

## NIIDA NOBORU AND CHINESE LEGAL HISTORY

by DENIS TWITCHETT

In the autumn of 1965 Professor Niida Noboru, who had recently retired from his chair at Tokyo University, visited Europe for the first time. After taking part in the Twelfth International Congress of Historical Sciences at Vienna, to which he contributed a very important paper on the influence of T'ang law in the countries surrounding China, he came to London to take up an appointment as Visiting Lecturer at the School of Oriental and African Studies, of which he was a Corresponding Member. For this purpose he had written a series of most stimulating and provocative lectures, the Japanese texts of which have recently been published, together with a number of other posthumous papers and a diary of his visit to Europe, as *Chūgoku no hō to shakai to rekishi 中國の法と社會と歴史* (Chinese law in its social and historical context). Unfortunately, before he was able to deliver these lectures as planned, he suffered a serious cerebral haemorrhage which necessitated a series of major brain operations. Although he recovered sufficiently to return to Japan, he was still gravely ill, and died in hospital in Tokyo on 22 June 1966.

His death marks the end of an era in the study of Chinese law and institutions, and it seems an appropriate opportunity to sum up his scholarly achievement.

Few scholars can ever have dominated any field of study so completely. Legal and institutional studies of China as they exist today are very largely fashioned in his image, and his enormous output – twelve volumes, several of which run to a thousand pages or more, and more than two-hundred articles – form the central core of the standard literature in the field. He was perhaps the most hard-working and totally dedicated scholar I have ever known, and was doubly fortunate in his wife, who was a model of selfless devotion and assisted him very greatly.

His interest in law was hereditary. His father, Kanno Zenzaburō, was a judicial official, and his uncle Niida Itarō, whose name he later adopted, was a well-known jurist. From his schooldays, too, he developed a passionate interest in Chinese literature, during his undergraduate days at Tokyo

University devoting much time to the study of archaic Chinese and epigraphy. He was immensely well read. Not only did he have the whole of standard Chinese historical literature and the technical literature of law at his fingertips, he had also a wide knowledge of literature, not only the standard classical writers, but all sorts of popular and semi-popular writing scorned by most traditional scholars.

With these basic interests already well established, he had the good fortune to enter the law faculty of Tokyo University at the time when the great legal historian Nakada Kaoru 中田薫 (born 1876) was at the very height of his powers. Nakada, in the pre-war years dominated the field of Japanese legal history just as his pupil later did with Chinese legal studies, and has indeed continued to produce important work until very recently (the fourth volume of his collected articles appeared only in 1964). He was himself a pupil of Miyazaki Michisaburō 宮崎道三郎 (1855–1928), an immensely influential scholar who had studied "Rechtsgeschichte" in Germany from 1884 to 1887, and after his return to Japan taught comparative legal history, until his retirement in 1921, at Tokyo University. Nakada thus combined in his scholarship the old native tradition of legal history, deriving from the investigation of Japan's past institutions at the time of the Meiji Restoration, together with the new style of European historical analysis, largely based on the investigation of Roman and Ancient German Law. Although the bulk of Nakada's most important contributions were in purely Japanese legal history, he also wrote, early in his career, a number of very important detailed studies of comparative problems both in ancient German law and more importantly in Chinese and early Japanese law. Among the latter was an attempt to reconstitute, on the basis of the Japanese *Ryō 令* of the Nara period dealing with land tenure, the lost Chinese Statutes (*Ling*) on which these had been modelled.

Niida graduated in 1928, and became a research student under Nakada's direction. His master's thesis, "On the private ownership of land in Ancient China and Japan" was developed out of this work of Nakada's published some twenty years before. At this time, too, Niida was made a Research Assistant at the newly established Tōhō bunka gakuin, a semi-government research institute set up with the Boxer Indemnity Funds to pursue academic research of the highest level on China. Here, and at the sister institution in Kyoto, a brilliant group of promising young scholars were brought together, provided with excellent library facilities, and given complete freedom to develop their own academic research. Niida continued to work under Nakada's supervision, researching on text-critical problems connected with T'ang codified law. In 1931, jointly with Makino Tatsumi 牧野巽, later to become one of the foremost authorities on the history of Chinese family and social institutions, he published a massive study on the date of compilation of the surviving T'ang criminal code, *T'ang lü shu-i*

唐律疏議. This was proved to be the text as promulgated in 737, with some later interpolations, and not, as had been commonly assumed, the earlier version of 653. They also showed its relationship with the Sung criminal code *Sung hsing-t'ung* 宋刑統. At this same time he was completing the compilation, reconstruction and editing of all the surviving fragments of the T'ang *Statutes*. This work, an immense labour, was completed and published in 1933 under the title *Tōryō shūi* 唐令拾遺. It immediately established Niida as a scholar of the very first rank, a fact which was recognized by the grant of the Imperial Academy Prize for 1934. The *Tōryō shūi* was not only an invaluable work of reference for all scholars working on T'ang or early Japanese legal or institutional history, and a vastly important step forward in our knowledge of T'ang law. It was also a masterpiece of traditional textual and critical scholarship, showing a rare command of the complex bibliographical problems surrounding many of the sources involved, which established Niida's reputation as a top-flight sinologist. The 35 years which have since elapsed have brought to light a certain amount of new material, notably among the manuscripts discovered at Tunhuang and Turfan, and at the time of his death Niida was working upon a 300-page supplement which will, we hope, eventually be printed from his extensive notes. But none the less, the passage of thirty years has left this book with an indisputable title as a classic work of scholarship.

At about this time also, Niida began collecting the far more scattered and fragmentary surviving quotations from the other categories of T'ang codified law, the Regulations (*Ko* 格) and Ordinances (*Shih* 式). Some of these results were included in his study of the *Shui-pu shih* 水部式 manuscript fragment from Tunhuang, published in 1936.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately, however, the whole manuscript of his reconstruction, which would have formed a very important supplement to the *Tōryō shūi*, was destroyed, together with his personal library and house, in one of the fire-raids on Tokyo in 1945.

These early studies, although of the greatest value, were very orthodox and conservative, dealing with the precise texts of codified law as enacted by the state. The scholarly ancestry of *Tōryō shūi* can be traced directly back to the Japanese scholars of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries who re-edited the legal compilations of the Nara period, such as *Ryō-no-shūge* 令集解 and *Ryō-no-gige* 令義解 and edited the T'ang Code for the Bakufu. Its earliest direct predecessor is the manuscript *Tōryō* 唐令 compiled in 1734 by Matsushita Kenrin 松下見林 which is still preserved in the Seikadō Bunko.

It is perhaps at this point worth summing up what was the current state of studies of Chinese law in the early 1930's, for this gives a necessary context for Niida's achievement. The first really important work on Chinese

legal history which still retains its scholarly value, was that of Asai Torao 淺井虎夫 (1877-1928). Asai was one of the scholars engaged during the early years of this century in the very important investigation of Taiwanese customary law (Rinji Taiwan kyūkan chōsakai) under the direction of Okamatsu Santarō, and was responsible for some sections of both major works which came out of this, the *Taiwan shihō* 台灣私法 (Tokyo and Kobe 1910-11, 6+9 vols.) (Private law in Taiwan), and the *Shinchō gyōsei hō* 清朝行政法 (Tokyo and Kobe 1910-14, 7 vols.) (Administrative law of the Ch'ing dynasty). His own chief contributions, however, were his *Shina hōsei shi* 支那法制史 (1904) and his *Shina ni okeru hōten hensan no enkaku* 支那ニ於ケル法典編纂ノ沿革 (1911), which were very formal histories of Chinese law, centring upon the promulgation of codified law, revisions of law, and the machinery of justice. Both were very influential books in their day, and were later translated into Chinese.

In China in the early years of the century, some interest in legal history was stimulated by the proposals to provide China with a modern code. The chief achievements in the historical field were the re-edition of certain important texts, such as *Sung hsing-t'ung* 宋刑統 and *Yüan tien-chang* 元典章 and the reconstruction of the fragments of codified law from the pre-T'ang dynasties. The best representative works of this type were Shen Chia-pen's 沈家本 *Han-lü chih-i* 漢律摭遺 (1912) and Ch'eng Shu-te's 程樹德 *Han-lü k'ao* 漢律考 (1918) and *Chiu-ch'ao lü-k'ao* 九朝律考 (1927, reprinted in a revised edition 1964).

Both in China and Japan, there was some development from these purely formal studies. Azumagawa Tokuji 東川徳治 who had worked with Asai and the great economic historian Katō Shigeshi on the *Shinchō gyōsei hō* in Taiwan, contributed a number of interpretative studies of Chinese law, as well as compiling a dictionary of legal terminology (*Tenkai* 典海 Tokyo 1930). The great historian Kuwabara Jitsuzō 桑原隲藏 also produced a volume of legal studies (*Shina hōseishi ronsō* 支那法制史論叢 1935). These studies approach law either in the spirit of the Confucian morality of their Chinese sources, or through the analytical patterns of the rather old-fashioned German legal scholarship which remained the dominant trend in Japanese legal education. Where a re-interpretation of the source material was attempted, this was done by applying to the Chinese material ready-made concepts from western legal scholarship. The most successful attempt to make such a re-interpretation on a wide scale remained the *Shinchō gyōsei hō*. In China, too, the first attempt to deal with law in terms of a western framework of reference, Yang Hung-lieh's 楊鴻烈 *Chung-kuo fa-lü fa-ta shih* 中國法律發達史 (2 vols., Shanghai 1930) had appeared, but dealt only with the most formal aspects of codified law.

This then was roughly the context in which Niida's early work must be seen. Not only was almost all of this published work concerned with the

<sup>1</sup> Hattori sensei koki shukuga kinen rombun-shū (1936) pp. 761-88.

more formal aspects of codified law and official procedure. The knowledge of legal history was also very patchy. Chinese scholars had worked over the earlier periods in some detail, Japanese scholarship had dealt with T'ang law, largely as a source of early Japanese law. On a more practical level, Japanese work by the colonial administration in Taiwan and studies conducted by the research bureau of the South Manchurian Railway, and Chinese work in connexion with the various attempts to revise the Chinese legal code along modern lines had clarified many aspects of the actual operation of law and custom in the nineteenth and twentieth-centuries. From the Sung to the nineteenth century almost nothing was known.

Niida, having laid the necessary foundation of a profound knowledge of Chinese codified law, now again followed the direction which his teacher Nakada had taken in dealing with early Japanese law, and began the systematic study and interpretation not only of codified enactments, but of the law as it was actually operated in a social context. From 1934 to 1937 he concentrated his energies upon the legal documents among the manuscripts which had been discovered in the early years of this century at Tunhuang and Turfan, and which were in the late 1920's and early 30's beginning to be edited and published. In these documents, many of them private papers from the lower strata of society, was a unique corpus of material covering all sorts of commercial and personal relationships between individuals; sale and purchase, mortgage, hire, marriage and divorce, inheritance, servitude, etc., which could be confronted with the written stipulations in the codified law to reveal the somewhat different set of legal norms which were actually operative in society. During these years, Niida produced a whole series of specialized studies based on the Tunhuang evidence, which culminated in 1937 with the publication of his book *Tō-Sō hōritsu monjo no kenkyū* 唐宋法律文書の研究 (Legal documents of the T'ang and Sung periods). This work was an epoch-making advance in our study of medieval Chinese society, and shows a breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding which is truly astonishing in a scholar still only 33. In this volume Niida gathered together not only many unedited manuscripts from Tunhuang and Turfan, but an astonishing sweep of material from his very varied reading, and his analysis also makes some use of the comparative concepts which Nakada had employed to such a striking effect. Unlike the *Tōryō shūi*, some sections of the *Tō-Sō hōritsu monjo no kenkyū* have been rendered obsolete in detail by later research, most of it by Niida himself. In particular, the microfilming of the Stein collection in the British Museum, the rediscovery of the lost Ōtani manuscripts in 1949, and latterly the revelation of the large Leningrad collection, provided him with many new materials, and enabled him to correct many inaccuracies in the rapidly made transcriptions and poor photographs on which he was forced to rely for most of his Tunhuang material. At the time he fell ill in London, he was

working systematically through the Stein documents themselves, and planning to visit the Paris and Leningrad collections. In spite of these shortcomings, however, the value of this book is immense. It remains the best general statement of what we would call civil law in T'ang and Sung times, and in estimating his achievement it must be remembered that many of the MSS. with which he deals are not only quite unique in content, but present great difficulty simply to read and decipher.

The years following the publication of *Tō-Sō hōritsu monjo no kenkyū* were spent in the shadow of the China Incident and the Pacific war. In his main research during this period Niida was engaged on a massive general statement of the law of persons in traditional China. This was completed and published under the title *Shina mibun-hō shi* 支那身分法史 in 1941. It is a very detailed treatment ranging over the Chinese clan, lineage and family systems, slavery and legal status differentiations of various kinds. Its contents, too, range over a much broader period than the early studies, taking in much material from Sung, Ming and Ch'ing sources. It is an invaluable collection of material which would on its own have made the reputation of a lesser scholar. But Professor Niida himself once told me that this was the one among his works for which he had least regard. He found it in fact an almost intolerable task to complete it, partly due to the profoundly disturbing influences of the political situation in Japan, but also partly as the result of new intellectual influences with which he had then been brought into contact.

At this time Niida became involved in a quite new type of work which had a profound effect upon his future scholarly activities and upon his basic conception of law. Ever since the early years of its existence, the South Manchurian Railway had maintained an excellent research department, which produced a stream of reports, including the enormous *Manshū kyūkan chōsa hōkoku* 滿洲舊慣調査報告 (9 vols., 1913-15), a compendium of custom and law similar to the *Shinchō gyōsei hō* produced in Taiwan, and a very large number of field surveys, of economic, social and legal problems. In 1938 they formulated a grandiose plan for a ten-year programme of field research into rural custom and law in the occupied territories of northern China. To process the reports of these field surveys, which depended heavily on questionnaires and interviews, an academic committee was established in Tokyo, attached to a government research agency, the *Tōa kenkyūjo*. Niida was appointed to this committee as an expert on the history of Chinese law. Its chairman was a brilliant Tokyo University law professor, Suehiro Gentarō 末弘 嚴太郎 who had also been indirectly responsible for planning the actual work to be carried out in the field. Suehiro was a man of revolutionary ideas, an exponent of a dynamic sociological theory of law, who believed that the basic task of the legal scholar was to extract the "living law" from actual social usage and to

analyse it in terms of its own broad social context rather than to attempt to reduce observed usage and customs to terms of ready-made accepted formal legal concepts. Until the end of the war Niida was engaged in processing the reports and data from the field surveys as they arrived in Tokyo, and was forced to confront the results of his historical researches based on texts with the living reality. He had already made one short trip to China in 1935, but in 1943 and 1944 he was sent on two long field trips to Peking, where, together with Imahori Seiji 今堀誠二, an expert on the society of Inner Mongolia, he undertook a first-hand study of the merchant and artisan guilds of the city. The results of this study, a fascinating mixture of observation and historical reading, were published in 1951 as *Chūgoku no shakai to girudo* 中國の社会とギルド (The guilds and Chinese society).

For Niida, the 1940's were a period of deep personal crisis. Awareness of the excesses of Japan's militarist leaders, the loss of home, books and manuscripts, followed by the trauma of humiliating defeat, led him like so many Japanese intellectuals who underwent the same experience to a fundamental reappraisal of many of his academic and political assumptions. In 1942 he had been appointed to a chair in the law faculty of Tokyo University, and although he continued to be a member (and later the head) of the Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo, the successor institute to the Tōhō gakuin, until his retirement and spent much of his time there, he now became involved in teaching a generation of young students equally disturbed and disorientated by the times through which they had lived. His vision was greatly broadened, and he began to formulate a radically new approach to the history of law, no longer bounded by any strict formal limits, in which law, economics, and sociology interacted with one another, and in which the past and present formed an indivisible continuum.

The works which he produced in the immediate post-war years were all deeply rooted in his wartime work on the North China survey, the six massive published volumes of which (*Chūgoku nōson kankō chōsa* 中國農村慣行調査 6 vols. Tokyo 1953-9) he helped edit, and all exhibit this new and far more integrated and dynamic approach to history. The study of the guilds mentioned above appeared in 1951, and the *Chūgoku no nōson kazoku* 中國の農村家族 (Chinese rural family) in 1952. The latter he considered his favourite book, and said that it contained more of himself than anything else he wrote. These two books, beside giving a very personal and deeply felt analysis of Chinese society on the eve of the Communist revolution, also provide a model for a type of synthesis between social science and history, and between field observation and textual research, which is currently beginning to develop among the younger scholars of Chinese matters in the west. This phase of Niida's work came to an end with the rather disappointing little book *Chūgoku shakai no hō to rinri* 中國社會の法と倫理 1954 (Law and ethic in Chinese Society), a discourse on the

fundamental authoritarianism underlying all Chinese traditional legal thought, and with his excellent short text-book on Chinese legal history, *Chūgoku hōsei shi* 中國法制史 of 1952. The latter, especially in its later revised and expanded version of 1959, is the best general statement of his basic views both on law and on history, and certainly deserves to be translated into English. Not only does it summarize much of his detailed research and range widely over the whole field of law and social institutions, but it also attempts to define precisely many of Niida's key concepts on such subjects as feudalism, authoritarianism, servitude and so forth. His latest, posthumous volume of lectures contains further refinements of these general ideas.

Niida's works of this post-war period, unlike the orthodox scholarship of his earlier years, were highly polemical and controversial, and he faced a great deal of harsh criticism, particularly over his use of Marxist concepts. There is little doubt that, as enduring monumental works of scholarship these four small volumes will not stand up to the test of time as will the *Tōryō shūi*. But, on the other hand they mark the beginning of a completely new phase in legal studies. They sounded the death knell for the old style of legal history with its exclusive interest in the enactment of codes, the judicial process and similar official manifestations of law. Niida, at the cost of much painful criticism and controversy, had made legal history an integral part of the history of social institutions, and whatever the fate of his interpretations of detail (and he would have been the first to admit that an historical interpretation is itself merely an historical phenomenon and valid only for its own time), the study of legal history can never be the same again, and Japanese work in this field has been placed in a much more fruitful general context and at a much higher level of generalization as the result of his work.

In his later years, although still passionately concerned with general ideas about history and society, and still engaged continually in refining and redefining his interpretations of history, Niida returned to his work on the earlier periods of law. The rediscovery of the Turfan manuscripts discovered by the Ōtani expedition led to the formation of the Research Society on Central Asian Culture (Saiiki bunka kenkyūkai) through the Ryūkoku University, to study, re-examine and publish the documents. This same society also worked on the microfilms of the Stein collection of Tunhuang manuscripts in the British Museum, and from 1959 onward published its results in the six large volumes of *Saiiki bunka kenkyū* (*Monumenta Serindica*). Professor Niida contributed to the series, and published a number of separate studies on Tunhuang material which were later reprinted among his collected articles. At the same time he searched widely through Chinese literature for similar legal material related to actual social practice rather than to codified law, in the most obscure corners of Chinese bibliography. Novels, drama, ephemeral popular encyclopaedias for

everyday use, folklore and sayings, analogies from Japanese, Korean, Mongolian and Vietnamese law and custom, everything which might be made relevant was combed for any new insight into the function of the living law of the past. He also contributed a number of important articles on Communist Law and would undoubtedly have done more had it not been for the extreme paucity of published material available.

From 1959 to 1964 he collected together and revised his older articles, and published these, together with a large number of important new studies in four substantial volumes of *Chūgoku hōsei kenkyū* 中國法制研究 (Studies in the History of Chinese Law). It would need a very considerable space even to summarize the contents of these volumes. Volume 1 deals with criminal law, Volume 2 with land law and commercial law, Volume 3 with family law and the law on servitude, and Volume 4 with law and custom and law and morality. Each volume contains upward of a dozen substantial major studies, many of them breaking entirely new ground.

Niida is not an easy scholar to read. He presupposes in his reader a very close acquaintance with historical scholarship in both Chinese and Japanese, and his writing is dense with quotations and references. Moreover, in his search for precise expression of his ever changing historical concepts he developed, particularly in his later writings a somewhat individual usage of vocabulary which makes him very difficult to render into adequate and lucid English.

Among Japanese scholars he has been at the centre of one of the major historical controversies of post-war years, and has been much criticized for his acceptance of Marxist ideas and for his support of various "progressive" causes. To my mind, however, there is little substance in these charges. He was certainly no hard Party-line Marxist, and in immediate post-war Japan it was almost impossible for a man of basically left-wing principles to escape Marxist influences. In fact the Marxist style of historical analysis seems to have done little more for him than to give him another dimension to the significance of the institutional changes which he was already studying, and to make him look into these social and economic institutions for the basic dynamic of Chinese history.

Most of the controversy surrounding his name arose from his involvement in the new "periodization" of Chinese history first put forward by Maeda Naonori 前田直典, shortly after the war. According to Maeda the general scheme of periodization established by Naitō Kōnan, in which the unmistakable period of radical change from A.D. 800 to 1200 represents the transition from medieval to modern times, is to be rejected in favour of an interpretation of this period as the transition from "ancient slave society" to "medieval feudalism". Now Maeda's original argument, which he unfortunately died before he could refine further, was designed to find a single system of stages of development common to all East Asian societies.

Niida and Sudō Yoshiyuki, the great economic historian gave some real scholarly substance to such an interpretation, first by the rejection of the conventional interpretation of the *feng-chien* 封建 system of the Chou as a sub-type of feudalism, and secondly by their interpretation of the new tenant system (*tien-jen* 佃人) of Sung times, as a type of subservience involving mutual obligation which could be interpreted as a "feudal relationship". Controversy over this theory has raged for the past 15 years, with Miyazaki Ichisada and the Kyoto school ranged against Niida and Sudō. Niida was a hard-hitting controversialist, revelling in the smoke of battle, and kept up his position until the end. Of course, this was a controversy which could hardly lead to a conclusive result, since both parties are usually speaking of different things. But the concentration of research upon the Sung period in recent years, which has to a large extent arisen from the controversy, has led to the filling of one of the worst gaps in our knowledge of China's past, and also to a considerable refinement of our ideas about the structure of Sung society.

At first sight Niida's conception of the Sung as the new period of feudal servitude would seem to fit in well with the interpretation of the Chinese Marxist scholars who see "feudal society" as coming to an end in 1840, or even more recently. But Niida destroyed this possibility by pointing out that the system of servile relationships which he detected in the Sung tenancy system died out in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, to be replaced by an unspecified, but freer pattern of social relationships.

To Niida, what was far more important than such theoretical problems was to see how the new developed out of the old, and how the nature of change was determined by existing institutions. For this reason, Communist China fascinated him for, as he often said, even when the Communists broke completely with the past, the rationale underlying this rejection was itself to be found in the past just as much as were the origins of institutions which, showed continuity. Niida was a passionate believer in the new order in Chinese society, and did much to assist cultural exchanges between China and Japan. He visited Peking briefly in 1959, and was able to collect much important new material.

Perhaps the saddest thing about his death, tragically premature as it was, is the fact that he leaves no obvious successor. He was full of plans for new work, and brimming with new ideas which only a scholar of equally vast learning could have accomplished. He has of course had a vast influence on every young Japanese historian, particularly on those of the Tokyo school. But no one has followed him into the immensely difficult and complex terrain of his own chosen field. His own work had, of course, set the required standards very high indeed, demanding a grasp of such a range of different fields of learning that prospective students were intimidated. But in another sense, he destroyed the boundaries of his own field. Legal history, in the

narrow sense of his youth, is no longer adequate, and its emphasis is now upon law's role in social history rather than upon codified law and legal institutions. This sort of broad vision and grasp of problems in a wide historical context does not, unhappily, come too easily to most Japanese historians, working in a tradition of close and narrow specialization. But at the same time, thanks to his tremendous pioneering efforts, the general outline of the field is now remarkably well mapped out.

Lastly, a brief personal note about him as a man. We first met in 1953 when, as a very green research student with only rudimentary spoken Japanese I was sent to do post-doctoral work at the Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo. Niida was then already established as by far the greatest scholar in the world in his field, and had accumulated every conceivable academic distinction. Expecting to meet an offhand and overpowering *daisensei* I was received with the greatest kindness, patience and friendship. He remained unaffected, simple and modest to a degree, and was always eager to talk, which he did unceasingly and at great speed. I learned more not only about Chinese law, but about Japan, from the breakneck discussions strap-hanging on Tokyo trams and elsewhere, than from any amount of formal study. Politically he was an angry man. Injustice, cruelty and oppression fired him. Vietnam, the international isolation of China and some aspects of government policy distressed him deeply. He was occasionally used by unscrupulous people to lend his name to their causes. But he was an upright and honest man, and even when we disagreed, I have always found it impossible not to admire him for his complete sincerity and integrity.

The Japanese world of scholarship will be a much poorer place without him.