thought of those who, in this country, where a knowledge of the true way has been handed down, do not take the trouble to examine it, but, simply accepting the erroneous doctrines of foreign lands, imagine that that which they call Ten is a thing of peerless excellence, and in all matters can talk of nothing but its principle? Take again their pedantic and wearisome *Taikhi* [the Great Limit], *Mu Ki* [the Limitless], *Yin* and *Yang* [Positive and Negative Principles of Nature], *Ch'ien* and *K'un* [Celestial and Terrestrial Principles], *Pakwa* [Eight Diagrams of the Book of Changes], and *Wu-hing* [Five Elements], which are pure inventions of the Chinese, and for which there is in reality no sound reason. What consummate folly it is for those who would interpret our sacred books to rely implicitly on principles of this kind. In recent times even those who try to divest themselves of Chinese prejudices in their interpretations fail to understand the

falseness of their doctrines of the Principle of Ten, and of the Positive and Negative Powers of Nature, and do not succeed in bursting the barrier because they do not put thoroughly away from them their Chinese notions, nor resolutely rouse themselves from their deluding dreams. Moreover, the refusal of some to identify Ama-terasu no Ohomi Kami [the Sun Goddess] as the Sun of Heaven is owing to their being steeped in Chinese narrow-minded reasonings, and so become blind to the wonderful and profound principle of the true way.²⁾

3. The main theme of *Uiyamabumi*

How to get rid of “Karagokoro” and how to get “Yamatogokoro”. First of all, we must notice the following: Needless to say, the foreign learnings that Norinaga rejected as Ju-Butsu 儒仏 (Confucianism and Buddhism) in a lump are not necessarily as they were in early time of Confucius and Gotama Buddha, the originators. Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism in Norinaga’s days were quite different from each originator’s teachings. The religious sect of Norinaga’s family Motoori was Jōdo-kyō, to which I have already referred in my article published in *Jinbun* Volume 3. Both Neo-Confucianism and Buddhism were japanized. In any way, the issue is not the difference between the early ones and the ones of Norinaga’s age, but his declaration of independence from Chinese learnings, seeking Yamato-Damashii. With some teachers before him, Norinaga had to grope for the way within the dark. *Uiyamabumi* seems to be his biography showing his groping to its readers.

Norinaga advises in *Uiyamabumi* the Japanese people to read the important history books of Japan, especially *Kojiki* and *Nihon-shoki* by which we learn the way of Amaterasu-ōmikami, not to speak of his own book *Kojiki-den* and ritual notes and books on poetry, especially *Manyōshū*. He explained the importance of studying Japanese antiquity or the ancient way (the way of Amaterasu), and he advised to learn the Japanese “Miyabi” (elegance) through Waka (Japanese poetry) and ancient Japanese language. He paraphrases “Miyabi” to “Mononoaware” (sensitivity toward elegance). As he says in another book (*Genji Monogatari Tama no Ogushi*), it is *Genji Monogatari* that “Mononoaware” is narrated in various ways. We can understand what “Mononoaware” is, if we read *Genji Monogatari*, he insists.

What seems remarkable to me in *Uiyamabumi* are the following passages:

Now I will try to instruct you by listing faults in the practices of recent poets.

First, there is blind obedience to traditional principles; traditions are held to be

sacrosanct, eliciting much reverence and trust. For poetry as well as scholarship, these people believe that only someone who is orthodox in a traditional sense is acceptable, while those who do not observe tradition are regarded as worthless. Also, they admire the poetry of ancient poets or founders of particular poetic schools without trying to judge its quality; they consider them unattainably superb. On the other hand, they do not accept the poetry of another school, no matter how outstanding it may be; they do not even take the trouble to pursue it. They steadfastly regard the rules and regulations of their own school as divine law, and consider it imperative to conform to them rigidly.

As a result, they are bound by teaching and rules, growing overly dependent on them. Their poetry is set in the recent style in terms of the diction and rhythm of the poem. It is full of bad features, the style is shallow and stuffy, inflexible like a man whose arms and legs have been tied. Their poetry appears suffocating and shabby, with no trace of imagination or expansiveness. Yet without any self-reflection, they are convinced that their attitude alone is correct.³⁾

As for the rules of this art, you should distinguish the good from the bad and follow the former, but never adhere to them rigidly. It is also nonsense to regard the poetry of the ancients as uniformly superior and unattainable, without attempting to judge its quality. There are many defects in ancient poetry; although composed by a poetic genius, not every poem is splendid. Even if it is the poetry of Hitomaro and Tsurayuki, you must scrutinize its actual merit and try to comment upon it critically, however junior you may be in scholarly achievement.

In sum, there is no better training and cultivation of the art than trying to discern superior and inferior poetry; it is a very beneficial practice. But if you believe, as recent poets do, that the standards of the ancients are completely unattainable, then there is no way of refining your sensitivity to assess the quality of poetry, and as a consequence you cannot judge the quality of your own poetry. Is it not cowardly to go on this way, depending and leaning on the great masters? If you adopt the inappropriate and mindless method of learning of these poets of recent years, you may be sure that no good poetry will result for the rest of your life.⁴⁾

Chapter 2. Norinaga's Medicine

Concerning the articles (works) on Norinaga's medicine, I have so far met the following two pieces:

The first piece was written in 1700 Chinese characters (Kanji), a document for Fuji Bunyo, who was a colleague of studying together medicine in Kyoto and who was going home after finishing his study in Kyoto. This document was written by Norinaga in 1756, one year after his returning home.

The second piece is a passage from Norinaga's work *Suzunoya Tōmonroku*, completed in 1801, number 45.

There are few articles or books which are referring to Norinaga's medicine (medical science) and his "Kokugaku" in a combined form.

In referring to Norinaga's first document (for Fuji Bunyo), I am consulting mainly Takahashi's book,¹⁾ and in referring to his second document in *Suzunoya Tōmonroku*, I am consulting Ishida's article.²⁾

1. Document given to Fuji Bunyo

Norinaga studied at first the learning of Chu Hsi (1130–1200) under the guidance of Hori Keizan. In those days people intending to become a medical doctor used to begin with studying the Confucian learning. Then Norinaga studied Ri Chu (李朱) medicine under the guidance of Hori Motoatsu. Ri Chu medicine was founded on the basis of the Neo-Confucian learning of Chu Hsi in Kin (金) Dynasty or Mongolian (Gen 元) Dynasty in China and was introduced to Japan at the end of Muromachi Era. Norinaga had studied both Chu Hsi and Ri Chu medicine eagerly and visited Takegawa Kōjun, who was children's doctor. Norinaga began to study the books which were useful for practical medical technology. Needless to say, we can find within these books *Honzō-kōmoku* (本草綱目) compiled by Li Shih-chen, which is the Chinese fundamental text on medical plant.

In 1757, Norinaga returned to his home town Matsuzaka with the medical name of Shun-an (春庵), and began to practice medicine. Ishida pays attention to some changes taking place in Norinaga's mind, and says that these changes are recorded in the above-mentioned document written in 1756: that is according to Ishida the sympathy with Chuang-tzu (莊子 356–290B. C.), not with Confucius, Chu Hsi, nor with Lao-tzu. According to Norinaga, Chuang-tzu thinks everything freely, thinking natural phenomenon "to be naturally so", without the so-called Cause-Effect-Principle.

At the time when Norinaga was a student of medicine, the group of Ko-hō (古方) medicine had been already criticizing Ri Chu medicine based on the teaching of Chu Hsi attacking its Yin-Yao and five-element theory. Ko-hō school made much of treating patients practically or experimentally, not theoretically nor metaphysically. One of the most

prominent physician of Ko-hō group was Yamawaki Tōyō (1705–1762), who dissected the dead body for the first time in Japan, and began to doubt Ri Chu medicine. Though Norinaga studied Ri Chu medicine, he was on one hand affirmative to the critical attitude of Ko-hō group, but on the other hand he criticized the tendency in this group of ignoring too much the traditional medical method, which Ri Chu school possessed.

On the opposite side of Ko-hō group, the medical group named Kin-hō was also prospering. The Kin-hō group, in turn, according to Norinaga, also had problems. Because to this group the Ri Chou medicine was like something sacred. This group was depending too much on authority. And so, according to Norinaga, both groups were making the mistakes respectively. Namely, Ko-hō group insists too strongly upon its own way, and Kin-hō group depends too much on authority.

Norinaga says ironically that Ko-hō gives to the patients the medicine or medical plants too much, while Kin-hō admires the way of Ri Chu too much. The more medicine a doctor gives to the patient, the less effect does the medicine have, he says. According to Norinaga, the medical method and the medicine are not always almighty. It is the subjective judgment of a doctor to decide how much he should give to the patients. The doctor must judge by himself how much he should give. He should not adhere to a medical doctrine. He should treat his patients by adapting himself to each occasion. Here we can notice the similarity between what Norinaga says on distinguishing the good poetry and the bad one and what he says on the medical method. For the moment, that similarity will remain unsettled.

What is important to the treatment of disease, according to Norinaga, is not medical treatment or medicine, but “Ki (気)”, or “Genki (元氣 vigorous spirit or energy)”, which is given by “Ten (天, Heaven)” and this Ki is incomprehensible even to Kami (神, God). With Ki human beings are alive, and without Ki they are dead. We must (here also) distinguish the good (true) Ki and the evil one. As only good Ki protect us from disease, the doctor must support the good Ki, which lies originally in us. It is useful for supporting the good Ki that we have less food, less thinking, much obedience. Then we animate Ki well, and we obey to it throughout our whole body. According to Ishida’s explanation, this Ki-theory derives from Ko-hō. The doctor who practices all these things is called by Norinaga a good doctor. Norinaga says that Fuji Bunyo is the very doctor. For Norinaga, Fuji Bunyo is an ideal doctor, because he has a literary talent. Also in Norinaga medical mind and literary mind runs parallel. This issue will be discussed later.

2. *Suzunoya Tōmonroku* No. 45

This passage was written about 20 years later after the document above. It goes as follows: All the things that occur in Heaven and Earth are caused by Kami (God).....not only small pox, plague (epidemic), the shakes, but also all other disease. Some diseases are serious, others light. If we are seriously ill, we can explicitly admit that the Kami causes it, but in the light cases, we do not always admit it. There are no disease, however, but are caused by the Kami. When one becomes sick, one takes some medicine, or one is cared by some techniques. All those cases are also caused by the Kami. In order to cure, the Kami decides this medicine for this sickness, or that technique for that sickness. It is only by the spirit (“tama” in Japanese) that each sickness is cured.

When he was a student of medicine, he had studied the Japanized Ri Chu medicine, and then he was influenced by Ko-hō medicine which criticized Ri Chu medicine, staying at experimental positivism without asking the cause of each sickness. This passage of *Tōmonroku* shows us that Norinaga came to attributing the cause of every sickness to the Kami. He had once had sympathy with Chaung-tzu.³⁾ What had occurred to him in those 20 years? Examining his biography and the description written by himself on medicine and further examining his prescription to patients, we know that medical mind and literary mind were working in him in parallel. He had many kinds of patients as a physician and a children’s doctor, while he was investigating his “Kokugaku” and writing many books one after another.

In the above-mentioned *Uiyamabumi*, Norinaga advised the Japanese intellectuals to read not only the books on Japanese history, but also *Waka-shū* (Poetry books) and story books in order to make up and confirm “Yamato Gokoro” (Japanese Spirit), by understanding “mono no aware” (pathos) and “kami no michi” (the way of God).

According to Norinaga’s books (*Shibunoryō* and *Isonokami no Sasamegoto* both published in 1763), “mono no aware” is bestowed to “mono” (thing, phenomenon) by the Kami, while the Kami also bestows a mind of feeling, “aware”, to each human being. For Norinaga, “mono” means not only thing or phenomenon in nature, but also people who are around him or who visit him as his patients, it seems to me. In short, “mono no aware” means for Norinaga to feel everything properly, including the conditions of his patients, it seems to me.

In *Naobi no mitama*, which is written as a preface to *Kojiki-den*, Norinaga mentions two kinds of Kami: Magatsubi (the evil Kami) and Naobi (the good or right Kami). All the evil things come from Magatsubi. “Maga” means to be bent, crooked, therefore not right.

When Magatsubi rages violently, no one, even Amaterasu, the Sun Goddess, can do anything against him. It is only Naobi who stops what Magatsumi does. We must know that all the acts and ideas come from these two kinds of Kami, and that with the help of the spirit (tama) of Naobi and by studying classics, we must try to correct what Magatsubi does.

Norinaga ends *Naobi no mitama* with the following passage: What I (Norinaga) say in *Naobi no mitama* is not my dogmatic thought. All these sayings of mine are based on classics. A good reader of classics would never suspect it.

Here, like a sceptic, Norinaga seems to be afraid of falling into dogmatism. He seems to suspend even his own judgment lest he should fall into dogmatism.

In *Tōmonroku* Norinaga says that every disease is caused by the Kami. Now that we read *Naobi no mitama*, we know that the Kami who is causing disease, for example infectious disease like small pox, is not anybody else but Magatsubi. Human beings suffered from infectious disease 200 years ago still more than now. Once such a disease was generated, there was no other way against it than to escape or wait for waning of itself. I feel some reality in what Norinaga says on Magatsubi. In any way, Norinaga was surely a medical doctor of “Yamato Gokoro” equipped with “mono no aware”.

It is well known that Norinaga painted in 1773 a self-portrait with a branch of Yama-Zakura (mountain cherry blossoms), putting his work *Kojiki-den* on the desk in front of himself. He symbolizes nature (“mono”) with a branch of Yama-Zakura, with which he seems to intend to identify himself. What is symbolized by this Yama-Zakura is not limited to the nature including himself or his patients, but is being enlarged to cosmos, the universe. His interest in the natural science was not limited to the medical science, but was being enlarged to astronomy.

3. Attempting to unite Yamatogokoro and the European Modern Science

Norinaga was interested in astronomy, or we should say that he was interested mainly in the movement of the sun and the moon. In 1782 he wrote *Tenmon-zusetsu* (Astrological Diagram) and *Shinreki-kō* (Study on the True Calendar). In these books, he tries to explain on an actual proof those astrological movement which he can experience with precise and detailed diagrams. Ishida insists, quoting *Tamakushige*, *Kojiki-den* and *Kuzubana*, that we can discern two leading thoughts of Norinaga.⁴⁾ The first one is as follows: Both the sun and the moon we can really experience every day and night. Therefore what occurs in *Kojiki* occurs really in our everyday life. (Norinaga tries to attach scientific actuality to the myth — *Kojiki* and *Nihon-shoki* — by showing the diagrams. The second one is according to

Ishida as follows: Ishida defines the characteristics of Norinaga's scientific attitude as explaining HOW everything occurs, but not WHY everything occurs. Besides, Ishida also pays attention to the following expressions in *Kuzubana*: the apparent thing to our senses, namely what is apparently visible, and the obscure thing to our senses, existing only in idea, for human being unknowable. Norinaga distinguishes these two things, saying: "We feel hot in fire, and cold in water. It is empirically apparent for us to feel hot and cold, which is the reality itself given to our senses. The learning of Chu Hsi, however, explains such a natural phenomenon by Yin, Yan, and "Taikyoku" (great pole) theory. Yin, Yan, and "Taikyoku" are not the reality, which is apparent to our senses, but are only the reason (WHY). The reason why fire is hot, and water is cold, is unknowable for us. Nevertheless Chu Hsi theory will explain with such a theory. The ideas produced by that way of thinking are no more than illusions.

I would like to take notice of distinguishing the apparent thing to our senses from the obscure (not apparent) thing to our senses in *Kuzubana*.

Ishida, moreover, picks up the following passage from *Kojiki-den*: We should wash away "Karagokoro" (the Chinese mind), which thinks everything with our mind only. We know very well that heaven and earth, men and women, fire and water. All these things are natural as they are, and that they are unknowable by human beings, being mysteriously celestial, because all these things are caused by the Kami. Ishida calls such "natural science" of Norinaga the Shinto natural science, which cherishes, according to Ishida, agnosticism.⁵⁾

By the way, Norinaga (1730–1801), Hiraga Gennai (1729–1779), Sugita Genpaku (1733–1817) were contemporaries. Sugita, who is famous as the author of *Rangaku Kotohajime* (The Beginning of Dutch Learning), studied the Dutch medicine, observing the dissection of the executed dead body. In 1716 the Shogun Yoshimune initiated the so-called Kyōhō Reform, one of the policies of which was to encourage the study of the Dutch language and learning, and as a result, the Dutch medicine flourished in Edo, Japan's capital. The waves of the Scientific Revolution in the 17th Century had been reaching Japan with a delay of more than 100 years behind Europe. The heliocentric system was introduced into Japan by Motoki Yoshinaga (1735–1794). Within these waves from Europe, Norinaga spoke highly of European modern science because of its empirical positivism. Though he seemed to have been unable to understand and accept the heliocentric system, he tried to adjust his own "Shinto natural science", criticizing Neo-Confucianism and the cosmology of Buddhism ("Shumi-sen" theory, which seems to derive rather from ancient Indian thought than from Buddhism itself).

In his astrological diagram, Norinaga, putting the earth in the center, describes precisely and in detail the movement of the sun and the moon. In order to adjust between this diagram based on European astrology and the mystical cosmology of *Kojiki-den*, *Sandai-kō* (The three great thinkings) was written by Hattori Nakatsune, Norinaga's disciple, following his teacher's idea. In this book, Hattori declares that Amaterasu-ōmikami rules Takamagahara (heaven) and the sun, Tsukiyomi-no-mikoto rules the moon, and Yomi no kuni (the land of night). And Hattori puts the earth in the center. The ruler of the earth is according to him Tennō (Emperor of Japan). In this peculiar way, the cosmology of *Kojiki* was adjusted by Hattori's *Sandai-kō*, and was united with the modern European scientific thinking.⁶⁾

In *Shinreki-kō* (Study on the True Calendar), Norinaga adopts the solar system, instead of Chinese lunar-solar system. He thinks the solar system to be natural to the living things, which depend upon the rhythm of the sun.

Norinaga spoke highly of the modern science, as I have pointed out, because of its empiricism and positivism. He seems, however, not to have had intention to learn the Dutch medicine, though he was to some degree interested in the Dutch language. As a medical doctor, did he ever try to correct the wrong doing of Magatsubi with the help of Naobi-no-mitama? If so, how did Naobi help him cure his patients, and how did he accept Naobi's help? The modern European medical science, as a matter of fact, was great and outstanding in finding the Cause-Effect Principle (law), to say symbolically, in the work of the God of Magatsubi.

Chapter 3. The Three Discoveries

1. The Meaning of Norinaga's Discovery

Norinaga is always consistent in avoiding the blind obedience to the authorities and in keeping his ability of proper judgment in any case, for example in examining his patients as is shown in the document on medicine for Fuji Bunyo, or in distinguishing the good Waka (poetry) from the bad one as is shown in *Uiyamabumi*.

After completing his another work *Naobi no Mitama* in 1771, he is afraid that someone might suspect Norinaga to be falling into dogmatism in what he says. And besides distinguishing the apparent to five senses from the obscure (not apparent), he insists, as I have suggested above, that it is only the former that human beings can recognize, and that it is beyond human ability to intend to know the cause of phenomenon, thus criticizing in

Kuzubana the learning of Chu Hsi.

This passage in *Kuzubana* reminds us of what Sextus Empiricus says concerning Aristotle. In his work *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, he puts Aristotle at the top of dogmatists and demonstrates the philosophy as Pyrrhonism. Sextus begins this work as follows:

The natural result of any investigation is that the investigators either discover the object of search or deny that it is discoverable and confess it to be inapprehensible or persist in their search. So, too, with regard to the objects investigated by philosophy, this is probably why some have claimed to have discovered the truth, others have asserted that it cannot be apprehended, while others again go on inquiring. Those who believe they have discovered it are the “Dogmatists,” especially so called — Aristotle, for example, and Epicurus and the Stoics and certain others; Cleitomachus and Carneades and other Academics treat it as inapprehensible: the Sceptics keep on searching. Hence it seems reasonable to hold that the main typus of philosophy are three — the Dogmatic, the Academic, and the Sceptic.¹⁾

Of the Sceptic philosophy one argument (or branch of exposition) is called “general,” the other “special.” In the general argument we set forth the distinctive features of Scepticism, stating its purport and principles, its logical methods, criterion, and end or aim; the “Tropes,” also, or “Modes,” which lead to suspension of judgment, and in what sense we adopt the Sceptic formulae, and the distinction between Scepticism and the philosophies which stand next to it.²⁾

Scepticism is an ability, or mental attitude, which opposes appearances to judgments in any way whatsoever, with the result that, owing to the equipollence of the objects and reasons thus opposed, we are brought to a state of mental suspense and next to a state of “unperturbedness” or quietude.³⁾

The phrase “opposed judgments” we do not employ in the sense of negations and affirmations only but simply as equivalent to “conflicting judgments.” “Equipollence” we use of equality in respect of probability and improbability, to indicate that no one of the conflicting judgments takes precedence of any other as being more probable. “Suspence” is a state of mental rest owing to which we neither deny nor affirm anything. “Quietude” is an untroubled and tranquil condition of soul. And how

quietude enters the soul along with suspension of judgment we shall explain in our chapter (XII.) “Concerning the End.”⁴⁾

Sextus then argues the reason why one judgment and another one are equal, and we must suspend the judgment.

The usual tradition amongst the older Sceptics is that the “modes” by which “suspension” is supposed to be brought about are ten in number; and they also give them the synonymous names of “arguments” and “positions.” They are these: the first, based on the variety in animals; the second, on the differences in human beings; the third, on the different structures of the organs of sense; the fourth, on the circumstantial conditions; the fifth, on positions and intervals and locations; the sixth, on intermixtures; the seventh, on the quantities and formations of the underlying objects; the eighth, on the fact of relativity; the ninth, on the frequency or rarity of occurrence; the tenth, on the disciplines and customs and laws, the legendary beliefs and the dogmatic convictions. This order, however, we adopt without prejudice.

As superordinate to these there stand three Modes — that based on the subject who judges, that on the object judged, and that based on both. The first four of the ten Modes are subordinate to the Mode based on the subject (for the subject which judges is either an animal or a man or a sense, and existent in some conditions) : the seventh and tenth Modes are referred to that based on the subject judged: the fifth, sixth, eighth and ninth are referred to the Mode based on both subject and object. Furthermore, these three Modes are also referred to that of relation, so that the Mode of relation stands as the highest genus, and the three as species, and the ten as subordinate sub species. We give this as the probable account of their numbers; and as to their argumentative force what we say is this.⁵⁾

In the eighth Mode, Sextus asks whether “to exist differentially” is absolute or not absolute (relative), and concludes that it is relative. In this passage on the eighth Mode, it is allowed, according to Sextus, to think that “to exist differentially” means to be independent of anyone by itself, that is to say, to be the invariably unmoved, as is suggested by Plato’s work *Theaetetus* 157.

If so, this is the most important thought in Aristotle’s metaphysics and cosmology, not to mention Plato’s.

Norinaga, according to Ishida, is agnostic, when Norinaga says in *Naobi-no-Mitama* that the reason of heaven and earth is caused by the Kami and is too mysterious for human being to understand. In another passage of this book, however, he says as follows: In the future the way of our country is invariably unmoved together with heaven and earth. This is an exquisitely mysterious property of our country, more excellent than in any other foreign countries.

Norinaga thinks that the way of the Kami will remain unmoved in the future. Is it possible to think that “Ri” (reason) of Chu Hsi’s theory has the idea of the unmoved? If not, we may say that rejecting Chu Hsi’s theory, and instead, following the way of the Kami, Norinaga thinks more metaphysically than this theory.

Well, Sextus is said to have been a physician. In the first argument (or Trope) of *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, Sextus explains the variety in animals in the relation between the so-called four humors (juices) and the senses of smell. It goes as follows:

.....Smell also differ because of the variety in animals. For if we ourselves are affected in one way when we have a cold and our internal phlegm is excessive, and in another way when the parts about our head are filled with an excess of blood, feeling an aversion to smells which seem sweet to everyone else and regarding them as noxious, it is reasonable to suppose that animals too — since some are flaccid by nature and rich in phlegm, others rich in blood, others marked by a predominant excess of yellow or of black gall — are in each case impressed in different ways by the object of smell. So too with the objects of taste; for some animals have rough and dry tongues, others extremely moist tongues. We ourselves, too, when our tongues are very dry, in cases of fever, think the food proffered us to be earthy and ill-flavoured or bitter — an affection due to the variation in the predominating juices in excess, in respect of taste also they will receive different impressions of the real objects.⁶⁾

In Europe it had long been thought that the proportion of the four humors in human bodies were decisive. Sextus adopted this theory, too.

Then, Sextus shows preference to the so-called methodical school. About this school, the footnote of the translation of Sextus of Loeb Classical Library comments as follows:

The later school of Medicine were three: ① the Dogmatic or Logical, which theorized about the “non-evident” causes of health and disease; ② the Empiric, which regarded such

causes as undiscoverable and confined itself to observation of evident facts; ③ the Methodic, which adopted an intermediate position, refusing either to affirm or deny “non-evident” causes.⁷⁾

Both V. Brochard and Craig Brush refer to the work of Galen, who had been the great authority, like Aristotle in philosophy, in physiology and medicine, and was contemporary of Sextus. Galen’s work, on its turn, explains the work of Sextus.

To make the description by Brochard short, his description on Sextus’ medicine goes as follows: ① In examining the patients, to observe well and describe, without any dogmatic judgment, how the situation of the patients are. ② To assemble the clinical example as many as possible. ③ To apply the similar treatment to the similar symptom. ④ As a result, to establish the theory in order to find the regulation in the similar symptoms. Medicine is a synthesis of these theories.

Craig B. Brush, says in his work *Montaigne and Bayle* as follows:

Appropriately enough, we know nothing certain about Sextus, neither his dates (probably third century A.D.), his birthplace, nor where he taught. Even the epithet “Empiricus” is the source of our mystery. If it means he belonged to the empirical school of medicine, how can we explain that he shows a preference for the methodical school in his *Hypotyposes*? What is clear is that he was one of several physicians adhering to the Pyrrhonist school of philosophy. Galen informs us of the nature of empirical medicine’s methodology. It was compounded of three steps: observation of individual cases, documentation of the experience of other doctors, and inferences from one set of circumstances to another. In a very crude way, this early empiricism could be called scientific. It is important to note that skepticism and scientific empiricism, while quite different in some ways, are not incompatible, sharing as they do certain similarities in attitude, primarily a reliance on experience.⁸⁾

Montaigne shows special interest in maintaining health and medicine, criticizing the unscientific medicine of his time, and is influenced by Sextus Empiricus’ doctrine of Pyrrhonism and perhaps by Sextus’ medicine. We can find the beginning of modern science, or more concretely, of modern medical science in Europe in a series of procedure conveyed by Galen, though it was still crude, but established already in the second century. It is necessary for empirical science, especially for medical science, to go through this procedure.

2. The Meaning of Descartes' Discovery

We have no idea of whether Norinaga intended to consult or not “Naobi no Mitama” when his patients were suffered from any serious disease, as if Magatsubi had raged violently at the patients. Norinaga, however, says in *Naobi-no-Mitama* that everything is caused by the deed of the Kami, the good thing by the Kami Naobi, while the evil thing by the evil Kami Magatsubi. As the conclusion of the same book, Norinaga says as follows: In seeking the way of the Kami, we are approaching near it little by little, naturally through reading Japanese classics. It is difficult, as the case may be, to see Magatsubi doing without doing anything. We are obliged to correct it with the help of Naobi-no-Mitama, though the way of the Kami remains unknown to us.

If it is Norinaga as a doctor who is against Magatsubi with the help of Naobi, how can he get contact with the Kami? Norinaga says that the way of the Kami is too mysterious for us to know. When he stands against Magatsubi, he first of all needs to distinguish each case of the evilness of Magatsubi with his own eyes just as he distinguish the good poetry from the bad one. Intending to see everything with his own eyes is nothing but the intellectual property in the modern world, with which Norinaga seems to share the opinion to some extent, although not perfectly, because such a property requires certain criterion of judgment in oneself and because Norinaga's way of thinking seems to be lacking such a property.

Montaigne, avoiding the authorized traditional thinking, seeing everything with his own eyes, and seeking something certain for him, discovered the existence of Himself in the depth of him. This Himself is a being the most certain for him as the criterion of truth. Montaigne sought the criterion of truth, and at last he found it in Himself. He says that I am the first person to discover Myself.

Descartes, seeking way of new science, and of new technology, discovered the thinking I, which seems to be more advanced than Montaigne's Myself as the criterion of truth. Montaigne lived a public life primarily as a politician performing various functions.

Descartes, seeking a new science in the mounting tide of science and art promoted by Cardinal Richelieu, and polishing lens with the help of craftsmanship cultivated since the Medieval Ages, he most of all intended to complete a universal mathematics applicable to various kinds of science, or achieve a method with certainty or with certain criterion of truth leading people to a new science. Advancing in the dark with a dim light of algebra and geometry, in 1628 he wrote *Rules for the Direction of the Mind* (hereafter quoted simply as *Rules*). From *Rules* I would like to pick up some points important for us now:

The end of study should be to direct the mind towards the enunciation of sound and correct judgment in all matters that come before it. (Rule I).....

Science in its entity is true and evident cognition.....of all sciences known as yet, Arithmetic and Geometry alone are free from any taint of falsity or uncertainty. We must note then that there are two ways by which we arrive at the knowledge of facts, viz. by experience and by deduction. (Rule II)

In the subjects we propose to investigate, our inquiries should be directed, not to what others have thought, nor to what we ourselves conjecture, but to what we can clearly and perspicuously behold and with certainty deduce; for knowledge is not won in any other way.....knowing by deduction, by which we understand all necessary inference from other facts that are known with certainty, though not by themselves evident, but only deduced from true and known principles by the continuous and uninterrupted action of a mind that has a clear vision of each step in the process. It is in a similar way that we know that the last link in a long chain is connected with the first, even though we do not take in by means of one and the same act of vision all the intermediate links on which that connection depends, but only remember that we have taken them successively under review and that each single one is united to its neighbour, from the first even to the last.....

These two methods are the most certain routes to knowledge, and the mind should admit no others. All the rest should be rejected as suspect of error and dangerous. But this does not prevent us from believing matters that have been divinely revealed as being more certain than our surest knowledge, since belief in these things, as all faith in obscure matters, is an action not of our intelligence, but of our will. They should not be heeded also since, if they have any basis in understanding, they can and ought to be, more than all things else, discovered by one or other of the ways above-mentioned, as we hope perhaps to show at greater length on some future opportunity. (Rule III)

There is a need of a method for finding out the truth.....by a method I mean certain and simple rules, such that, if a man observe them accurately, he shall never assume what is false as true, and will never spend his mental efforts to no purpose, but will always gradually increase his knowledge and so arrive at a true understanding of all that does not surpass his powers.....I am quite ready to believe that the greater minds of former ages had some knowledge of it, nature even conducting them to it. For the human mind has in it something that we may call divine, wherein are scattered the first

germs of useful modes of thought. Consequently it often happens that however much neglected and choked by interfering studies they bear fruit of their own accord. Arithmetic and Geometry, the simplest sciences, give us an instance of this; for we have sufficient evidence that the ancient Geometricians made use of a certain analysis which they extended to the resolution of all problems, though they grudged the secret to posterity. At the present day also there flourishes a certain kind of Arithmetic, called Algebra, which designs to effect, when dealing with numbers, what the ancients achieved in the matter of figures. These two methods are nothing else than the spontaneous fruit sprung from the inborn principles of the discipline here in question;..... (Rule IV)

If we wish our science to be complete, those matters which promote the end we have in view must one and all be scrutinized by a movement of thought which is continuous and nowhere interrupted; they must also be included in an enumeration which is both adequate and methodical.....we must note that by adequate enumeration or induction is only meant that method by which we may attain surer conclusion than by any other type of proof, with the exception of simple intuition.....For if I want to prove by enumeration how many genera there are of corporeal things, or of those that in any way fall under the senses, I shall not assert that they are just so many and no more, unless I previously have become aware that I have included them all in my enumeration, and have distinguished them each separately from all the others. (Rule VII)⁹⁾

“Rules” stop at XXI, remaining perhaps unfinished and unpublished. In this way Descartes begins to establish new philosophy, or new science, evidently and distinctly modeling all the sciences after *Mathesis Universalis* (synthesis of algebra and geometry).

It is not until after 9 years since then that *Discourse on the Method* (hereafter quoted simply as *Discourses*) with three “Essays” accompanying it, the Dioptrics, Meteors, and Geometry was published. During these 8 or 9 years, Descartes seems to have read Sextus’ *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, or Montaigne’s *Essays*. The title of *Discourse on the Method* is followed by *of Rightly Conducting the Reason*. The Part I of it begins with the following sentences.

Good sense is of all things in the world the most equally distributed,.....the power of forming a good judgment and of distinguishing the true from the false, which is properly speaking what is called Good Sense or Reason, is by nature equal in all men.¹⁰⁾

The Latin word for “reason” is “ratio”, which also means proportion. In Part II of *Discourse* Descartes says after showing four precepts as follows:

.....although their objects are different, they do not fail to agree in this, that they take nothing under consideration but the various relationships or proportions which are present in these objects.....in order the better to consider them in detail, I should picture them in the form of lines,.....what pleased me in this Method was that I was certain by its means of exercising my reason in all things, if not perfectly, at least as well as was in my power.¹¹⁾

“The reason” in the expression “rightly conducting the reason” means ratio, proportion and understanding how to use proportion or even the so-called “coordinate algebra”. In the following Part III, making again four maxims and saying “God has given to each of us some light with which to distinguish truth from error”,¹²⁾ he was approaching to finding the foundation of philosophy more certain than any other. And at last in Part IV the moment came as follows:

.....immediately afterwards I noticed that whilst I thus wished to think all things false, it was absolutely essential that the “I” who thought this should be somewhat, and remarking that this truth “I think, therefore I am” was so certain and so assured that all the most extravagant suppositions brought forward by the skeptics were incapable of shaking it, I came to the conclusion that I could receive it without scruple as the first principle of the Philosophy for which I was seeking.¹³⁾

In the rest of Part IV, Descartes refers to the relationship between God and Descartes. To make long explanation short, “I think God, therefore God is”.

When, at which situation, does Descartes think God? He thinks God when he wants to be certain and complete. When does he want to be so? In Part V of *Discourse*, he says that God is perfect, God creates the law of nature, and that this law works precisely as it is created. He approaches nature with technology or mechanism like lens. In Part VI, he refers to his own work *The Dioptrics*, and says that he makes and adjusts mechanism without omitting any detail. In the eighth part of *The Dioptrics*, he begins with the sentence “how to make lens in order to make it as precisely as possible”. It is necessary for mechanism to be certain and perfect, otherwise this mechanism is not useful. Descartes also says that great

address and practise is required to make mechanism perfect without omitting any detail. We can realize that “the way of God” of Descartes is, as it were, the effort to attain perfect technique.

3. “Descartes of the nineteenth century” Claude Bernard

Les homes qui ont une foi excessive dans leur théories ou dans leurs idées sont non-seulement mal disposes pour faire des découvertes, mais ils font aussi de très-mauvaise observations.....

Mais il arrive encore tout naturellement que ceux qui croient trop à leurs théories ne croient pas assez à celles des autres. Alors l’idées dominante de ces contempleurs d’autrui est de trouver les théories des autres en défaut et de chercher à les contredire. L’inconvénient pour la science reste le même.....On est donc conduit ainsi par ces deux voies opposes au même résultat, c’est-à-dire à fausser la science et les faits.¹⁴⁾

We can find the similarity between the above-mentioned passages in French and what Norinaga stated concerning his medical standpoint criticizing both Ko-hō medicine and Kin-pō medicine. Those passages above are from *Introduction à l’étude de la médecine expérimentale* by Claude Bernard (1813–1878), who not only contributed to the fields of biology, physiology and medicine, but also influenced the intellectuals of his days as a philosopher.

Criticizing Neo-Confucianism, Norinaga distinguished the apparent to our senses from the obscure (not apparent or unempirical), and thought it illusory to make the Cause-Effect relationship between the apparent and the obscure. Originally, it was Sextus Empiricus that distinguished the apparent from the obscure, criticizing dogmatism. Claude Bernard, who call himself Descartes in the nineteenth century, seems to have developed the meaning of discoveries in Montaigne and Descartes, and demonstrates how modern science, in which Norinaga was interested, should be. This book, Bernard’s *Introduction*, was written in 1864, when 64 years had passed after Norinaga died, and it was three years before the Meiji Restoration. I would like to summarize primarily the first half of *Introduction* in English.

The chapter with the title “Observation and Experiment” may be summarized as follows:

One can observe the phenomena around him only in a limited range. As most of these phenomena is excluded from one’s senses, one cannot attain the observation enough. And so, it is necessary for enlarging knowledge, decomposing objects and studying the hidden

parts to provide the various kinds of apparatus which can penetrate into the inner parts of objects. In the philosophical meaning, observation shows the facts, while experiment instructs something about the facts. One who observes nature only collects what nature shows to him as it is, while one who experiments changes the natural phenomena with some purpose, produces environment (or condition) which nature does not give him and inquires it. Experiment-maker must experiment with a prediction. He must ask nature on an actual proof, and put questions to nature. Once nature begins talking, he must remain silent, and verify earnestly what nature answers, listen to it carefully and obey to the promise of nature in any case.

The chapter with the title “On the a priori idea and on doubt in the experimental inference” may be summarized as follows:

The inquiry of truth begins with feelings (in French sentiment) which produces a priori idea and intuition. And then reason (inference) develops idea and deduces logical result. It is in a form of absolutely necessary relation (Cause-Effect relation) alone that truth appears in human mind. It is always through hypothesis that absolute truth is admitted. Few persons have anticipation of truth. In all the sciences, majority of people obeys to, develops and inquire what minority does. One who discovers something makes the source of energy, providing a new rich imagination. The first important thing that the scientists devoting themselves to inquire natural phenomena have to keep their mind completely free, founding their inquiry on the basis of philosophical doubt. They must believe in science, should not be skeptical in this viewpoint. They must believe in the determinism of things, that is to say, the absolutely necessary relationship (the Cause-Effect relation) in the phenomena proper of the living-things as well as of other sciences. At the same time we must remain in an approximate estimation in grasping this relationship, we must firmly believe that the doctrines we have demonstrate no immovable truth, but they are only partial and temporary ones, and so they will be corrected in the future along with the development of science. The scientists intending to find truth must keep their mind free, and they must not teach a doctrine as dogma. Because the exaggerated belief of the doctrine would rob them of freedom of their mind, and suffocate their originality. The great scholar is a person who has no respect to the authority of preceding scholars before him, destroys their errors, and bring a new thought, should never be an advocate of absolutely immovable truth. Even if he lights his age with a torch of truth which his preceding scholars would not have permitted, it is his destiny that he will be outstripped by the progress of ages. Because the true scientists know well that as regards natural phenomena both the principle with which they start and the

result in which they end express only relative truth, they are suspicious of absolute truth, but they believe in science. (They don't believe themselves alone.) Science is to find certainty in the reciprocal relations of phenomena.

Conclusion

It is Louis Pasteur (1822–1895) that studied Claude Bernard's work well and realized it successfully. Still today, even people who know nothing about Pasteur benefit a great deal from Pasteur-ized milk, sterilized by low temperature.

Pasteur had had the idea that microbe might cause not only the fermentation of alcohol, but also dangerous infectious disease. It is not until in the nineteenth century that the mankind noticed the relation between microbe and the disease of living beings. For Pasteur, the issue was not only to discover the bacteria which causes disease, but, it is more important, to discover how to conquer and how to prevent the infectious disease. European modern science seems to be successful at least in getting rid of various kinds of infectious diseases which had long tormented animals and mankind, though they are now being threatened by new diseases unknown until recently. In any way, at least in the "civilized" countries, people seldom die of any infectious disease any more. Descartes' daughter also died of such an infectious disease in her early childhood.

Some Japanese bacteriologists joined this successful work. When we imported European sciences, however, we should have imported the basis of European science as well, a thing which has not been realized in a sufficient way. The basis is, I would like to stress this point, the skeptical mind of Pyrrhonism which is correctly demonstrated by Bernard. The similar thing had occurred about 1500 years ago, when Buddhism came to Japan. Our ancestors had accepted Buddhism cutting off scepticism which Goutama Buddha originally possessed as I have demonstrated in my article "Early Buddhism and Pyrrhonism as Human Wisdom".¹⁾ The sceptical mind of Pyrrhonism had been carried into the modern European philosophy, whose situation remains not understood by the Japanese philosophers and intellectuals in general. Claude Bernard shows us what the authentic sceptical mind is. Furthermore, it is noticeable that in his *Introduction* he had already given a caution to the mankind living 100 years later.

Henri Bergson made a speech in commemoration of the one hundred anniversary of Claude Bernard's birth, paying his respect to Bernard.²⁾ . 229–237. At its beginning, Bergson compared Descartes' *Discourse* of the seventeenth century with Bernard's *Introduction* of the

nineteenth century. According to Bergson, both works have the same meaning in the point of having brought the method to each work. He says as follows: Descartes brought this method to the abstract science, Bernard brought it to the concreter inquiry. Acknowledging and digesting what Bernard wrote in his *Introduction*, Bergson says in his own way as follows: Bernard, having already noticed the gap (in French *écart*) between the logic of human beings and the logic of nature, took precautions against it.³⁾

So did Norinaga, and Bergson himself. This comment on Bernard made by Bergson is full of suggestions. Indeed Norinaga says nothing concrete about his medical practice, and in the way of thinking on his medicine we cannot find any logically strict argument against dogmatism or the medical procedure, though pre-scientific, as shown by Sextus, nor the system of chains linked by the reason on the basis of the first principle as shown by Descartes, but we can still find some modernity in Norinaga's way of thinking, and most of all we cannot help being deeply impressed both by the enormous and exhaustive investigation for a long period of Yamatogokoro and by the effort, to use the term of Bernard and Bergson, not to make any gap between the objects with which Norinaga had relation in literary work and medicine, and his own eyes.

NOTES:

Preface

- 1) Michel de Montaigne, *Essays*, Volume I, translated by John Florio, Everyman's Library (London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1965), p. 139. Chapter 25 (hereafter quoted as I-25).
- 2) René Descartes, *A Discourse on Method*, Part II, in: Robert Maynard Hutchins (Editor in Chief), *Great Books of the Western World* 31. *Descartes Spinoza* (Chicago London etc.: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1952).
- 3) Sey Nishimura, "First Steps into the Mountains: Motoori Norinaga's *Uiyamabumi*", in: *Monumenta Nipponica*, Volume 42, Number 2, 1987, p. 456.
- 4) Nakako Miyake, "Impermanence and Incertainty", in: *Jinbun*, Volume 3, Gakushuin University, Research Institute for Humanities, 2004, p. 68.

Chapter 1. Chapter 1. Karagokoro (Chinese Thought) and Yamatogokoro (Japanese Thought)

1. Kokugaku and Norinaga

- 1) W. G. Aston, *A History of Japanese Literature* (London: William Heineman, 1898, Second Impression 1907), (Short Histories of the Literatures of the World, VI, Edited by Edmund Gosse), pp. 319–329.

2. The Chu Hsi School

- 2) Ibid., pp. 330–332.

3. The main theme of *Uiyamabumi*

- 3) Sey Nishimura, “First Steps into the Mountains: Motoori Norinaga’s *Uiyamabumi*”, in: *Monumenta Nipponica*, Volume 42, Number 2, 1987, pp. 488–489.
- 4) Ibid., pp. 489–490.

Chapter 2. Norinaga’s Medicine

- 1) Takahashi Masao, *Motoori Norinaga* (Kōdansha Gakujutsu Bunko, No. 640) (Tokyo:Kōdansha, 1986). In the chapter 5 of this book, “I-ron” (On Medicine), Takahashi concentrates his description on Norinaga’s medicine.
- 2) Ishida Ichirō, “Motoori Norinaga no Shintō, Kokugaku to Igaku: Norinaga niokeru shūkyō to shizen kagaku” (Motoori Norinaga’s Shintoism, National Learning, and Medicine: Religion and Natural Science in Norinaga), in: *Butoku Kiyō*, published by Kokushikan University, Volume 1, 1984. This article discusses Norinaga’s medicine very much in detail. In dealing with Norinaga’s medicine in this article, I owe much to Takahashi’s book and Ishida’s articles. Also highly illuminative for me are Ishida’s following articles: Ishida, “Norinaga-gaku no keisei to Chūgoku shisō” (The Making of Norinaga’s Scholarship and Chinese Thought), in: *Chūgoku-teki jinsei-kan to sekai-kan* (Chinese View of Life and World), edited by Naitō Kanji (Tokyo:Tōhō Shoten, 1994), and, Ishida, “Motoori Norinaga to shizen kagaku: Tokugawa jidai ni okeru shizen kagaku no shuju-ō” (Motoori Norinaga and Natural Sciences: Various Aspects of Natural Science in the Tokugawa Era), in: *Bunmei* (Civilization) No. 35, (Tokyo: Tōkai University Press, 1982).

2. *Suzunoya Tōmonroku* No. 45

- 3) Ishida, “Motoori Norinaga no Shintō, Kokugaku to Igaku”, p. 37.

3. Attempting to unite Yamatogokoro and the European Modern Science

- 4) Ishida, “Motoori Norinaga to shizen kagaku”, passim.
- 5) Ishida, “Motoori Norinaga no Shintō, Kokugaku to Igaku”, pp. 41–43.
- 6) Arakawa Hiroshi, “Motoori Norinaga no Uchū Shisō” (Motoori Norinaga’s Cosmological Thought), in: *Jinbun Ronshū*, Volume 49, No. 1, published by Shizuoka University, 1998. In dealing with Norinaga’s cosmology, I owe much to this article.

Chapter 3. The Three Discoveries

1. The Meaning of Norinaga’s Discovery

- 1) Sextus Empiricus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, English translation by R. G. Bury, Loeb Classical Library No. 273 (London: William Heinemann, 1933), p. 3.
- 2) Ibid., p. 5.
- 3) Ibid., p. 7.
- 4) Ibid., pp. 8–9.

- 5) Ibid., pp. 26–27.
- 6) Ibid., p. 31.
- 7) Ibid., pp. 146–147.
- 8) Craig B. Brush, *Montaigne and Bayle: Variations on the Theme of Scepticism* (The Haag: Martinus jhoff, 1966, pp. 8–9.

2. The Meaning of Descartes' Discovery

- 9) Robert Maynard Hutchins (Editor in Chief), *Great Books of the Western World* 31. *Descartes Spinoza* (Chicago London etc.: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), pp. 1–11.
- 10) Ibid., p. 41.
- 11) Ibid., pp. 47–48.
- 12) Ibid., p. 50.
- 13) Ibid., p. 51.

3. “Descartes of the nineteenth century” Claude Bernard

- 14) Claude Bernard, *Introduction à l'étude de la médecine expérimentale* (Paris: J. B. Baillièere et fils, 1865, pp. 67–68.

Conclusion

- 1) Nakako Miyake, “Early Buddhism and Pyrrhonism as Human Wisdom”, in: *The Annual Collection of Essays and Studies, Faculty of Letters, Gakushuin University*, Vol.L. (2003).
- 2) Henri Bergson, “La Philosophie de Claude Bernard, Discour prononcé à la cérémonie du Centenaire de Claude Bernard”, in: *La pensée et le mouvant*, 31. edition (Paris: PUF, 1955), pp. 229–237.
- 3) Ibid., p. 235.

本居宣長における実験的実証主義：フランス哲学との比較において

三宅中子

はじめにモンテーニュの『エッセー』、デカルトの『方法序説』、本居宣長の学問論として知られる『うひ山ふみ』から権威のある伝統的な思考に批判的であることで共通性のある一節を夫々選ぶ。モンテーニュ、デカルトの両者に指針を与えた二世紀のセクストゥス・エンピリクスを加えた三者が批判した権威がどんなものであったかを問い、それらがアリストテレス、バイブル、中世までの学問であったことを述べる。そしてセクストゥスは古代のピュロニズムの集大成であり、モンテーニュは古典古代からさえも自立しようとしていたこと、更にデカルトは新しい学問の建設を図っていたことを述べ、宣長も似たような状況にあった事実を明らかにする。つまり宣長は朱子学のような外来の学問が我が国の正統な学問となっていることを疑問視して仏教的な考え方もろ共、漢意（からごころ）として退け、日本の歴史書や朝廷の儀式に関する書物、歌の本などを対象とした国学を確立し、古事記の研究を中心としてもののあわれ、大和心、神の道を追求したのである。

しかし宣長の学問はそもそも医者になるために始められた。宣長には医論はないか、あるとすればどんな考え方か、そしてそれは彼の国学と関わりがあるのか、あるとすればどのように関わるか。本論文の関心事はここにある。そこで彼の医論について、初期のものと後期のもの夫々をとりあげ、夫々の内容を理解し、そして宣長の天文学や暦学をも加えた広範囲にわたる国学の研究が医学と平行して行なわれており、日本にも到来し始めた十七世紀西欧の学問上の革命の波に刺戟されて、そこに国学を近づけようとしていた事実をつぎとめる。

本稿序文の三者は結局独自の発見をしたことになる。最後に主として宣長とデカルトの学問論のガイドブックである『うひ山ふみ』と『方法序説』を使い、セクストゥスの医論にも言及しながら、三つの発見を比較して宣長の医論及び学問の特徴を明らかにする。

しめくくり医学・生理学の泰斗、一九世紀のデカルトといわれたクロード・ベルナルの『実験医学序説』を登場させ、この名著に三者が夫々生きて意味を与えられていることを見出し、ベルナルが示した学問のあるべき姿は又、宣長が目指すところでもあったことを見てとり、改めて当時の時代状況の中での宣長の仕事を評価する。

キーワード【懐疑主義 モンテーニュ 医学 大和心 クロード・ベルナル】

Experimental Positivism in Motoori Norinaga: In Comparison with French Philosophy

Nakako MIYAKE

Montaigne (*Essays*), Descartes (*A Discourse on Method*), and Motoori Norinaga (*Uiyamabumi*) were all antagonistic toward authorized traditional thinking, and sought to discover new ways of learning. Both Montaigne and Descartes were influenced by Sextus Empiricus's *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*. In his *Essays*, Montaigne described “discovering himself,” while Descartes focused on “the thinking I” as his first principle and tried to establish a new science.

Norinaga, rejected Chinese scholar Chu Hsi's traditional way of learning. Norinaga was devoted to Kokugaku (National Studies as the learning of “the way of the Kami (god)” and “Yamatogokoro”). Norinaga, however, began his learning as a medical doctor. This essay aims to prove that the theme of *Uiyamabumi* and Norinaga's approach to Kokugaku are related to his research and practice of medical science.

Additionally, this paper compares other discoveries with those of Norinaga; and, referring to Claude Bernard's *Introduction to the Study of Experimental Science*, it addresses the

meaning of Norinaga's experimental positivism.

Key words: skepticism, Montaigne, medicine, Yamatogokoro, Claude Bernard