A Concrete Holistic Approach to the Study of Japanese Culture: An Example of Civilization Studies

Josef KREINER
Bonn University

1. The History of Japanology in Europe
2. Approaches in Japanology
3. The Study of Japanese Culture in Japan
4. Holistic Approaches to the Study of Japanese Culture in Modern Japan
5. The Contemporary State of Japanology as a Concrete Science
6. Studies of Social Structure at the Village Level

Theodor Adorno [1957] once charged that empirical sociology only doubles reality. Sociology, he criticized, confines itself to mere description of social situations and exhibits no ambition for their explanation. On the other hand, Justin Stagl [1973] complains that trying to understand social reality by means of modern empirical sociology would be more than disappointing. He stresses that compared to its methodological rigor and *raffinesse*, the results obtained by empirical sociology remain remarkably pale and indistinct.

It is my opinion that both these criticisms apply to that human science which makes the study of Japanese culture its object, traditionally called Japanology and more recently known as Japanese studies, and newly established in Japan as *Nihon bunka kenkyū*. I will first discuss the nature of this science, and then concentrate on a recapitulation of studies of social structure at the village level.

1. THE HISTORY OF JAPANOLOGY IN EUROPE

Japanology, or for that, Japanese studies, is different from other area studies like Indology or Sinology, in that it has a long history and tradition within Japan as well. It is therefore necessary to review both its foreign and domestic roots when tracing its history.

The European study of Japan and its culture dates back to the first encounter between the two cultures, and quite early there appeared such monumental synopses as Bernhardus Varenius' 1649 *Descriptio regni Japoniae* and various works by Louis Frois. One may even doubt if there was anything like an interruption between these pioneer works and the better known researchers like Philipp Franz von Siebold who

visited Japan in the latter half of the Edo period (1603–1868) as an employee of the Dutch East Indian company, taken over at that time by the Dutch government. In any case, the nature of this study as well as its substance changed with von Siebold.

It is often erroneously assumed that there existed no substantial knowledge nor any clear image of Japan in Europe before Engelbert Kaempfer's *History of Japan* was published in 1717, and that it did not reach the German speaking countries before 1770, when its first full-length edition in the German language was published by Dohm in Lemgo. Both these assumptions are wrong. Japan and those European countries with which the Japanese were first in contact had similar, feudalistic social structures when these contacts began.[1] Therefore the language of European feudal culture was quite appropriate for describing Japan and its culture. This led even to neglect of the existing differences between both cultures: Japan was seen as a part of Europe and was included in the criticism of Europe by Europeans just beginning. It was used as the most suitable model in focusing on European contradictions and weaknesses. Jesuit-drama of the counter-reformation in Middle Europe used Japanese themes, as did novels and fiction in the Baroque period. Only with the beginning of the era of enlightenment, was China depicted as a model of reason, and Japan seen in a more negative way.

As early as 1726, in Jonathan Swift's *Travels into Several Remote Nations of the World, by Lemuel Gulliver...*, and later also in Voltaire's *Candide ou l'optimisme*, (1759), there appears the motif of the self-humiliation of Europeans (Dutch), who for the sake of money and earthly profit in Japan deny their religion, a motif used to criticize European society. Kaempfer's narration of the various "monkey-farces," which the Dutch *opperhoofd* and his companions played before the Shōgun at their *hofreis* to Edo, echoes this motif in fiction like the "Chinese letters" by Goldsmith [1760–61] or d'Argens [1739–40[. Here Japan is not only the country where Europe as a whole is humiliated, but also a country which resembles Europe in many ways. To sum up, the European image of intimate closeness of both cultures is a very concrete one and is developed within the context of European self-awareness and or selfcriticism.

Von Siebold's assignment to do a "whole study of Japan, including its geography, nature, people, economy, customs and politics" marks the beginning of an entirely different approach. Here I need not point out, that von Seibold was sent to Japan after a rather long interruption of Dutch trade brought on by the Napoleonic wars in Europe, and that an extension of trade relations through scientific exploration was one of his clear-cut goals. Doubtless there was also the influence of French encyclopedists, a tradition which influenced the European studies of Japan for quite a long time. This influence continued until very recently, and may have been responsible for the failure of von Siebold's systematic and comprehensive approach to result in either a new image of Japan or in a new holtistic study of Japanese culture. Studies

1) I have dealt with this early history of contacts and the image of Japan in Middle Europe through the eighteenth century in a more detailed paper [KREINER 1984].

of Japan were instead fragmented into a number of isolated approaches in various disciplines. There were also no successors to the study of Japanese language and literature, which was also stimulated a good deal around the middle of the nineteenth century in some universities and academies by von Siebold and by collections which he generously donated all over Europe.[2] During the latter half of the century it was mainly foreigners residing in Meiji Japan as diplomats, missionaries or specialists hired by the Japanese Government (*o-yatoi-gaikokujin*) who promoted studies in various fields. British scholars like Ernest Satow, William George Aston, John Harrington Gubbins, Algernon B. Mitford or Basil Hall Chamberlain in particular used their knowledge of Japanese language as a tool for further penetration into Japanese history, politics and the like, and combined in a very favorable manner a more theoretical approach with practical aims.[3]

With the return of these scholars to Europe at the turn of the century and the establishment here of the first institutes and chairs of Japanology at European universities, the nature and content of Japanese studies again saw considerable change. If European scholars had before taken up, shoulder to shoulder with their Japanese colleagues, the very central problems of Japanese culture and history, they now became increasingly separated not only in space from their object of study, but they lost contact with more recent developments in their field in Japan as well. They came to confine themselves largely to studies of classical literature, "marching and countermarching through the literature, because it is there," as Levenson [1964] has described a similar situation in Sinology. In contrast, Japanese scholars specializing in Japanese literature were the very ones with the most meager knowledge of foreign languages, so it was only natural that there existed almost no contact between foreign and Japanese studies in this field for quite a long time and that in Japan "Japanology" was considered no more than a hobby for a few Japanophile foreigners.

While the Japanologists' command of the language enabled them sometimes to acquire an even remarkable general knowledge of Japan, in most cases they had no training in any academic discipline. This lack resulted in an isolation of Japanologists even among their own faculty members.[4] The harsh criticism concentrated on Japanology after the Second World War in Middle Europe in the 1960 focused on just this state of affairs. It even questioned the right of this "self-contained, in ward-looking" and "in its worst manifestations ... a little bit amateurish," science to exist [Bownas 1976: 266, 272]. The newly established Japanese studies which had emerged in the United States during and after World War II, was seen as the

2) J. J. Hoffmann in Leiden, Léon Rosny in Paris, August Pfizmaier in Vienna.

3) It was in connection with Satow's writings that the term "Japanologist" was first recorded, appearing in A. E. Nordenskjöld's *The Voyage of the Vega Round Asia and Europe* [1881: II: 321].

4) Cornelius Ouwehand in his Inaugural Lecture at Zurich, 1969, speaks of "der einsame Japanologe" [Ouwehand 1969, 1976].

5) See Geoffrey Bownas in his 1966 Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge [Bownas 1967, 1976] For a German view, see Hammitzsch [1966].

only possible means of salvation.[5] The fact that Japanology was not split up into several approaches according to the academic disciplines was taken as a sign of its immaturity. Japanese studies, on the contrary, was expected to develop within the theoretical and methodological frame-work of these more "professional" disciplines.

2. APPROACHES IN JAPANOLOGY

One may distinguish between two types of approach even within the newly created Japanese studies. The first is best represented by Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* [1946]. This essentially social anthropological approach envisages Japan as a monolithic whole, neglecting the abundance of local color as well as historical variation in Japanese culture. The second approach, concentrating on specific aspects of Japanese culture, succeeded in producing a wealth of valuable new knowledge in the field, and even introduced new problems in the scientific study of Japan. For this approach, the enrichment of knowledge within the discipline in general with materials from Japan is of course the first and most important aim, to which the understanding of Japanese culture is only secondary and subordinate. The overwhelming majority of cultural and social anthropological studies of this second type remain on the level of monographic description of a limited area, usually a village or town, and lack any attempt at generalization. They do not treat, for example, the meaning of "small tradition" within Japanese culture or Japanese villages.[6] I shall touch on these problems again below.

With the exception of the British, European Japanologists are still hesitant to adopt this model of Japanese studies as their own. Japanologists are generating a very broad knowledge of Japan, and Japanology is still defined as "the whole entity of human sciences which make Japan their object, including political and cultural history, history of thought and religion; and in its wider meaning also including archaeology, ethnology, sociology, jurisprudence and economics" [LEWIN 1968: 172]. As long as the growing wealth of material and knowledge created by Japanese scholars in these fields continues to challenge their European colleagues, there seem to remain only three options for the future.

The first would voluntarily limit Japanology to what is often called "Japanology in a narrow sense," that is, the traditional European approach—especially strong in Germany—of a philological study of Japanese language and literature. This is as justified as any other limitation to the social sciences, for example, although in this case a change in "label," perhaps to something like "Japanese literature" would be fair. A second option would be to stress the role as of Japanology as "translator," to transmit the results of Japanese scholarship to the West,[7] but this option is in no way sufficient for the definition of this discipline and may be left aside here.

6) Here I suggest John Embree [1939] and Richard K. Beardsley, John W. Hall, and Robert E. Ward [1959]. The latter is a representative of a number of village monographs resulting from the University of Michigan's Okayama-based program.

7) Günther Wenck proposes this possibility in his *Japanische Phonetik* [WENCK 1954: 4].

The last option would be an "irrevocable" split-up of Japanology according to the model of Anglo-American Japanese studies. "What is needed now is the education of historians, linguists, sociologists and economists, with complete Japanological training" [HAMMITZSCH 1966: 145; BOWNAS 1967: 10]. A similar solution was applied to Chinese studies some years ago, but was turned down by sociology.[8] Such a division would, I think, result in the loss of the very aim toward which Japanology and only Japanology strives: knowledge of Japanese culture. Even what Lewin [1968: 172] calls "the sum of human studies which make Japan their object" will not suffice to achieve a through understanding of Japanese culture.

It must be understood that the European study of Japan through long years of seclusion had lost not only contact with its allied disciplines in general, but also with the development of its counterpart, the study of Japanese culture in Japan. It had thus limited itself to only a small portion of its nominal definition. Harsh criticism of this situation has led to the ideas discussed above, but as I hope I have shown, all of these result from misunderstanding of the real object of this study and of its importance, and seem to me inadequate as solutions. In this repsect, a look at the development of this discipline in Japan may be of advantage.

3. THE STUDY OF JAPANESE CULTURE IN JAPAN

Reflections on its own history and culture in Japan date back quite a long time, first becoming systematized during the first decades of the Edo period [KREINER(ed.) 1976]. While scholars of Western (at that time Dutch) learning (*rangaku*) as well as of the Chinese tradition (*kangaku*) also contributed to some extent to the study of Japan, the school of learning which devoted itself exclusively to a holistic approach is that known as *kokugaku* (national learning), or *wagaku* (Japanese learning). Because *kokugaku* developed nationalistic traits very early in its own history, and was used for nationalistic purposes during the nineteenth century and up until 1945, there was a tendency after the war to describe *kokugaku* as a pure study of literature. The term *kokugaku* has from its beginning, however, had broader implications than either of these extreme interpretations can indicate. It was first used by Kōgen (Sō) Shiren in his *Genkyō-shakusho* published in 1322, in contrast to the Buddhism-centered Indian studies (*bongaku*). As such, it centers, of course, primarily on the specific Japanese tradition of Shintō and comes very close to being a theological study of the Shintō restoration (as in Yoshida-Shintō and other sects). Sometimes it even becomes *kami-no-manabi* (studies of ancient religion), as for example in Yoshimi Yukikazu's *Isuzu-kawa-no-ki* of 1744. But in Motoori Norinaga's *Uiyamabumi* (1798), perhaps the most fundamental theoretical work of *kokugaku*,

8) See Maurice Freedman [1964: 528]: "Social science is about society; Sinology is about China." In the same vein, Twitchett [1964: 110] says "Both (Sinology and Sociology) are essentially bodies of technique and approaches designed for specific purposes.... there is no question of a value judgement between them." Both of these statements are true as well in the case of Japanese Studies.

the ultimate goal is described as the discovery of "the *michi* of men." In this connection "men" means of course "Japanese men" and "*michi*," or "way" may be taken to mean "cultural pattern" as used in cultural anthropology, or to be similar to Ruth Benedict's "dominant drive" or to Leo Frobenius' "paideuma." I would even go so far as to ask whether or not this *michi* of the *kokugaku*-tradition may be compared to what Professor Umesao calls "a set of human beings and institutions" as the object of civilization studies.

The philological approach within *kokugaku*, commonly known as *uta-no-manabi* (studies in poetry), was granted great importance especially after 1945, and it has great meaning in Motoori's system as well. This is largely because the *kokoro* (spirit) of ancient Japan can be traced only in classical literature. But to Motoori, *uta-no-manabi* as well as the three other pillars of *kokugaku*, namely *kiroku-no-manabi* (studies in ancient history), *yūsoku-no-manabi* (studies in ancient customs) and *kami-no-manabi* are only necessary preliminaries, subordinated in the theory of cognition to the central aim of comprehending *michi* as a whole. In other words, Motoori's scholarship takes the holistic approach of a cultural science, and it is in this sense that his followers understood it. For example, Haga Yaichi and Ueda Mannen began to call it "philology" quite in accord with the broad definition of philology as a science of men and culture put forward by scholars like August Boeckh (1877) and others.[9]

But neither this concept newly imported from Germany nor the traditional *kokugaku* was able to develop further during the Meiji-period (1868–1912). What Boeckh had already pointed out with regard to Kant, namely, the danger that philology might easily be misinterpreted as a "science of literature," manifested itself in Japan, too. In the process of accepting modern science, *kokugaku* was split up into various separate approaches to different aspects of Japanese culture. This is comparable to the fate of Japanology as it was replaced by Japanese studies, and to what is being suggested now in Europe. Although these newly developed approaches have brought excellent results, neither they nor their combined efforts have been able to replace the central aim of *kokugaku*, that is, the comprehension of Japanese culture as a whole. In Japan, therefore, the need for a holistic approach, moving beyond the level of the various academic disciplines, has never ceased to be felt.

4. HOLISTIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF JAPANESE CULTURE IN MODERN JAPAN

Yanagita Kunio established a holistic approach to the study of Japanese culture, which he first called *minkan-denshō-ron* (*tradition populaires*) and later on *minzokugaku* (*Volkskunde*), which goes well beyond the content and common definitions of European folklore and may justly be considered a universal science of Japanese cul-

9) See especially August Boeckh's definition of philology as "Erkennen des Erkannten," which comprises the whole of conscious culture [BOECKH 1877: 8, 10, 13].

ture. In this, Yanagita saw himself and his approach as the legitimate successor to the *kokugaku* tradition, which he criticized only for its excessive emphasis on literary tradition.[10] Yanagita saw his ultimate aim to be the reconstruction of the history of that segment of the Japanese people who was without script. He called these people *Jōmin*, the "enduring people," and considered them to be at the very center of Japanese culture. Through this unique approach, Yanagita's understanding of "rice (*ine*)" and "rice-farming" as *Leitmotiv* of Japanese culture changed our understanding of Japan fundamentally. The methodological weakness of Yanagita's system, however, led his successors to lose the deep understanding of their master and they often failed to move away from the study of survivals in folk culture, something their European colleagues had referred to as folklore for a long time.

In the field of Japanese literature (*kokubungaku*), too, there had been efforts to overcome the narrow limitations of this approach by including Yanagita's "culture of oral tradition" and to develop a new science of *bunkagaku* (cultural science) [HISAMATSU 1966, 1976]; but, as far as I know, these have not been very successful.

In contrast to Yanagita's view of Japanese culture as a coherent whole, defined by the central element of "rice-farming," in the approach of historical ethnology, represented by Oka Masao and his followers, Japanese culture was defined as a complicated structure of different cultural strata [ISHIDA *et al.* 1948, 1956]. This approach has won great interest especially in the fields of archaeology and ancient history, and, recently, even among the Japanese public. But concrete field work by Japanese cultural and social anthropologists continues to concentrate primarily on village-level monographs. At this point I would like to draw attention to Ishida Eiichirō's attempt to provide cultural anthropology with just such a theory and to build a new "science of Japanese culture (*Nihon bunka kenkyū*)" [ISHIDA 1967]. The object of Ishida's "comparative cultural study of the character of the Japanese people" is "the culture of the Japanese people on a superorganic level," or "Japanese culture as a whole, built up in organic, integral correlations."

What Ishida calls here "culture" is easily misunderstood. As a supra-historical pattern, it may be equated with Professor Umesao's *bumpō* (grammar), to what he calls "cultural style," or even to the "civilization as a system, created by the fusion of various cultural elements." From this, one has to distinguish the idea of concrete elements, which are shaped by the "grammar" of a culture. In other words, one has to discern, first, culture as a sum of various cultural elements, then the system of ideas (*bummei* or civilization) defining the structure of this given culture, and lastly the concrete "grammar" of this structure.

To sum up, I would like to stress the fact that notwithstanding great developments in the general disciplines in Japan, there have been continuing efforts to maintain an approach seeking supra-historical patterns or *leitmotifs* of Japanese culture as an organic and integral whole, an effort which the earlier *kokugaku* had

10) See Yanagita [1935: 290]: "Wareware no gakumon.... wo shin-kokugaku to iu mo habakaranu." Also the title *Shin-kokugaku-dan* was used for some his of publications in 1946–1947.

already encompassed. These efforts have come from cultural and social anthropology in the widest sense. Japanology as the integral study of Japanese culture as a whole, or of the idea-system of this culture has fragmented into several different approaches defined by the methods of the disciplines, in general. This has resulted in the loss of the original and central aim of this field, that is, comprehension of the Japanese culture, and has led to a series of studies of particular elements or traits of culture. But as I have already stated, it is not its methods but its aim and object which define a science. In this sense, the history and development of *Nihon bunka kenkyū* within Japan provide a valuable model relevant to non-Japanese scholars in the field. First it helps us define clearly the object of our study, and secondly it shows us that to achieve this aim, a suitable methodology from any discipline in general may be applied.

5. THE CONTEMPORARY STATE OF JAPANOLOGY AS A CONCRETE SCIENCE

Japanology (and here I deliberately use the term as tantamount to Japanese studies, because in my opinion neither has an advantage over the other) will, if defined as above, cease to be a hobby of Japanophiles. Neither will it be reserved to Japanese scholars. Ishida's attempt and the more elaborately designed proposal by Professor Umesao of civilization studies as a discipline may form the general framework of the theory of cognition, to which Japanology as a specific and concrete science belongs.

This science embraces two different approaches which are already in use. The first is a more structuralistic one which attempts to comprise Japanese culture and society in a monolithic way, often threatening to reduce itself to mere journalistic discussion as in what is known as *Nihonjin-ron*, generalizing from personal impressions. The second approach is the one adopted by social anthropological studies in their monographic descriptions of village-level societies, lacking any attempt to generalize findings to the national level. To bridge this very large gap, works on intermediate levels may be quite useful and in fact some have already appeared with this purpose [KREINER 1983]. The idea proposed is that following village studies, explorations of the culture of a given area would be necessary. What is here called "area" does not mean local administrative areas like provinces, prefectures or counties, but should be understood as a geographically and, most important, historically defined area. In Japan, especially the so called *Kyūgakkai-rengō*, a federation of usually about nine disciplines, has been attempting to bring about interdisciplinary studies on the culture of various areas since the early 1950s. But as early as 1954 in the publication of the first of a series of fieldwork studies, Imamura Yutaka stated that the original goal had not been reached. He stressed that interdisciplinary work does not mean that many scholars of different disciplines work together in one place or area, but that through their joint efforts results should be achieved which exceed the sum of all the separate studies [IMAMURA 1954: 566]. It was not possible to achieve this at the first attempt at Tsushima, nor later on with the far more elaborate

and costly enterprises of *Kyūgakkai-rengō*. Harsh criticism come from Nakano [NAKANO 1974] and from Nakane Chie [NAKANE 1970: 33], who writes, that "the individual representatives (of the nine learned societies) developed no communal links with members of other groups, and the societies have generally remained quite distinct from each other." Nakane concludes that "these efforts (of the *Kyūgakkai-rengō* to achieve true interdisciplinary work) turned out to be rather disappointing." Moreover, the original aim, i.e., the comprehension of the integral culture of a given area, seems to have been entirely lost.

Similar attempts followed those of the *Kyūgakkai-rengō*. For example, the late Wakamori Tarō of the former Tokyō University of Education conducted a series of studies with the goal of describing the folk culture of various areas, including marginal areas like Shimokita, Kunisaki and Iwami, just as the *Kyūgakkai-rengō* had done. Again, these attempts proved unsuccessful in grasping and describing the cultural patterns of the areas in question. The same may be said of other, more sporadic attempts like the study on the Kinki area by scholars of Kyōto University [KYŌTO DAIGAKU KINKI-KEN SŌGŌ-KENKYŪKAI (ed.) 1969] or the study of the Tokyo metropolis [TOKYO TORITSU DAIGAKU TOSHI-KENKYŪKAI (ed.) 1968]. As some of the above-mentioned critics rightly point out, attempts by a great number of specialists to study as many cultural traits or segments of the culture as possible is basically different from what I have defined as the aim of Japanology, so long as they make no attempt to grasp the nature of that culture, i.e., the pattern or grammar underlying and structuring it. The same holds true also for the few foreign attempts at interdisciplinary studies at the intermediate level.[11] For most of these, the failure to pose a historical problem is perhaps the most decisive cause of their failure. With the introduction of such a historical view, a comparative approach will automatically gain significance and will make it possible finally to combine several such studies to achieve a perception of Japanese culture as a whole.

6. STUDIES OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE AT THE VILLAGE LEVEL

In studies of Japanese culture and society on the village level, Yanagita Kunio had already, in 1931, proposed a scheme for classifying various types of villages, based on their historical genesis [YANAGITA 1931; SUMIYA 1974]. He categorized villages according to this scheme into *onden-mura, dezukuri-mura, kaidō-mura* and *shinden-mura*. Yanagita's great interest in the first type of villages, the *onden-mura*, is discernable all through his work. It is difficult to understand why he considered this type, which was created by dispersed *samurai* fleeing into backward valleys and which is historically speaking only of secondary importance, to be the original form of the Japanese village. But it was just this view, which had the greatest effect on later studies and is even influencing the current image of Japanese society in the West.

11) For example, the "Program on East Asian Local Systems" of the Center for East Asian Studies of Stanford University or the Aso project of the Institute für Japanologie of the University of Vienna. For the latter see also Slawik and Kreiner (eds.) 1975.

Yanagita's theory was later carried on, together with Yamada Moritarō's concept of areas with different processes of reproduction of capital [YAMADA 1960] and Ariga Kisaemon's definition [1956] of the village as a federation of *ie*-families, by Fukutake Tadashi [1949], who finally shaped the theory of two different types of social structure on the village level. According to Fukutake, eastern Japan is characterized by the so-called *dōzoku*-type which stresses the vertically structured lord-vassal-like relationship of branch families to their stem family in every aspect of life, whereas western and southwestern Japan is characterized by more horizontally structured interaction of families of equal status (*kō-gumi* type). Not only is the latter defined negatively as the opposite of the *dōzoku*-type, but it is also understood to be historically younger, a product of the dissolution of the former *dōzoku*-type, which is thought to be the characteristic Japanese type of social structure. This view has gained much popularity. Taking the form of the "vertical society" of Japan as envisioned by Nakane Chie, it continues to be most influential as a means of describing and solving the problems of Japanese society.

Aside from the difficulty of describing the complex structure of a whole culture or a whole society by means of just one principle, there arises also a historical contradiction. It is yet to be explained why the pattern of social structure prevailing in northeastern Japan, which is the most backward area of economic development, according to Yamada, should be considered the base for the success of modern Japan. Here Harada Toshiaki's concept gains great significance. According the Harada, that type of village organization which may be described by alternating or rotating leadership among several families of euqal status and ranking and which is to be found especially in the Kinki-region and western Japan is the historically original and characteristically Japanese type of social organization [SUMIYA 1982].

Both these approaches to a definition of Japanese society share a basic weakness in that they both use only a single principle for explanation. It may be of importance to make use of both these concepts, the "vertical society" and Harada'a principle, to match the complex reality of Japanese society.

In the field of Japanese religious beliefs we again recognize a similar situation. While Yanagita stresses belief in an ancestor-village tutelary deity (*ujigami*) as historically old and at the very core of Japanese religious thinking, Harada on the contrary envisages for the village a monotheistic belief in an almighty god without name and image as basic. While Origuchi Shinobu describes a dualistic world-view with a paradisic "Other World" beyond the seas, Yanagita speaks of a dark realm of the dead, but again Harada proposes a world-view, embracing in one world both man and god. In addition to these, in recent years shamanism as a constituent of Japanese religious culture has been emphasized. Here again it will be impossible to rely on only one principle of explanation. Comparative studies will prove that most if not all these elements, which have so often been labelled "typically Japanese," are in no way restricted to Japan, but show a quite extensive, if not universal, distribution. What may be called "Japanese" is perhaps their unique pattern of incorporation in the structure of Japanese culture. The problem of why such elements can and

do co-exist, or alternate, or function within Japanese culture in the way they do may not be solved or answered by any of the specific academic disciplines. Such problems must be left to a more all-embracing science of culture on a higher level, which in the case of Japanese culture is Japanology as a concrete manifestation of a science of culture, i. e., civilization studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADORNO, Theodor

1957 Soziologie und empirische Forschung. In K. Ziegler (ed.), *Wesen und Wirklichkeit des Menschen.* Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, pp. 245–260.

Argens, Jean-Baptiste de Boyer, Marquis d'

1739–40 *Lettres Chinoises.* P. Pangie.

ARIGA, Kizaemon (有賀喜左衛門)

1956 『村落共同体の構造分析』 時潮社.

BEARDSLEY, Richard, John HALL and Robert WARD

1959 *Village Japan.* University of Chicago Press.

BENEDICT, Ruth

1946 *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword.* Houghton Mifflin.

BOECKH, August

1877 *Enzyklopädie und Methodologie der Philologischen Wissenschaften.* Tendner.

BOWNAS, Geoffrey

1967 From Japanology to Japanese Studies. *KBS-Bulletin on Japanese Culture* 85: 1–13.

1976 From Japanology to Japanese Studies. In Josef Kreiner (ed.), *Japanforschung in Österreich,* Institut für Japanologie der Universität Wien, pp. 261–279. (German translation of BOWNAS 1967).

EMBREE, John

1939 *Suye Mura.* University of Chicago Press.

FREEDMAN, Maurice

1964 What Social Science Can Do for Chinese Studies. *Journal of Asian Studies* XXIII(4): 523–529.

FUKUTAKE, Tadashi (福武 直)

1949 『日本農村の社会的性格』 東京大学出版会.

GOLDSMITH, Oliver

1760–61 *The Citizen of the World, or Letters from a Chinese philosopher Residing in London to His Friends in the East.* (self publication).

HAMMITZSCH, Horst

1966 Die Japanologie in Deutschland. *Mitteilungen de Deutschen Gesellschaft für Matur-und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* 27: 139–157.

HISAMATSU, Sen'ichi (久松潜一)

1966 「日本文学研究について——文献学と文芸学と文化学と」『国学院雑誌』67 (3): 1–7.

1976 Über die japanische Literaturforschung, Philologie-Literaturwissenschaft-Kulturwissenschaft. In Josef Kreiner (ed.), *Japanforschung in Österreich.* Institut für Japanologie de Univeɹsität Wien, pp. 247–260. (German translation of HISAMATSU 1966).

IMAMURA, Yutaka (今村　豊)
1954 「対馬総合調査の教訓」 九学会連合対馬共同調査委員会編『対馬の自然と文化』古今書院, pp. 566.
ISHIDA, Eiichiro (石田英一郎)
1967 「日本文化論の理論的基礎」『東北大学日本文化研究所報告』3: 1–20.
ISHIDA, Eiichirō (石田英一郎), Masao OKA (岡　正雄), Ichirō YAWATA (八幡一郎) and EGAMI Namio (江上波夫)
1948 「日本民族の起源」『民族学研究』13(3): 11–81.
1956 『日本民族の起源』 平凡社.
KREINER, Josef
1976 Hauptrichtungen in der Erforschung japanischer Kulturhistorische Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Probleme. In Josef Kreiner (ed.), *Japanforschung in Österreich*, Institut für Japanologie der Universität Wien, pp. 293–314.
1983 Die Bedeutung des Themas im Rahmen der Japanologie-Diskussion. In Josef Kreiner (ed.), *Japans Wandel von der Agrar-zur Industriegesellschaft*, Westdeutscher Verlag, Opladen, pp. 3–33.
1984 Japan und Deutschland. Die frühen Jahrhunderte. In Josef Kreiner (ed.), *Deutschland-Japan. Historische Kontakte*. Studium Universale 3: 1–67, Bouvier.
KREINER, Josef (ed.)
1976 *Japanforschung in Österreich*. Institut für Japanologie der Universität Wien.
1983 *Japans Wandel von der Agrar-zur Industrie-gesellschaft*. Westdeutscher Verlag.
KYŌTO DAIGAKU KINKI-KEN SŌGŌ KENKYŪKAI (ed.) (京都大学近畿圏総合研究会編)
1969 『近畿圏——その人文・社会科学的研究』 鹿島出版.
LEVENSON, Joseph R.
1964 The Humanistic Disciplines. Will Sinology Do? *The Journal of Asian Studies* XXIII (4): 507–512.
LEWIN, Bruno
1968 *Kleines Lexikon der Japanologie*. Otto Harrassowitz.
NAKANE, Chie
1970 The Anthropological Study of Japan. *Rice University Studies* 56 (4): 29–36.
NAKANO, Takashi (中野　卓)
1974 「方法の反省」『人類科学』16: 145–151.
NORDENSKJÖLD, A. E.
1881 *The Voyage of the Vega Round Asia and Europe*. Macmillan.
OUWEHAND, Cornelius
1969 Über westöstliche Wege der Japanologie. *Neue Züricher Zeitung* No. 527 (28 August).
1976 Über westöstliche Wege der Japanologie. In Kreiner (ed.), *Japanforschung in Üsterreich*. Institut für Japanologie der Universitat Wien, pp. 281–292.
SLAWIK, Alexander and Josef KREINER
1975 *Aso. Vergangenheit und Gegenwart eines ländlichen Raumes in Südjapan* I. *Beiträge zur Japanologie* 12. Institut für Japanologie der Universität Wien.
STAGL, Justin
1973 Zum Projekt einer regionalen Soziographie *KAI. Mitteilungen des Lehrstuhls für Soziologie und Kulturwissenschaften der Universität Salzburg* 6: 9–30.
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR EAST ASIAN STUDIES (ed.)
1970 *Program on East Asian Local Systems*. (Mimeo).

SUMIYA, Kazuhiko
1974 Vergleichende Untersuchungen von japanischen und österreichischen Dorfstrukturen. *Beiträge zur Japanologie* 16: 23–48.
1982 『日本の意識』 岩波書店.
TŌKYŌ TORITSU DAIGAKU TOSHI-KENKYŪKAI (ed.) (東京都立大学都市研究会編)
1968 『都市構造と都市計画』 東京大学出版会.
TWITCHETT, Denis
1964 A Lone Cheer for Sinology. Comments on the 'Chinese Studies and the Disciplines' Symposium. *Journal of Asian Studies* XXIV (1): 109–112.
VARENIUS, Bernhardus
1649 *Descripto regni Japoniae.* Ludovic Elzevir.
WENCK, Gunther
1954 *Japanische Phonetik.* Otto Harrassowitz, vol. 1.
YAMADA, Moritarō
1960 『日本農業生産力構造分析』 岩波書店.
YANAGITA, Kunio (柳田国男)
1931 『日本農民史』 刀江書院.
1935 『民間伝承論』 共立社.