J.G. van Bremen

THE POST-1945 ANTHROPOLOGY OF JAPAN

In general, it can be stated that the sociological approach is especially dangerous in fostering over-simplification, when sociologists attempt to analyse social reality in terms of a dichotomy.

W.F. Wertheim (1964: 254)

I

The history and theory of the anthropology of Japan have increasingly attracted attention in recent years. In this essay I shall discuss one set of recent studies of this subject, with reference to the theories and models that have been developed in the anthropology of Japan and an assessment of their adequacy as explanations and descriptions of Japanese reality, considered against the background of their past and current histories and their paradigmatic and social constitutions and contents. The analysis which I shall be examining was completed over the past five years by two students of Japan who work in Australia, Y. Sugimoto and R.E. Mouer, respectively a sociologist and a scholar

An earlier draft of this paper was read at the Conference on the Social Anthropology of Japan, held at the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies, Oxford, on 18–21 March 1984, and at the Research Group 'Theory and Method' of the Vakgroep CANSA, Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum, Universiteit van Amsterdam, on 24 May 1984. I am indebted to participants at both occasions for comments and criticism.

trained in law and diplomacy engaged in modern Asian studies (e.g. Mouer and Sugimoto 1980, 1982; Sugimoto and Mouer 1981, 1983). The anthropological studies of Japan which these authors discuss come predominantly from North America and Japan (little European research in this field is included). In order to evaluate the subject, I shall be discussing the nature of these contributions, and in particular the influence of anthropological research on Japanese studies in other fields and disciplines, as well as on Japanese Studies as a separate field of enquiry in its own right. Also of relevance here is a consideration of the influence of the anthropology of Japan on popular images of Japan and, conversely, the effects of research in other fields and disciplines (including that deriving from non-academic sources) on the anthropology of Japan.

Within the confines of a single paper, I can only touch upon these questions, but I shall be enumerating them in the light of Sugimoto and Mouer's contentions. I do not, however, agree with many of their statements about the anthropology of Japan, for example the characterisations and classifications which they employ. The first issue I wish to deal with concerns their denunciation of one class of explanatory contentions, namely those which entail the proposition that Japanese behaviour, culture and society cannot be studied or well understood without reference to qualities and dynamics particularly Japanese.

The argument here is whether one has to take into account specific, even unique, features of Japanese culture when one studies Japan. The question is whether such forms exist, and if so whether they can be discriminated and indeed whether there are patterns which show persistence, continuity and characteristic modes of change and transformation. This question is worthy of attention and investigation for several reasons. The general reason is that comparative studies in anthropology have demonstrated the necessity of taking into account both locally specific features and those of wider distribution (Evans-Pritchard 1963; Blok 1978), while conceptual reflections (Blok 1975; Needham 1975) have made it clear that social phenomena answer to forms of polythetic classification and a holistic approach.

But there are also specific reasons, among the first of which is the existence of evidence in support of the contention. The American anthropologist R.J. Smith (1962), for example, has shown the remarkable continuity in the use of Japanese kinship terms over the period of the past one thousand years. For the same period of time, I. Morris (1975) has pointed to the Japanese 'tragic hero' as a form of behaviour, orientation and appreciation in Japanese history and in the present day. The historian T. Najita (1974) has stressed the presence of two dominant patterns of ideological orientation found in Japanese society and political behaviour in and since the Tokugawa period, which he has named 'bureaucratic pragmatism' and 'intuitive idealism', often articulated by the occurrence of 'restoration movements'. In my own study of contemporary Japanese adherents of Wang Yang-ming Neo-Confucianism (van Bremen 1984), I found modes of consciousness, orientation to social action such as sacrificial behaviour, and patterns of mentorship and perceptions of time which show redeployment since the introduction and absorption of the creed from the seventeenth century

onwards. In the field of psychological anthropology, the American anthropologist and Japanologist G.A. de Vos (1973) has demonstrated the existence of patterns of psycho-dynamics and psycho-pathology ranging over at least the present century, among them patterns of socialisation, suicide and alienation. De Vos and others (de Vos and Wagatsuma 1967; Donoghue 1977; Lee and de Vos 1981) have shown the persistence of 'caste' and attitudes toward 'caste' and minorities in Japan, both in the past and the present. With respect to forms of relationships and social organisation, isomorphic patterns have been noted along with change (Hendry 1981; Bachnik 1983). The Japanese historian M. Bitō (1984), as a last example, states that the Japanese concept of the family has persisted since the eighth century. I must stress that the argument is not intended to convey or promote an image of Japan as a homogeneous or unchanging society. I do believe, however, that there is an empirical basis for entertaining the proposition that Japanese culture and society exhibit certain social and cultural characteristics that have to be taken into account along with discontinuous change.

From another angle, one has to consider the force and persistence of the notion that Japan is unique and incomparable as a current collective representation among the Japanese. The sociolinguist R.A. Miller (1977a, 1977b, 1982) has exposed many such notions with respect to the Japanese language, showing how from a linguist's point of view they are false (Chew 1984). On the other hand, the Japanese linguist S. Watanabe (1974) has pointed out the importance of native Japanese words (*yamato kotoba*) for the expression of what anthropologists might call the 'primordial' in Japanese culture, contending that Sino-Japanese is consigned to denote the allochtone in Japanese culture. Watanabe's contention apparently holds (Saint-Jacques and Suzuki 1984) and provides further evidence for the existence of autochthonous realms of Japanese culture.

An important reason for entertaining the idea of autochthonous realms in Japanese culture is one of epistemology. Some authors contend that descriptive or explanatory models developed for societies other than Japan are in certain instances difficult to apply to Japan. G.A. de Vos is one such scholar; he insists that models of explanation or description developed in Europe and America are not necessarily of value if indeed applicable to Japan. De Vos (1984) considers this demonstrable in the cases of Freudian psychoanalytic therapy, Marxist developmental predictions and certain structuralist notions. The social psychologist H. Wagatsuma (1975: 309) also points to problems arising from the 'conceptual Westernization' of Japanese academic theory in his field. In his experience, not enough attention is paid to the social-psychological reality of the Japanese. Western theories are based upon Western psychological reality and are not necessarily directly applicable to Japan. In the field of Japanese history, the historian M. Bitō (1981), in lectures in America, has argued that the common historical divisions and periodizations employed in European history are neither appropriate nor enlightening when applied to Japanese history. He advocates that one should proceed from structural changes and discontinuities in Japanese history. Thus Bitō stresses, as one crucial transformation in the history of pre-industrial Japan, the change from personal bonds and ties to ones of status and

function (*yaku*), along with the separation of warriors and peasants (*heinō bunri*) in the period of the civil wars (*sengoku jidai*) (1467–1568).

It would not be difficult to add further arguments and cases, but I now wish to turn rather to other issues in the work of Sugimoto and Mouer, namely their classifications and qualifications and the role they ascribe to anthropological studies of Japan.

II

Y. Sugimoto and R.E. Mouer have been engaged in the study of models and theories about Japan over the past five years, publishing their findings in articles and monographs in English, Japanese and German. Their main concern is with the type of model or contention discussed above and usually referred to as *Nihonjinron*, or 'theories of the Japanese'. They have launched a large international programme of research for the comparative study of Japanese society; its progress is reported in *Dialogue*, a publication established for the purpose. For the present, a brief monograph published in 1981 and adapted from earlier publications dating from 1979 and 1980 can be considered as containing a succinct summary of their most important findings and ideas up to this point (Sugimoto and Mouer 1981).

To state the central idea first, the authors consider the dominant models or theories now current to be ideological rather than scholarly, and stress the need to develop new and alternative models. They reject an approach centred on Japan alone and advocate the application of cross-cultural or universal models of analysis and explanation called 'convergence' models, foremost among which they designate the 'conflict model'. As the authors (1981: 17) see it:

> All of this seems to be moving us toward a major reappraisal which may result in some new models for understanding Japanese society. Though it is too early to foretell the new image, it seems likely that, as with sociology which is itself multi-paradigmatic, the holistic image of Japan will be replaced not simply by another similarly restricting image, but perhaps by several competing images. For this reason, the next decade will be exciting for those studying. . Japanese society. Such a scenario will also underline the need of those dealing with Japan for up-to-date information, not the hackneyed clichés of 'the old Japan hands' who peddle Japanalia.

It is clear that Sugimoto and Mouer see little merit in an approach which is focused upon the study of Japan as one particular culture or field of ethnological enquiry and do not regard such an orientation as conducive to understanding that society. It is one of my aims to defend an anthropological point of view, which is basically no less comparative, and indeed to agree with the need for it, for interdisciplinary work and a variety of approaches and foci. I feel stimulated to respond to Mouer and Sugimoto's publications, as the authors put much of the blame on anthropology for the dominance of what they consider a deficient

model.

To discuss these matters, it is necessary to present Sugimoto and Mouer's analyses and to make some clarifying statements about anthropology itself. The contribution of anthropology is closely linked with methods of local research - 'participant observation'—centred on a prolonged stay by the anthropologist among a population or community of some kind. Participant observation, extended case-studies, half-structured interviews, and working with control of the local language, are the characteristic techniques of research. Regional specialisation can help to make this method a reasonably trustworthy tool of investigation. It should be noted that the anthropologist seeks to gather local knowledge and inside points of view, as well as applying viewpoints derived from the wider discipline and comparative perspectives.

In recent years—in fact since the 1930s—anthropologists, while maintaining a focus on local populations, have gone beyond the purely local level (Mintz 1982). Japan was among the first places where such research was done (Embree 1939; Smith and Wiswell 1982). Anthropological orientations and research methods have developed, and attention is now paid to historical dimensions and processes as well as to the wider spatial and social realms linked to a community. Also, more penetrating methods of enquiry into culture have been developed along with historical research techniques. Comparative studies have moved, away from structural-functional cross-cultural comparisons, in the direction of the 'experimental comparative method', pioneered in England by E.E. Evans-Pritchard and R. Needham and developed in Dutch anthropology by G.W. Locher (1932) and J.P.B. de Josselin de Jong (1935), and more recently by A. Blok (1978). Description and understanding have been improved by Blok's methodological directive (1975) to employ classification by 'family resemblances', and by the matching viewpoint represented by R. Needham's advocacy (1975) of the use of 'polythetic classification'.

It is apparent from their presentations that Sugimoto and Mouer work within a framework of simple dichotomies, in spite of their advertising a 'multiparadigmatic' sociology and a simplified anthropology of Japan. Theories are simply classified as either 'consensus models' or as 'conflict models'. Although attention must be paid to the sociology of knowledge, I regard such a classification too crude to fit the range of existing models and theories. Still, Sugimoto and Mouer, in analysing these, argue that the dominant theories should be characterized as stereotypes rather than as valid empirical representations. The notion that Japanese society has cultural predispositions which must be taken into account is rejected. Such a view, known as 'divergence' in developmental sociology, stresses a holistic perspective and the importance of culture. The authors opt for 'convergence', the proposition that societies with similar industrial technology will tend to produce common patterns, despite dissimilar cultural origins and social organization. They note that the views of divergence theorists have almost completely dominated the English-language literature on Japan, wrongly stressing the social and cultural integration and singularity of Japanese society. This image should be removed and prominence given instead to a competing image, the conflict model of a class society.

The dominant model is labelled (1981: 5) 'The Great Tradition: Images of Consensus and Homogeneity'. It is a picture of Japanese society which leads one to believe that it is exceptionally well integrated and that, to a degree greater than that to be found in other similarly industrialized societies, the Japanese are group-oriented and regulated by norms placing a great value on consensus and on loyalty to 'the group'. Responsibility for the creation and dissemination of 'the great tradition' model is placed, first of all, upon 'the anthropological heritage', sketched in a lengthy passage (ibid.) in which it is said to consist largely of Ruth Benedict's influence and limitations. In addition, three other factors are held accountable for the creation, spread and dominance of 'consensus models' (ibid.: 5–7): 'the American setting', 'the Japanese literature', and 'the relationship to ideology'.

With regard to 'the American setting', the core of the argument (ibid.: 5–6) is that, in the 1960s, the Americans tried to fit Japan into a structural-functional model of modernization. This pronouncement is followed by a characterisation of the models in use in the 1970s (ibid.: 6):

> With Japan's 'modernization' accomplished or recognized, the next wave of writings. . .gave rise to the notion of 'Japan, Incorporated' and other portrayals of overly coordinated or orchestrated 'economic animals'.

As for the next factor, 'the Japanese literature', it is pointed out that in Japan there is a large literature emphasising Japanese uniqueness, known as *Nihonjinron*. This literature began to appear widely in the mid-1960s, and Sugimoto and Mouer argue (ibid.) that it bolstered the position of the consensus-oriented theorists. It has a broad national-character approach and has attained an ideological significance both in Japan and abroad. It can be linked to pre-war Japan and some of the concepts popular at that time, such as *yamato damashii* (Japanese spirit) and *fūdoron* (theories of climate).

Reviewing the literature classified as 'the great tradition', Sugimoto and Mouer note the over-riding orientation towards group and consensus models. They argue (ibid.: 8) that

> The world of work and industrial relations is one place where these kinds of images have been most readily associated with concrete examples. . . . The world of work is also an area where the debate on convergence and divergence has been most vigorous and where there seems to be the most difficulty in bridging differences in disciplines, with anthropologists tending to argue for the consensus model and Japanese uniqueness. . .and sociologists attempting to fit Japan into a more universal framework. . . .

Apart from what they describe as the dominant model, Sugimoto and Mouer also point to the existence of a competing model of Japanese society, called 'The Little Tradition: Images of Conflict in Japanese Society' (ibid.: 8–10). The images thus far available, however, recount only particular conflicts and do not amount to a comprehensive or systematic view of Japanese society. As a result, those who wish to have an overview of Japanese society are obliged in the main to turn for inspiration to studies that emphasise consensus.

If consensus models seem to dominate the English-language literature, conflict

models are more pronounced in the Japanese literature. 'There is a solid Marxist socialist tradition in Japanese scholarship on Japanese society,' they write (ibid.: 8), 'but the small dribble which comes out in English through *AMPO*, *Ronin* or the *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* does not match it either in volume or in creative diversity.' Sugimoto and Mouer (ibid.: 11) stress that a revision of the consensus model is in order, for three reasons:

> First, empirical observation, it can be argued, does not support the holistic view of Japanese society. Second, the methodology of those emphasizing the uniqueness of Japanese society is seen as having major weaknesses. Third, from the perspective of a sociology of knowledge, the ideological uses of the consensus-oriented view of Japanese society also make it unattractive.

Regarding the empirical sources of the doubt they refer to, studies do exist on conflict in Japanese society, showing conflict to be part of every period in Japanese history (ibid.: 11–12). The methodological shortcomings in the work of those who are said to promote holistic images of Japan are seen as particularly severe (ibid.: 12–15) and are discussed under five headings. The first charge is 'anecdotism' and 'exemplarism' –that is, the provision of only arbitrarily chosen examples. The second charge is 'linguistic reductionism'—that is, the reliance on identifying words unique to the Japanese language. One such method is the citation of *kotowaza* (proverbs and wise sayings); another is based on the assumption that words or expressions which possess nuances that are difficult to translate represent special features of the Japanese national character. Again, the method appears to be 'exemplarist' in character. The third accusation is 'cliquish intuitiveness', meaning that the 'uniformity theorists' have a tendency to argue that only the Japanese, together with a few select foreigners, are able to understand Japan at all. Sugimoto and Mouer (ibid.: 14) especially deplore the use of the term 'Japanology', because to them the word suggests knowledge accessible only to initiates. The fourth methodological shortcoming of consensus theorists is their tendency to view the West in a monolithic manner, for the purpose of contrasting it with a supposedly homogeneous Japan. The fifth charge is 'the comparison of non-parallel universes'. Thus, for example (ibid.: 15), one cannot compare (i) employment practices for regular employees in Japan's largest firms, which employ less than thirty per cent of the Japanese labour force in the private sector, with (ii) average practices for the entire American labour force in the private sector, the issue at the Japanese end of the comparison being, of course, the system of lifetime employment and seniority wages. How this task should be correctly handled, therefore, is formulated as follows (ibid.):

> The very first methodological task in comparative research is the delineation of the relevant sub-populations in each society to be compared. This allows the research to align universes in terms of such stratification variables as age, occupation, level of education, sex and social class.

Anthropologists have shown the dangers of comparing seemingly similar universes in cross-cultural studies, though whether Sugimoto and Mouer's proposals (1983) for a 'multi-cultural' approach will enable these and other difficulties to be overcome in practice remains to be seen.

Sugimoto and Mouer (1981: 16–19) end their discussion with a number of recommendations designed to improve studies of Japanese society. The new directions they suggest are (1) the recognition of variation in Japanese behaviour, culture and society; (2) the recognition of conflict; (3) the need for new models, in particular conflict models; and (4) cooperative research.

It is obviously hard to disagree in principle with any proposal which would improve the perception and understanding of Japan, yet I find difficulty with the programme suggested and with the appended recommendations. On the one hand, I would not rely so totally on the social sciences as they propose, nor, on the other hand, do I share their low view (ibid.: 19) of Japanology and Japanese studies:

> Gimmicks, we suspect, will remain as the major trademark of those interested in 'Japanology', but they will be viewed with caution by those interested in promoting Japanese studies that are firmly rooted in the social sciences.

The 'social sciences' appear somewhat over-rated as a source of inspiration and orientation for the anthropological study of Japan; whereas Japanology is in my experience a rich field, highly graded and far from being an antiquated or 'gimmick-laden' pursuit. Attention is well directed upon it, as indeed upon the humanities and letters at large.

III

The critical questions raised by Mouer and Sugimoto can be concisely stated, and I make use of a formulation by J. Galtung. Galtung's subject is the intellectual and academic worlds that exist at present in a number of national and cultural forms and contexts; his description is equally valid for the student of Japan (Galtung 1981: 821; original italics and notes omitted):

> What is it that intellectuals do? I think it is fair to refer to their task as descriptive and explanatory; that is, describing what reality is like and trying to understand it. In the typical methodology text-book language it would be referred to as data collection, data processing and data analysis on the one hand, and theory formation on the other. As we know, either of these may condition the other.
>
> But intellectual activity, of course, goes beyond this. There is the dimension of paradigm analysis, of looking into the foundations of what one does, of exploring the limitations of one's own intellectual enterprise. One may say that this is, in a certain way, exactly what this essay is about. And here is one very simple little point: it is all too easy for each one of us to see the subjective limitations of any one particular colleague. We can see them because we can compare with other colleagues.

At issue are descriptions, explanations, theories of knowledge, epistemology and the sociology of knowledge. Contrary to Sugimoto and Mouer, I take them to be less simple, and constituted of finer categories and gradations, not so easily brought in accordance with empirical realities, and in need of finer historical

perspective. Without the proper precision, the discussion remains at the level of stereotypes.

Every researcher everywhere inevitably has preconceived notions. Invisible at the time, they emerge later through comments, discussion and criticism, through other studies and comparisons. Such, at least, is the experience of many; consider for example the following remarks by the historian G.K. Goodman, in looking back over his previous work (1983: 169):

> Back in the now remote immediate postwar decade, in the wake of our enthusiasm for the seeming wonders of Occupation reform, many of us then eager, budding Japanologists framed our research in terms of the quest for 'basic democrats' in 'old' Japan as well as for 'reasonable' (to us Jeffersonian Americans) explanations for the attributed prescience of the 'ministers of modernization', whose triumphs we touted. I was one of those almost messianic types, and the Pollyana approach that I took to my subject matter in *The Dutch Impact on Japan* (Leiden: E.J. Brill 1967) is damning testimony with which I still have to live.
>
> What a surprise it is, then, nearly three decades later to discover that there are still researchers who are trying to find and to extol Japanese heterodoxy and/or dissident movements, and, in this instance, to suggest that *shijuku* [private academies] of some eight or ten very different types were perhaps at the root of it all. If Matsuzaka in the second half of the eighteenth century had an 'open and progressive atmosphere'. . .as reflected in the social mix of Motoori Norinaga's Suzu no Ya, are we perhaps supposed to conjure up a Tokugawa version of the New School for Social Research?

In a similar vein, we can treat the observations of the anthropologist S. Seshaiah, reflecting on his fieldwork in Japan (1979: 244):

> As an Indian, the most important problem I faced in my fieldwork, particularly when I began to study the class structure, was the absence of caste. Not that I went to Japan without any knowledge about its social structure; in fact, I did not expect to find caste in Japan, except for the numerically small Eta, the untouchables. What I refer to is the strong impressions we carry of things which may be contrary to our surface intellectual perceptions. While I did not expect to find caste, I thought I would discover *something similar to caste*. When I did not find anything like that, I felt as though the ground under my feet had been removed. It took some time for me to realize that I was reading too much of my Indianness into Japanese society. At the same time, I also became aware that I would not make headway with my work without bringing my Indianness into continuous comparison with everything I studied. This operated at the conscious as well as the unconscious level. In fact, I could not carry on interviews with villagers without their asking me at some point during the interview, 'How is it in India?' Such occasions threw up facts or ideas which were similar to things Indian or in sharp contrast. In this way I not only learnt about Japan but my understanding of my own society became sharper, which incidentally also proved to me the usefulness of the comparative method in studying societies.

In the course of a discussion on recent studies of Chinese and comparative Chinese–Western intellectual history, J. Ching (1984: 479, 482) remarks that in her field, the student is well advised to start with human beings in their diversity rather than with abstract theory. This viewpoint is contained in her call for 'cross-cultural sensibilities'.

I have thus far noted various limitations in the approach and orientation of Mouer and Sugimoto. To these I would add here the weaknesses resulting from their virtual failure to recognize culture. The approach that I would favour is one that is holistic, interpretative, comparative, humanistic, historical and open, albeit sharpened by a keen anthropology and theory of knowledge. I do not accept the allusion that anthropologists cultivate diversity for its own or their own sake. I would rather side with Geertz (1983: 154, 181–2), when he argues that

> . . .ethnography. . .is an attempt not to exalt diversity but to take it seriously as itself an object of analytic description and interpretive reflection; [it] welds the processes of self-knowledge, other-perception, other-understanding; that identifies, or very nearly, sorting out who we are and sorting out whom we are among.

The anthropology of Japan is not so uniform and unchanging, as Sugimoto and Mouer would have it: work by American, European and Japanese anthropologists attest to this. From studies of the development of– in this case primarily American—anthropology (Wolf 1969; Hatch 1983; Ortner 1984), one is tempted to believe that Sugimoto and Mouer's stress upon conflict orientation is as much to be accounted for by its dominance in the social sciences in the 1970s as by an exclusive superiority or inherent appropriateness to Japan.

Nor can the comparative methods to be used and advocated be taken for granted. There are ample studies that demonstrate the empirical weaknesses that so often invalidate the bold idea or theorem when comparison is all too wide and shallow. As for global comparison, I find the work of R.A. Rappaport and R. Needham offers useful perspectives and method. Findings from general anthropology are not to be neglected by anthropologists who study Japan. Needham's insight into dual sovereignty (1980) sheds light, for instance, on the institution of the *tennō* and the division of secular and sacred authority (and cf. also Yoshida's paper in this volume). Rappaport's studies of ritual (1979) are analytically clear and rich in insight and can be used for the study of ritual in Japan. Comparison on a regional, thematic and interdisciplinary basis should also receive attention, as testified by the work of de Vos and Sofue (1984), a good recent example of the combination. Finally, M. Lock's (1980) study of East Asian and 'cosmopolitan' medicine in Kyoto and elsewhere in Japan shows these two to exist largely apart from each other. It seems that one cannot take a medical system out of its context any more than an industrial or any other system.

In sum, Sugimoto and Mouer's presentation of the anthropology of Japan and their account of its 'methodological shortcomings' is both inadequate and misleading, while the 'new directions' proposed are hardly new. I share their aims and ambitions, but not their choice of instruments. I would rather venture the opinion that much of what they are looking for and recommend can indeed already be found in the anthropology of Japan, East Asian area studies and 'Japanology' or Japanese studies.

One more word about 'Japanology' and 'Japanese Studies'—and by implication about the relationship between the anthropology of Japan and other

disciplines and fields of Japanese studies). One can take the two as identical and regard 'Japanology' as the earlier and 'Japanese Studies' as the subsequent development in the research of Japan. I do not find it fruitful to argue over the word, but my appreciation of Japanology is a different one. I do not share the derisive image and opinion that Sugimoto and Mouer present. The value of Japanology or Japanese Studies is amply demonstrated by the research and publications produced by members of bodies such as the European Association for Japanese Studies and its national chapters and centres, the Japan Anthropology Workshop (JAWS), established at the conference in Oxford at which many of the papers in the present volume were first presented, and corresponding organisations and centres in North America, Asia and elsewhere (see, for example, Sofue 1960). It seems quite unreasonable to level the accusation against anthropological studies in particular of having created then disseminated the stereotypes of Japan which rule public, popular and academic minds. These appear in any case to be not so much the work and influence of anthropologists as of publicists, journalists and the like, as studies such as those by Lehmann (1978, 1984) have indicated. Minear (1980) names academics among the instigators and perpetuators of stereotyped images and conceptions, but it is perhaps significant that anthropologists do not feature among them. Minear's remarks are not entirely out of place, but on the other hand this fact does not warrant the emphasis placed by Mouer and Sugimoto on the use of stereotypes instead of the ethnographic realities in the research papers and critical discussions they refer to.

In fairness, however, it should be added that Mouer and Sugimoto's project is potentially extensive, wide and penetrating to the point where it would involve multi-disciplinary, multi-cultural and multi-paradigmatic contributions. This would lead to finer conceptual, methodological and empirical modes through which precision in presentation and findings could be enhanced. At the same time it would also prevent the domination of the field by a single orientation, approach or discipline. Some of this, in fact, is already discernible in the studies which appear as the Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre of Monash University, Melbourne, under the editorship of J.V. Neustupný and Y. Sugimoto, now joined (with number five) by G. McCormack.

Finally, of course, mention must be made of the anthropology of Japan undertaken by Japanese anthropologists or as promoted by particular Japanese institutions. Prominent among the institutions are the Ethnological Foundation of Japan, the Folklore Society of Japan, the National Museum of Ethnology, the Union of Nine Learned Societies, the Anthropological Society of Kyoto University, Tokyo Metropolitan University and other universities, and the Japanese Studies Center of the Japan Foundation.[1] For useful surveys of Japanese anthropology see the overview by Sofue (1961), Ishida's investigation (1967) of Western and Japanese orientations as applied to the study of Japan,

1. Journals in Japanese which contain much of the work include *Minzokugaku Kenkyū*, *Jinruigaku*, *Minzokugaku* and *Shakai Jinruigaku Nenpō*.

Nakane's comments (1970, 1974) on the anthropological study of Japan, and Kanahara's analysis (1972) of trends in American studies of Japan. Newer reports and studies are available (e.g. Umesao, Befu and Kreiner 1984) or in preparation.[2] In the work of Japanese anthropologists, comparative perspectives and the interchange with American and European anthropology are beginning to offer an important new platform for discussion and research, such as in the work on religion by Itō (1984) and Yoshida (1984). The outlook for the future is promising as the field continues to grow.

2. Two forthcoming publications promise to be of particular interest in this connection—first, a review, by the Ethnological Foundation of Japan, of work undertaken since 1969 by Japanese anthropologists, together with a transcript of a round-table discussion by six anthropologists, including T. Sofue, on recent trends in Japanese anthropology (to be published in the *Japanese Journal of Ethnology*) (T. Sofue, personal communication); and secondly, a special issue of *Current Anthropology*, to be devoted specifically to the work of Japanese anthropologists of Japan.

References

Bachnik, Jane M. 1983. 'Recruitment Strategies for Household Succession: Rethinking Japanese Household Organisation', *Man* n.s., Vol. XVIII, no. 1, pp. 160–82.

Bitō, Masahide 1981. 'Society and Social Thought in the Tokugawa Period', *The Japan Foundation Newsletter*, Vol. IX, nos. 2–3, pp. 1–9.

. . . 1984. 'Confucian Thought during the Tokugawa Period', in de Vos and Sofue 1984, pp. 127–38.

Blok, Anton 1975. *Wittgenstein en Elias: Een methodische richtlijn voor de antropologie* (Inaugural Lecture), Assen: Van Gorcum.

. . . 1978. *Antropologische Perspectieven*, Muiderberg: Coutinho.

Chew, John J., Jr. 1984. 'The Japanese Language in the Eyes of Postwar Japan: A Review Article', *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XLIII, no. 3, pp. 475–80.

Ching, Julia 1984. 'Adventures in Cross-Cultural Sensibilities: Some Recent Studies of Chinese and Comparative Philosophy', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. XLV, no. 3, pp. 476–82.

de Vos, George A. 1973. *Socialization for Achievement: Essays on the Cultural Psychology of the Japanese*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

. . . 1984. *The Incredibility of Western Prophets: The Japanese Religion of the Family*, Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam [Antropologisch-Sociologisch Centrum, Vakgroep Culturele Antropologie en Niet-Westerse Sociologie, uitgave 21].

DE VOS, George A., and Takao SOFUE (eds.), 1984. *Religion and Family in East Asia*, Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies, no. 11].

. . . and Hiroshi WAGATSUMA 1967. *Japan's Invisible Race: Caste in Culture and Personality*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

DONOGHUE, John D. 1977. *Pariah Persistence in Changing Japan: A Case Study*, Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

EMBREE, John F. 1939. *Suye Mura: A Japanese Village*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

EVANS-PRITCHARD, E.E. 1963. *The Comparative Method in Social Anthropology* (L.T. Hobhouse Memorial Trust Lecture, no. 33), London: The Athlone Press.

GALTUNG, Johan 1981. 'Structure, Culture and Intellectual Style: An Essay Comparing Saxonic, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic Approaches', *Social Science Information*, Vol. XX, no. 6, pp. 817–56.

GEERTZ, Clifford 1983. *Local Knowledge: Further Essays in Interpretive Anthropology*, New York: Basic Books.

GOODMAN, Grant K. 1983. Review of R. Rubinger, *Private Academies of Tokugawa Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press 1982), in *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XLIII, no. 1, pp. 168–70.

HATCH, Elvin 1983. *Culture and Morality: The Relativity of Values in Anthropology*, New York: Columbia University Press.

HENDRY, Joy 1981. *Marriage in Changing Japan*, London: Croom Helm.

ISHIDA, Eiichirō 1967. 'The Theoretical Foundations of the Debate about Japanese Culture' (in Japanese).

ITŌ, Mikiharu 1984. *Banquets and Japanese Culture: A Comparative Anthropological Approach* (in Japanese).

JOSSELIN DE JONG, J.P.B. de 1935. *De Maleische Archipel als ethnologisch studieveld* (Inaugural Lecture), Leiden: Universiteitsboekhandel en Antiquariaat J. Ginsberg.

KANAHARA, Saemon 1972. 'Developments and Perspectives in American Research on Japan' (in Japanese).

LEE, Changsoo, and George A. DE VOS 1981. *Koreans in Japan: Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

LEHMANN, Jean-Pierre 1978. *The Image of Japan: From Feudal Isolation to World Power, 1850–1905*, London: Allen & Unwin.

. . . 1984. 'Old and New Japonisme: The Tokugawa Legacy and Modern European Images of Japan', *Modern Asian Studies*, Vol. XVIII, no. 4, pp. 757–68.

LOCHER, G.W. 1932. *The Serpent in Kwakiutl Religion: A Study in Primitive Culture*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.

LOCK, Margaret M. 1980. *East Asian Medicine in Urban Japan: Varieties of Medical Experience*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

MILLER, Roy A. 1977a. 'The "Spirit" of the Japanese Language', *The Journal of Japanese Studies*, Vol. III, no. 2, pp. 251–98.

. . . 1977b. *The Japanese Language in Contemporary Japan: Some Sociolinguistic Observations*, Stanford: Hoover Institution.

MILLER, Roy A. 1982. *Japan's Modern Myth: The Language and Beyond*, New York and Tokyo: Weatherhill.

MINEAR, Richard H. 1980. 'Orientalism and the Study of Japan', *Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. XXXIX, no. 3, pp. 507–17.

MINTZ, Sidney W. 1982. '[Afterword] Peasantries and the Rural Sector: Notes on a Discovery', in Robert P. Weller and Scott E. Guggenheim (eds.), *Power and Protest in the Countryside: Studies of Rural Unrest in Asia, Europe, and Latin America*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

MORRIS, I. 1975. *The Nobility of Failure: Tragic Heroes in the History of Japan*, London: Secker & Warburg.

MOUER, Ross E., and Yoshio SUGIMOTO 1980. 'The May 1980 Canberra Symposium on Alternative Models for Understanding Japanese Society', *Center News* [Japanese Studies Center, The Japan Foundation], Vol. V, no. 5, pp. 2–3.

. . . 1982. 'Toward the Comparative Study of Japan', *Center News* [Japanese Studies Center, The Japan Foundation], Vol. VII, no. 2, pp. 2–4.

NAJITA, Tetsuo 1974. *Japan*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

NAKANE, Chie 1970. 'The Anthropological Study of Japan', in E. Norbeck and S. Parman (eds.), *The Study of Japan in the Behavioral Sciences*, Rice University Studies, Vol. LVI, no. 4, pp. 29–37.

. . . 1974. 'Cultural Anthropology in Japan', in S.J. Siegel (ed.), *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews Inc. Vol. 3, pp. 57–72.

NEEDHAM, Rodney 1975. 'Polythetic Classification: Convergence and Consequences', *Man* n.s., Vol. X, no. 3, pp. 349–70.

. . . 1980. *Reconnaissances*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

ORTNER, Sherry B. 1984. 'Theory in Anthropology Since the Sixties', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. XXVI, no. 1, pp. 126–66.

RAPPAPORT, Roy A. 1979. *Ecology, Meaning, and Religion*, Richmond, Ca.: North Atlantic Books.

SAINT-JACQUES, Bernard, and Takao SUZUKI 1984. 'Modern Japan: The Myth and the Reality: Review Article', *Pacific Affairs*, Vol. LVII, no. 1, pp. 90–4.

SESHAIAH, S. 1979. 'Selecting a "Representative" Village', in M.N. Srinivas, A.M. Shah and E.A. Ramaswamy (eds.), *The Fieldworker and the Field: Problems and Challenges in Sociological Investigation*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 231–45.

SMITH, Robert J. 1962. 'Stability in Japanese Kinship Terminology: The Historical Evidence', in Robert J. Smith and Richard K. Beardsley (eds.), *Japanese Culture: Its Development and Characteristics*, Chicago: Aldine, pp. 25–33.

. . . and Ella Lury WISWELL 1982. *The Women of Suye Mura*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

SOFUE, Takao 1960. 'Japanese Studies by American Anthropologists: Review and Evaluation', *American Anthropologist*, Vol. LXII, pp. 306–17.

. . . 1961. 'Anthropology in Japan: Historical Review and Modern Trends', *Biennial Review of Anthropology (1961)*, ed. B.J. Siegel, Stanford: Stanford

University Press 1962, pp. 173–214.

SUGIMOTO, Yoshio, and Ross E. MOUER 1981. *Japanese Society: Stereotypes and Realities*, Melbourne: Monash University [Papers of the Japanese Studies Centre, no. 1].

. . . 1983. 'The Study of Japanese Society: Figments of Whose Imagination?', *The Japan Foundation Newsletter*, Vol. X, no. 5, pp. 1–9.

UMESAO, Tadao, Harumi BEFU and Josef KREINER (eds.) 1984. *Japanese Civilization in the Modern World: Life and Society*, Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology [Senri Ethnological Studies, no. 16].

VAN BREMEN, Jan G. 1984. 'The Moral Imperative and Leverage for Rebellion: An Anthropological Study of Wang Yang-ming Doctrine in Japan', Department of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley: Ph.D. Dissertation.

WAGATSUMA, Hiroshi 1975. 'Problems of Cultural Identity in Modern Japan', in G.A. de Vos and L. Romanucci-Ross (eds.), *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change*, Palo Alto, Ca.: Mayfield, pp. 307–34.

WATANABE, Shōichi 1974. *The Heart of the Japanese Language* (in Japanese).

WERTHEIM, W.F. 1964. *East–West Parallels: Sociological Approaches to Modern Asia*, The Hague: Van Hoeve.

WOLF, Eric R. 1969. 'American Anthropologists and American Society', in S.A. Tyler (ed.), *Concepts and Assumptions in Contemporary Anthropology*, Atlanta, Georgia: University of Georgia Press [Southern Anthropological Society Proceedings, no. 3], pp. 3–12.

YOSHIDA, Teigo 1984. *The Anthropology of Religion* (in Japanese).

JAPANESE REFERENCES

石田英一郎
1967　「日本文化論の理論的基礎」『日本文化研究所 研究報告』3、1～21頁
伊藤　幹治
1984　『宴と日本文化－比較民俗学的アプローチ』東京：中央公論社
金原　左門
1972　「アメリカの日本研究の動向と展望」『法学新報』79、12、1～60頁
渡部　昇一
1974　『日本語のこころ』東京：講談社
吉田　禎吾
1984　『宗教人類学』東京：東京大学出版会

PART I

DIMENSIONS OF THE JAPANESE WORLD-VIEW: TIME AND SPACE