Preface

Why phenomenology and analytical philosophy? This is of course a subject in the contemporary philosophy because both philosophical currents are transformed successions from the opponents on both sides of the English Channel, namely from the continental rationalism and the English empiricism in the modern European philosophy. Moreover, this becomes a peculiar subject if one looks at philosophy in Japan. If now we may put aside the question whether one can characterize thoughts from Nara-era (since 710, e.g., Shotokutaishi) to Edo-era (since 1600, e.g., ANDO Shoeki) as “philosophy”, we must say that the influence from European and American philosophy still plays an important role in philosophy of Japan. Two eras can be called epoch-making for such influence. The one was in the Meiji-era (since 1868) of the opening policy, where European culture flowed into Japan after 250 years continued closing country. The other was in the post-war period (since 1945) where the United States brought American culture as an occupying troop after the World War II. In philosophy the representative in the first period was phenomenology, while the representative in the second period was analytical philosophy. In the following I would like to consider historically how phenomenology and analytical philosophy referred to each other, stood against each other and interwove with each other in philosophy of Japan.

1. Import of phenomenology (1911-1945)

When European philosophy was imported and introduced in the Meiji-era, NISHIDA Kitaro (1870-1945) was the first Japanese philosopher who learned it and developed an original philosophy based on Japanese tradition. In his first work Research of Good (1911) he discussed subjects like “reality”, “good” and “religion” with help of the concept “pure experience” from William James based on the western philosophy from Plato to Hegel. In the same year he published an article “On the assertion of pure-logical school in epistemology”, where he introduced both currents in...
the epistemology in German philosophy at that time as a pure-logical school and a psychological (or pure-empirical) school, and mentioned as philosopher in the first school Rickert, Windelband and also Husserl, although this one seemed him to be of quite different origin. Here Husserl was not introduced as a founder of phenomenology.

While TANABE Hajime (1885-1962), a disciple of NISHIDA, referred to the assertion of New-Kantian school, such as Marburg school (Cohen, Natorp) and Freiburg school (Rickert), in his papers such as “The limit of logicism in epistemology” (1914) and “Natural sciences versus human or cultural sciences” (1915), he touched Husserl in his article “On the Universal” (1916). However, this was Husserl in Logical Investigations, which came from the Austrian school of Bolzano, Brentano and Twardowski. Also in the article “On the Consciousness in General” (1919) he remained, on the way of the argument on the “consciousness in general” from Kant to Natorp, to introduce Husserl’s thoughts of “intentional experience” and “pure phenomenology” briefly. Nevertheless, in 1922 he himself went to Germany and next year visited Husserl’s seminar in Freiburg and got to know Heidegger who was still in Freiburg as Husserl’s assistant. After he came back to Japan, he read about “development of phenomenology” and published the article “The new Conversion in Phenomenology”. It signified the appearance of Heidegger’s hermeneutic phenomenology against Husserl’s constitutive phenomenology. This article introduced for the first time to the Japanese people Heidegger’s growing philosophy before the publication of Being and Time (1927).

MIKI Kiyoshi (in 1897-1945), also a disciple of NISHIDA, participated in lecture and seminar of Heidegger in 1923 who took just office at Marburg university. Next year Miki moved to Paris, and experienced a shocking meeting with Pascal’s Pensées. After his homecoming he published Investigations of human being in Pascal (1926), where he wrestled with Pascal’s texts by making use of the concepts he learned with Heidegger.

On the other hand, KUKI Shuzou (1888-1941) from Tokyo university went from 1921 to Europe, and learned at German universities in Heidelberg, Freiburg and Marburg, and in French university in Sorbonne, namely with Rickert, Husserl, Heidegger and Bergson. While he visited Husserl’s lecture, he met Heidegger at Husserl’s home. Then KUKI moved to Marburg to visit Heidegger’s lectures and seminars. The fact that Heidegger mentioned “a count KUKI” in From a Conversation
about language, between a Japanese and a questioner (1959), shows the exchange of both. After his homecoming in 1929 he agreed with Nishida’s invitation and got a place of the lecturer in Kyoto university and published *Structure of Iki* (いき), where he applied Heidegger’s hermeneutic method to Japanese culture. Lö with, a disciple of Heidegger, emigrated from Germany in 1935, got a place as a lecturer in Tohoku university with KUKI’s endeavor, who had a personal exchange with Lö with.

WATSUJI Tetsuro (1889-1960), also from Tokyo university, read Heidegger’s just published book *Being and Time* in 1927 during his study in Berlin. While he found Heidegger’s attempt to grasp the structure of human being in the temporality very interesting, he questioned, why the space cannot be unfolded as a same-original being structure. This came in his opinion from the fact that Heidegger’s “existence” still remained in an individual. The result of that what he researched as covering the lack was first *The Ethics as a Science of Person* (Between-Being:人間) (1934), secondly *Fudo* (climate:風土) (1935). In the latter he considered the climate not as an object of natural sciences, but as “intentional experience”. As Watsuji had immediate contact neither with Husserl nor with Heidegger, his main interest didn’t lie in phenomenology, but in ethics, in which he considered existentialism of Nietzsche or Kierkegaard and awakened interest in Japanese culture. Nevertheless, it was doubtless that phenomenology gave him a significant suggestion.

Otherwise, there were many Japanese who visited Husserl or Heidegger in their seminar or at home. Among them YAMAUCHI Tokuryu (1890-1982) should be added, who took part in Husserl’s seminar even earlier than Tanabe in 1911, translated after his homecoming Rickert’s *The Object of Recognition* and published his book *Introduction to the Phenomenology* (1929). It came from such an exchange with Japanese researchers that Japanese translation of Husserl’s two articles was published for the first time in the Japanese magazine *Kaizo* (改造: i.e. “Renewal - its Problems and Method” (1923) and “Renewal as an individual-ethical problem” (1924). Also afterwards up to the end of World War II (1945) many works were published, among which some were introductions of German phenomenology, and others were developments of original philosophy based on phenomenology, e.g.:

*Husserl’s Phenomenology* by TAKAHASHI Satomi (1931)
It is also remarkable that the Japanese translation of Ideas I was published in 1938 - in the year of Husserl’s death - in Iwanami paperback, famous as a series of classical texts. Also after the publication of Husserliana started in 1950 and Cartesian Meditations was published in the first volume, the Japanese translation of it by YAMAMOTO Manjiro was published already in 1954.

2. Fashion of existentialism (1941-1969)

The existentialism originated from phenomenological current, however, formed another stream and became a fashion after World War II. Especially, in in a miserable situation of Japan as a vanquished country, it was greeted in philosophy as well as in other areas with a great sympathy. Although existentialism will get away from the task of my lecture “Phenomenology and Analytical Philosophy”, it is worthwhile to touch briefly it because it prepared the following rehabilitation of phenomenology and also is contrasted to analytical philosophy appeared in the post-war period.

The pioneer in trend of existentialism began already in the middle of the War. For example, Japanese translation of Jaspers’ Existentialism (1938) was published already in 1941. However, this trend became lively first in the post-war period. KOSAKA Seiken (1900-1969) who published Historical world - a phenomenological attempt - (1937), where he mentioned neither Husserl nor Heidegger in spite of the subtitle, published Existentialism (1948) in the post-war period. KANEKO Takezo (1905-1987), who wrestled with Hegel’s Phenomenology of the Mind, published a book with the same title Existentialism in the same year. Also MATSUNAMI Shinzaburo (1913-1989), who published Japanese translation of Kierkegard’s Illness to the Death in 1948, published Existential Philosophy (1955), Existentialism (1962), which was an introductory book far read.

Among Japanese translations appeared Foulquié’s Existentialism (1953), Lukác’s Either Existentialism or Marxism (1953). The publication of Sartre’s complete works in

- *Introduction to the Metaphysics* (1952)
- *Nietzsche’s Word “God is dead”* (1954)
- *Explanation of Hölderlin’s Poem* (1955)
- *Anaximander’s word* (1957)

These were not read any more in connection with phenomenology than with existentialism, or at most in the so-called “conversion” from existentialism to the thinking of being.

In *Present Philosophy* (1950) edited by KOSAKA, main currents in the contemporary philosophy were divided into five, i.e. pragmatism, new realism, philosophy of life, existentialism and phenomenology. Kierkegaard, Heidegger and Jaspers were mentioned as existentialism and Husserl as phenomenology. The number of *Tetsugakuzasshi (Journal of Philosophy)* published in 1967 was a special number with the title “Existential Philosophy”. Afterwards, with many popular publications, such as:

- *Introduction to “Sartre”* by SIRAI Koji (1966)
- *Introduction to Existentialism* by KAYANO Yoshio (1968)

Existentialism became popular rather under widespread types of reader than existentialism in the strict philosophical sense. In the meantime, *Thoughts of Existence by Heidegger* and *Thoughts of Being by Heidegger* by WATANABE Jiro (1931-) discussed remarkably in detail, that Heidegger’s philosophy developed thought of being beyond existentialism.

In the 70’s the power of attraction of words like “existence”, “existentialism” “existential philosophy” weakened increasingly. Although “Society for Existential Thoughts” was founded in 1985 and continued to publish *Ranshu* (Collected Papers) up to the present, it is not any more counted as one current in the contemporary philosophy.

3. *Inflow of analytical philosophy (1953-1973)*
After World War II reflections about the way of philosophy in the prewar generation as well as in the war generation began. Not only because the state with friendly relations has changed from Germany to the United States, but also because people became to search less esoteric closure than public discussion, people became fascinated not with European traditional philosophy like phenomenology or existentialism any more, but with open philosophy in the United States like logical positivism, pragmatism and analytical philosophy.

UEDA Seiji (1902-1963), who was interested already during the war time in the Anglo-American philosophy, published *Contemporary Anglo-American Philosophy* (1941) and in the post-war period * Tradition of Anglo-Saxon Philosophy* (1947), *Philosophy of Empiricism* (1948), and continued further from 1954 in the centre of Waseda university the publication of *Collected Articles of Analytical Philosophy* in five volumes. What had a decisive influence on development of analytical philosophy in Japan, was the works of OMORI Shouzou (1921-1997). He changed his study from physics to philosophy after the war and studied philosophy from 1950 to 1951 in the United States. After his homecoming he appeared with articles “Logical Positivism” (1953) and “Analytical Philosophy” (1959) as a representative of analytical philosophy. From 1998 to 1999 *OMORI Shazou’s Collected Works* appeared in ten volumes.

Otherwise, many researchers who played a role for popularization of analytical philosophy are to be mentioned, e.g.:

ICHII Saburo (1922-1989), translator of Reichenbach’s *Formation of Scientific Philosophy* (1954) and Russell’s *History of Western Philosophy* (1959)

YOSHIDA Natsuhiko (1928-), translator of Ayer’s *Language, Truth and Logic* (1955)

NAKAMURA Hidekichi (1922-), translator of Russell’s *Autobiographic Memory* (1959) and *Introduction to Philosophy* (1964)

They were instigators for the situation that magazines with special subject were published as follows:


*Shiso* (Thoughts: 思想:1956): “Logical Positivism”

Then analytical philosophy was considered a current of contemporary philosophy in the 1950s and 1960s. E.G.:

The series appeared from 1958 Course for Contemporary Philosophy was composed of six volumes, namely 1) Existentialism, 2) Analytical philosophy, 3) Pragmatism, 4) Marxism, 5) Modern Thoughts in Japan and 6) Theories of Present Civilization.

Also in the series appeared from 1964 Philosophy in Scientific Times, analytical philosophy was mentioned as the third current of contemporary philosophy beside existentialism and Marxism. This characterization remained also in the series appeared from 1968 Course for Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy.

The series Philosophy in Scientific Times in three volumes can be held as a collective work of the best researchers of analytical philosophy in this period. “Society for Scientific Philosophy of Japan”, which holds afterwards regular conference, became a meeting place for researchers of analytical philosophy. Among other works of analytical philosophy in this period the following should be added:

- Translation of World of Philosophy in nine volumes (1967)
- The introductorial series of American philosophy Introduction to Analytical Philosophy in five volumes by John Hospers

As original works:

Analytical Philosophy – Logical Grounds of Linguistic Analysis (1959) by NAGAI Shigeo

Philosophy and Logic in the Present (1964) by SAWADA Nobushige

Language, Perception and World (1971) by OMORI Shouzou,

Language and Reality – Logical Analysis and Philosophical Synthesis (1971) by YOSHIDA Natsuhiko

What is Analytical Philosophy (1973) by NAGAI Shigeo.


Now, while the composition that existentialism, analytical philosophy and Marxism divide the contemporary philosophy was formed after World War II, the tendency that phenomenology would be already overcome by existentialism and existential philosophy spread. Just in such a situation the movement of rehabilitation to revise phenomenology appeared.

The publication of Japanese translation of Husserl and Merleau-Ponty gave an
occasion for it. As said, the translation of Heidegger’s selected works continued since 1952 with *Introduction to Metaphysics*, however, the translation of Husserl’s works had broken off since the abovementioned translation of *Cartesian Meditations* (1954). But now, following translations were published:

*The Idea of Phenomenology* (1965), translated by TATEMATSU Hirotaka (1931-)
*Phenomenology of Internal Time Consciousness* (1967), also translated by the same
*Logical Investigations* (1968 and 1976), translated also by the same et al.
*Philosophy as a Strict Science* (1969), translated by SATAKE Tetsuo
*Brentano and Husserl* in the series of *Masterpiece of World* (1970), which contained *Cartesian Meditations* translated by KOIKE Minoru and *Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* translated by FUNABASHI Hiroshi
*Experience and Judgment* (1975) translated by HASEGAWA Hiroshi.

Also what concerns Merleau-Ponty, following translations were published:

*Structure of Behaviors* (1964), translated by TAKIURA Shizuo and KIDA Gen
*Eyes and Spirit* (1966), translated by the same
*Phenomenology of Perception* (1967), translated by TAKEUCHI Yoshiro et al.
*Signs* (1969), translated by the same et al.
*Adventures of Dialectic* (1972), translated by TAKIURA et al.

Then following translations of books introducing French phenomenology were published:

Lyotard’s *Phenomenology* (1965)
Jeanson’s *Sense of Phenomenology* (1967)
Thévenaz’ *Development of Phenomenology* (1968)
Tymieniecka’s *Phenomenology and Human Sciences* (1969)
Derrida’s *Voice and Phenomenon – An Introduction to the Problem of Signs in Husserl’s phenomenology* (1970)

Translations of researches of the second generation of German phenomenology followed one after another, e.g.:

*Husserl and Modern Thoughts* (1972) by Fink et al.
*Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1978) edited by Müller et al. (Fink, Landgrebe, Claesges, Held, Aguierre, Brand, Theunissen, Waldenfels, Rombach, Schmitz, etc.)
The occasion for rehabilitation of phenomenology was given by the fact that Merleau-Ponty drew more attention of people than his contemporary Sartre, and also that connected with it Husserl in the late and last period drew more attention than Husserl in the early and middle period. What concerns the late Husserl, there was pioneer work of YAMAMOTO Manjiro’s (1903-), Development of Husserl’s Late Thoughts Around the concept of “Life-World (Lebenswelt)” (1962). But, what gave a widespread influence, was the small book What is Phenomenology? (1962) by NITTA Yoshihiro (1929- ). In spite of its compact size it contained results of the newest researches in Germany. As the book which aimed at Husserl’s thoughts in the late period and Merleau-Ponty, the small book Phenomenology (1970) of KIDA Gen (1929- ) got lots of readers and made a great contribution to rehabilitation of phenomenology in this period. Otherwise also the following books are to be added as representing this movement of new phenomenology:

Phenomenology of magination (1972) by TAKIURA Shizuo (1927-)
Development of Phenomenology – Phenomenology of Sensibility and Problems of Philosophy (1974) by YAMASAKI Yosuke (1934-).

In the background of this trend many magazines with special subject about phenomenology appeared as follows:

“Phenomenology” in Riso (1969)
“Phenomenology” in Tetsugakuzasshi (1970)
“Phenomenology” in Jouyoukyou (1975)
“Development of Phenomenology” in Shiso (1978)
“Husserl” in Gendaishiso (1978)
“Heidegger” in Gendaishiso (1979)
“Phenomenology” in Riso (1980)

Moreover, “Research Group of Phenomenology” was founded in 1972, based on whose activities “Phenomenological Association of Japan (PAJ)” was founded in 1979. From the next year began the publication of Course for Phenomenology in four volumes, published by four establishing members of PAJ, i.e. KIDA, TAKIURA, TATEMATSU and NITTA. And in 1984 appeared the first number of Yearbook for Phenomenology,

Just in the same time a new development appeared in analytical philosophy, too. While in the abovementioned first period logical positivism, Russell and Ayer stood in the centre, in this period of development the total image of Wittgenstein was exposed to view and people got interest more in the late Wittgenstein, influential for the school of ordinary language, than in the early Wittgenstion, influential for logical positivism.

What concerns Wittgenstein, the small book Wittgenstein (1959) by SUEKI Takehiro (1921-), in which he overlooks Wittgenstein's philosophy from the early period to the late period, played a pioneer role. But the translation of Wittgenstein's Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus (1968), translated by SAKAI Hidehisa (1934-), attached with an explanation and a remark of translator and also with a shortened translation and a commentary of Philosophical Investigations of the late Wittgenstein, gave an occasion for Wittgenstein boom in this period. With this we could touch the late Wittgenstein for the first time in Japan. With this chance another translation of Tractatus (1971) appeared in the series Masterpiece of World, translated by YAMAMOTO Ichiro. Further from 1975 to 1978 Wittgenstein's Complete Works were published in ten volumes edited by YAMAMOTO Makoto and OMORI Shouzou. It is also worthy to mention the anthology Wittgenstein edited by KURODA Wataru (1928- ), in which he made a general survey on Wittgenstein's philosophical development from early time to late time with a unified point of view, what is to be called a final account of this time.

While the general view of Wittgenstein's philosophy became clear with publication of Complete Works, the interest of researchers moved from the early time by the middle time to the late time of Wittgenstein. In such a situation, many magazines with special issue “Wittgenstein” were published as follows: Tetsugakuzasshi (1968); Gengo (1972); Riso (1975); Epistheme (1976); Gendaishiso (1980). With the interest in the late Wittgenstein the interest also increased at the school of ordinary language. Following translations were published in this situation:

Ryle's Revolution of Philosophy (1974)
Strawson's *Introduction to Logical Theory* (1976)

Strawson's *Individuals: an essay in descriptive metaphysics* (1978)

Austin's *How to do things with words* (1978)

At the same time the interest also increased in American philosophy which tried to interpret English analytical philosophy from the point of view of American pragmatism. Following books are to mention as examples:

Quine's *From a logical point of view* (1972)

Putnam's *Method about soul and world (selected papers)* (1974)

With this period the time for import and popularization of analytical philosophy came to the end. Japanese researchers began to search own way from this period.

6. **First Encounter (1975-1985)**

Only from such a situation of both sides it was prepared for an encounter and a discussion between phenomenological and analytical researchers. Here the first encounter has happened, however, an unhappy one.

The article “Phenomenology and Grammar” (1975) by KURODA Wataru gave the occasion. In it he tried to light up the relation between analytical philosophy and phenomenology, or also between Wittgenstein and Husserl anew. Because he brought up it for discussion at the symposium of Philosophical Association of Japan, he gave a great stimulation on both research groups.

Who reacted upon KURODA's article, was TAKIURA, one of representative researchers of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy and one of grounders of Phenomenological Association of Japan. He criticised KURODA's interpretation with three articles:

“Husserl und Wittgenstein - Intentionality und Use -“ (1977)

“What supports signs - Husserl and Wittgenstein -“ (1977)

“Language and Sense-giving” (1978)

Against them, however, KURODA contradicted with an article “Surroundings of Husserl and Wittgenstein“ (1978) and the abovementioned book *Wittgenstein* in the same year. While TAKIURA answered with an article “Second Version: Husserl and Wittgenstein“ (1978), KURODA manifested “The End of Discussion“ (1978) in an article with this title and TAKIURA lastly brought it with the article “Phenomenology and
The point of KURODA's article which gave an occasion for discussion was to state that Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Grammar* was his confrontation with Husserl's phenomenological theory of meaning in *Logical Investigations*, and that the overcoming of Husserl's theory accomplished Wittgenstein's freedom from *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Namely, the common assumption in Wittgenstein's *Tractatus* and Husserl's *Logical Investigations* that a mental act (intentionality) connects the sign and the reality was removed thoroughly in *Philosophical Grammar*, and the thesis of "independency of language" after which language would be concluded in itself was established. TAKIURA's Criticism against him consisted in the following two points:

First, there was no determining materials which should document facts of the relation between Wittgenstein and Husserl, and the circumstantial evidence of Ries and Spiegelberg, as well as documents of Wittgenstein's conversations with Weismann suggested only a thin influential relationship.

Secondly, Wittgenstein's intentionality deviates strictly speaking from Husserl's intentionality. Because the latter would be "a more fundamental function inspiring the act of consciousness in general" which would lie behind Wittgenstein's "intentionality" and "intention", Wittgenstein's argument would become no criticism against Husserl.

The point of KURODA's objection against it was to find an influential relationship between both in texts themselves and to point out a correspondence of terminology, like "facts (Sachverhalt)" and "state of affairs (Sachlage)", and the concept of "grammar". In *Philosophical Remarks* Wittgenstein considered "intentionality" and "intention" side by side which was identical with Husserl's "meaning-intention", and the "intention" came from Frege's "intention", therefore Wittgenstein's criticism was according to KURODA aimed against the common opinion of Husserl and Frege. However, TAKIURA pointed out against it that "facts (Sachverhalt)" and "state of affairs (Sachlage)" are not distinguished in *Logical Investigations*, and that Wittgenstein's "intention" would not be familiar with Husserl's "intentionality". Further, as a circumstantial evidence for the fact that Wittgenstein's phenomenology would not be identical with Husserl's phenomenology, TAKIURA pointed out that there flooded various "phenomenologys" in the 1930s, and that one would rather have to consider an influence from Lichtenberg.
about “logical grammar” and “private language”. Now following discussion by both should be omitted and be summarised.

Whether there was an influential relationship as a biographic fact or not between Husserl and Wittgenstein, this is a thing in history of philosophy. Whether Wittgenstein’s semantics overcame the phenomenological semantics in Husserl’s *Logical Investigations* or not, this is another thing in philosophical issues. The problem consists in the fact that the discussion were carried out without making a clear distinction between both things. If one wants to question an actual influential relationship, one has to pile up carefully surrounding circumstantial evidences, because there were no immediate mentions in Wittgenstein’s texts. Unfortunately, in this point KURODA’s argumentation was inadequate. Nevertheless, his purpose did not consist in such a proof, but in discussion about relationship of reconstructed philosophical assertions to each other. Nevertheless, he could not be released from the discussion on an actual influential relationship. On the other hand, TAKIURA should think that it is not worthy to aim at only negation of an actual influential relationship, and wanted to state that Husserl’s phenomenological semantics contains the lack of Wittgenstein’s semantics. But he was pulled by the manner of KURODA’s statement, and, in the end, they become reluctantly devoted to a scholastic text interpretation of an actual influential relationship.

In this way the discussion carried out in Japan for the first time between phenomenological and analytical researchers was not necessarily rich in fruits. Nevertheless, it exercised a stimulus on both sides and prepared a ground for a possible exchange.

7. **Following Development of Both Sides (1978-1998)**

The development of further spreading researches of phenomenology from 1980 and analytical philosophy from 1978 should be introduced here briefly.

Many translations were published as follows:

- Husserl’s *Ideas I* (1979), translated by WATANABE Jiro
- Heidegger’s *Complete Works*, edited and translated by TSUJIMURA Koichi et al. since 1985
- Merleau-Ponty’s works: *The Visible and the Invisible* (1989), translated by TAKIURA and KIDA
Levinas’ *Totality and Infinity* (1989), translated by GODA Masato

Translated researches of the third generation of German phenomenology:

Waldenfels’ *The Elbowroom of Behaviour* (1887), translated by NITTA et al.

Held’s *Living Present* (1988), translated by NITTA et al.

Monographs of Japanese researchers were uncountable because new generation appeared in Japanese phenomenology, and it is difficult to select among them. Nevertheless, it is worth to mention that the series *Phaenomenologica* (in Japanese version) was published since 1986, till present up to 32 volumes, whose name was lent of course from *Phaenomenologica* (Martinus Nijhof, now Kluwer Academic publishing company).

Also what concerns special issue in magazines, one can mention a lot: e.g.:

“Revival of Phenomenology” in *ORGAN* (1989)

“Phenomenology – Present of Crossing the border” in *Riso* (1992)

“Possibility of Phenomenology” in *Riso* (1998)

“100 Years of Phenomenology” in *Shiso* (2000)

“A new Turn of Phenomenology” in *Riso* (2001)

“Phenomenology and Eastern Thoughts” in *Shiso* (2004)

Every some years a special issue of phenomenology is still found in different magazines, and there one can see that phenomenological researches run out in Japan more and more.

It is worth to mention the publication of *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (1994), edited by KIDA, NOE Keiichi, MURATA Junichi and WASHIDA Kiyokazu, and written by 132 Japanese researchers. It preceded the publication of *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (1997), edited by Lester Embree et al. The first encyclopedia of phenomenology in the world is a result of phenomenological researches in Japan, on which we could be proud world-wide. Also in the fact that already several books and magazines about “Japanese phenomenology” appeared can be seen that the phenomenological research in Japan is internationally esteemed.

On the other hand, a worth mentioning thing as following development of analytical philosophy in Japan was the impact which Kripke's *Wittgenstein on rules and private language* (1983) gave. With it the trend appeared that the direction of researchs about Wittgenstein’s *Philosophical Investigations* started to develop the axis
of the concept “following rules”. The special issue in *Gendaishiso* (1985) was “Wittgenstein” and its main topic consisted in Kripke’s interpretation of *Philosophical Investigations*. In this period many biographies of Wittgenstein were written or translated: e.g.:

- Toulmin and Janik’s *Wittgenstein’s Vienna* (1978)
- KUROSAKI Hiroshi’s *Wittgenstein’s Life and Philosophy* (1980)
- FUJ IMOTO Takashi’s *Wittgenstein* (1981)
- TAKIURA’s *Wittgenstein* (1983)
- OKADA Masakatsu’s *Wittgenstein* (1986)


The next worth mentioning is an appearing of interest in Frege, started with NOMOTO Kazuyuki’s *Frege’s Linguistic Philosophy* (1986) and *Frege’s Selected Papers* (1988) translated by FUJ IMURA Tatsuo. After that the special issue “Frege Renaissance” in *Riso* (1988) appeared, then the publication of *Frege’s Collected Works* in six volumes began (1999). Connected with it it is to be mentioned that Dummett’s *Truth and other enigmas* (1986) and also *Origins of Analytical Philosophy* (1998) were translated, this should be mentioned later in relation with Husserl. Also for the development of analytical philosophy in the United States which was briefly mentioned already before, some translations in this time should be added:

- Quine’s *Word and Object* (1984)
- Davidson’s *Action and Event* (1990)
- Patnam’s *Reason, Truth and History* (1994)

The fact that the special issue in *Riso* (1994) was “A new Development of Analytical Philosophy” was a sign not only for the spreading of analytical philosophy, but also for it’s branching out. Although still many books with the title “Analytical Philosophy” were published as follows:

- *Present of Analytical Philosophy*, edited by FUJ IMOTO et al. (1997)
- *Introduction to Analytic Philosophy*, by the same (1999)
a critic says, however, that there is no more unity in analytical philosophy. It has broken up in different branches, like linguistic philosophy, philosophy of mind, action and science, ethics, metaphysics etc., while it remained formerly literally in linguistic analysis. The works (1987-2002) published by IIDA Takashi (1948-), *Collective Works of Linguistic Philosophy: Summa Logicae I-IV*, were a nice result of analytical philosophy in this time, but as the title of the works tells us, they remained primarily in the linguistic philosophy. Nevertheless, analytical philosophy in this time already went out linguistic analysis.

8. Attempts to Build a Bridge (1978-)

Based on this development of both sides, I would like to point out some attempts to build a bridge between phenomenology and analytical philosophy.

As said, although the KURODA-TAKIURA-debate brought an unhappy result, it prepared for new attempts. At first it is to be mentioned the works by NOE Keiichi (1949-), who studied with TAKIURA in Tohoku university, as well as with OMORI and KURODA in Tokyo university. Also because of his curriculum vitae he was already interested since the beginning in building a bridge between phenomenology and analytical philosophy. His work extends from phenomenology, linguistic philosophy and philosophy of science. But many of his successively appeared articles were with the interest of building a bridge between both currents, e.g.:

“Phenomenology of Speech Acts: An Introduction - Seeking a Dialog between Phenomenology and Analytical Philosophy” (1978)

“Language, Body and Sense - Wittgenstein and Merleau-Ponty” (1978)

“Intentionality und Refering Act - Föllesdal ‘s Interpretation of ‘Noema’” (1985)

“Wittgenstein and Transcendental Philosophy” (collaboration with OKAMOTO Yukiko, 1985)

“Possibility and Border of Linguistic Phenomenology” (1987)

“Crossroad and Break of Phenomenology and Analytical Philosophy” (1988)

These articles were at last in 1993 published as two books:

*Phenomenology of Speech Acts*

*Departure from Groundless*
His principal interest did not consist any more in an actual influential relationship like 
KURODA-TAKIURA-debate, nor in criticising the one by supporting another, but in 
adopting a common interest of phenomenology and analytical philosophy, and in 
building a bridge between two currents on a positive direction. Here a picture of a 
possible ideal exchange is painted.

The abovementioned interest in Frege in analytical philosophy called out an 
interest in his relation with Husserl. If one may quote here Dummett's excellent 
metaphor, the Rhine and the Danube originate from sources that lie very close to each 
other, they flow for a while almost parallel. Then both flow into absolutely different 
directions further and at last flow into different seas. Both rivers symbolize 
“Anglo-American” analytical philosophy and “continental” phenomenological philosophy, 
and the sources that lie very close to each other are Frege, the grandfather of analytical 
philosophy, and Husserl, the founder of phenomenology. Researchers directed their 
interest to what the both had in common and what brought the both in different ways. 
NOE Shinya (1952-) showed such an interest in his article “Husserl and Frege” (1980). 
WATANABE, who published the translation of Ideas I (1979/1984), undertook this 
interest, and published some articles like:

"An Introduction to Researching Husserl and Frege" (1984) 
"Frege's Foundation of Arithmetic and Husserl's Philosophy of Arithmetic" (1986) 
"Frege versus Husserl, Russell versus Heidegger" (1987)

Based on these articles WATANABE published Present philosophy – Studies of 
Anglo-American Philosophy (1991), where he treated analytical philosophy as a 
phenomenological researcher. Further the translation of Mohanty's Husserl and Frege, 
Origin of Analytical Philosophy (1998) should be read together with the book by 
Mohanty.

As said, analytical philosophy lost its unity and branched out in different problem 
areas, like linguistic philosophy, philosophy of mind, etc. When abovementioned NOE 
Keiichi tried to build a bridge between both currents, analytical philosophy was 
understood primarily as linguistic philosophy. In contrast to it, the work which wrestled 
with the relation between phenomenology and analytical philosophy as philosophy of
mind was made by NOE Shinya (Keiichi’s younger brother). After the translation of Dreyfus’ “Husserl, Intentionality and Cognitive Science” (1987), he published a series of papers as follows:

“Phenomenology and Functionalism” (1987)

“Cognistic Turn – Phenomenological Thinking in Cognitive Sciences” (2000)

“Change of Intellect and Phenomenology” (2001)

According to him, while analytical philosophy made once the linguistic turn in its source (Frege) and refused the point of contact with phenomenology, it is now starting with a cognistic turn, and there a point of contact with phenomenology appears again. This shows another direction for exchange of both currents again.

A lot of younger generation follows the abovementioned directions, but now no space remains to present such a work.

Conclusion

If one looks back thus at the history, one understands that phenomenology and analytical philosophy have an enormous influence in the philosophy of Japan since the Meiji-era. Phenomenological researches in Japan which started with participation in Husserl’s or Heidegger’s lecture or seminar has a tradition up to nearly 100 years. On the other hand, analytical philosophy which started under influence of Anglo-American culture after World War II has already tradition with more than 50 years. On both sides the time in which we import foreign philosophy has already passed. As based on learning German and French phenomenology already some original phenomenological researches appeared, so based on learning Anglo-American analytical philosophy also some original analytical philosophy appeared. We need now to go out the historical dimension of actual influential relationship and to perform a dialog between both currents on the philosophical dimension. This movement is about to start everywhere in Japan. Unfortunately, nevertheless, it is not possible at the moment to tell such a movable situation like a ready history.