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Although German “Japanology,” – the study of Japan and her culture and society – has been dominated by philological methods, social and cultural anthropology – Ethnologie as it is called in Germany – has contributed to this endeavor: there is an increasing number of ethnologists devoting their work to Japan as well as of Japanologists who try to make ethnological/ethnographic methods and theories fruitful in their study of Japan.

The postwar emergence of Japan as a once-again economic powerhouse with all characteristics of a modern society suddenly posed problems which eluded explanation by traditional philological approaches. The first attempts to transcend the narrow confines these “traditional” approaches made themselves felt at the University of Vienna, where, until 1965, Alexander SLAWIK (1900-1997) taught and practiced in the Institute of Ethnology (where, at that time, one of the centers of German historical ethnology was to be found). Since the time of its foundation in 1965, the Institute of Japanese Studies in Vienna was one of the centers of the ethnological study of Japan in the German-speaking world. In the years to come, ethnological theory has pluralized in Germany. Consequently, the approaches to Japan, its society and culture have multiplied and a variety of borderline studies (e.g., between ethnology and sociology) have been undertaken. The number of Japanologists drawing from ethnology, either methodologically or theoretically, has increased and is still increasing due to next decisive step, namely, the revival of culturalist theory, which again contributed to the multiplication of possible ethnological and ethnographic approaches.
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1. Introduction

Since its beginning, German "Japanology," in the strict sense of the word, has been — and still is — dominated by philological methods, textual analysis being by far the most important method of approach to the study of Japanese culture and society. And if one is not willing to label as "cultural anthropology" the study of foreign cultural elements per se, then ethnology¹ — Ethnologie as it is called in Germany — has never played a significant role in German Japanology. Nevertheless, there are ethnologists devoting their work to the description and explanation of things Japanese, as well as Japanologists who try to make ethnological/ethnographic methods and theories fruitful in the study of Japan. And, as we will see in a moment, their numbers are slowly, but gradually, increasing.

During the 1960s, and maybe starting with Japan's successful self-representation as a once-again economic powerhouse in East Asia during the Olympic Games in Tokyo, the first signs of the development of scientific approaches to the study of Japan, independent from philology, in its different disguises, could be discovered. Japan suddenly emerged as a modern society² which, with its most interesting phenomena such as democratizing efforts, economic development, and social change exemplified by dropping birth rates etc., eluded explanation by traditional philological approaches. New approaches inspired by economics and the social sciences came to the fore, questioning philological Japanology and creating for the first time approaches to Japanese culture and society comparable to Japanese Studies, in the US-American and British sense of the term. Josef Kreiner, one of the leading proponents of ethnology in Japanese Studies (see below), dates the moment academic ethnology entered the stage in Japanese Studies in the mid-1970s (Kreiner 2003: 1). In later years — perhaps reacting to the increasing degree of societal division of labor, pluralization, and individualization — the humanities (Kulturwissenschaften in German) diversified, developing a multitude of methods and theories where formerly there had been unity and consensus among the proponents.³ Of course, this diversification found its way into Japanese Studies,

¹ In the following text, the term ethnology (Germ. Ethnologie) is used in a sense synonymous to cultural anthropology in the United States and social anthropology in the United Kingdom, but without overly stressing its character as a social science (cf. Fischer 2003: 17, for a short discussion of the German term).
² Nevertheless, the modernity of Japanese society is still disputed by more conservatively-arguing members of Germany's scientific community, postulating a core of traditional and never-changing values and cultural traits at the bottom of Japanese economic and social development, whereas the outward appearance of social forms as modern bears no direct connection to the real state of affairs. Here, of course, the proponents of this opinion meet countless authors of the so-called Nihonjinron which they, consequently, still consider of scientific value in explaining and/or describing Japanese culture and society without giving positive proof of this value; see, e.g., Griesecke 1996: 18-9, who sees as part of the solution what others, correctly, see as the problem.
³ Anthropological reasoning, based on the view of culture and society as a system, requires that the social reasons of this development be exposed here. But, as the reader might imagine, this can not be done in this article, not only because space is limited, but also because such an endeavor would require quite a different approach.
once more creating a path where ethnology entered the Japanological stage.

Given this complex situation, and trying to describe the contribution of ethnology and ethnologists in the German-speaking region to Japanese Studies and Japanology, this essay has to deal with the following problems: first, the development of German ethnology during the last decades, a development which is, of course, inseparably connected to changes in the definition of ethnology in Germany, and is best characterized by the term "pluralization"; second, the way these developments were incorporated into German Japanology and/or Japanese Studies in theory and methodology; and, last but not least, the results of different "ethnological" or "ethnographic" approaches to Japanese culture and society. As a short glimpse at the list of references at the end of this article shows, the number of German books and shorter papers on Japan of the anthropological kind has grown immensely during the last decades — and this list is far from complete. Thus, it seems self-evident that it is impossible to introduce all researchers and all contributions in an article as short as this. The author will, therefore, confine himself to dealing with the most important approaches, developments, and authors, but he hopes that this is still sufficient to give a comprehensive overview of the situation.

2. Ethnology is …

Some thirty years ago, it was still possible to edit a book titled *Lehrbuch der Völkerkunde* (Textbook of Ethnology), giving an overview of the state of ethnological theory and methods in contemporary Germany, with the claim of completeness and exclusiveness (see Trimborn 1971). Unfortunately, those happy days are gone forever; as, since then, ethnology has changed in a variety of ways, with the overall trend of a pluralization of theories and methodological considerations, and even a multiplication of the formerly undisputedly uniform object of ethnology itself.

What Clifford Geertz wrote concerning the unclear character of anthropology, as early as 1985, has not lost importance during the last eighteen years. On the contrary, theoretical confusion, as well as terminological and methodological confusion, has constantly grown — notwithstanding the fact that Geertz sees an advantage here:

It is one of the advantages of anthropology as a scientific endeavor that nobody knows exactly what it is, not even its own representatives. (Geertz 1985: 37)

As a first step, German ethnology has freed itself from its self-imposed restriction to the so-
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* The original German version of the citation by Geertz (1985: 37) reads in its full length:
"Es ist einer der Vorteile der Anthropologie als eines wissenschaftlichen Unternehmens, daß, niemand ganz genau weiß, was sie eigentlich ist, nicht einmal ihre eigenen Vertreter. [...] Die Versuche der Definition dieser Disziplin reichen von unbekümmerten Cliquen-Argumenten ('wir sind alle irgendwie dieselbe Art von Leuten; wir denken ähnlich') bis zu naiv institutionellen Erklärungen ('Anthropologe ist jeder, der an einer anthropologischen Fakultät sein Examen gemacht hat')."
called "primitive" cultures. HELMERS (1993: 7), for instance, cites the example of economic anthropology which had been dominated by research on subsistence economy — wrongfully, as she contends, as the world of labor is of central importance even to modern man, and modern labor has consequently become a field of ethnological inquiry.

Since then, ethnological theory has pluralized in Germany, and, consequently, the approaches to Japan, its society and culture have multiplied and a variety of borderline studies (e.g., between ethnology and sociology) have been undertaken. Therefore, the number of Japanologists drawing from ethnology, either methodologically or theoretically, has increased to an extent hitherto unknown. The next decisive step was the revival of culturalist theory (see below), which again contributed to the multiplication of possible ethnological and ethnographic approaches.

The aim of this article is the presentation of contributions to Japanese Studies from the German-speaking region — which, of course, means also including Austria and Switzerland — contributions which might, in a comprehensive sense, be called "ethnological." Today, it is impossible to do justice to all authors who conduct research on Japan from an ethnological background. Therefore, the author of this essay will restrict himself to the introduction of the main characteristics of the current situation exemplified by one or two authors each, after giving an overview of the historical development since the 1960s, without which the current situation could not be understood.

3. Ethnology and Things Japanese in German-Speaking Academia

It has already been shown that there is no such thing as a monolithic ethnology in German-speaking countries. Therefore, the term "traditional ethnology" suggests a unity which does not exist. It is used here, however, to denote research either done in the traditional fields of ethnology, i.e., in the case of Japanese Studies, research on minorities and material culture, and/or research done by ethnologists ("Ethnology is what ethnologists do").

3.1 Japanology Meets Ethnology: The University of Vienna

Japanese studies at the University of Vienna offer the best example of the fact that the term "Japanology" has been defined in a variety of ways — sometimes contradictory — in German-speaking countries since the end of World War II. As mentioned above, the philological approach, based on the analysis of texts, was the most prominent during the earlier years. Ethnographic fieldwork was not important for German ethnology which was historical, in contrast to British social anthropology and US-American cultural anthropology, and the voyage to Japan was expensive in terms of money, as well as time. Thus, Japanologists (not

---

5 A thorough overview of different national approaches in ethnology can be found in HARRIS 1969, concerning the approaches mentioned here, especially Chapters 9 to 13 (USA), 19 (Great Britain) and 14 (German Diffusionist Ethnology).
only) in Germany concentrated on the exegesis of Japanese texts, tapping the rich traditions of philology in the humanities related to Eastern civilizations at its best, but often only introducing the results of Japanese research to the German-speaking public, thereby acting as high-class translators.6

One of the first researchers trying to transcend these narrow confines was Alexander SLAWIK (1900-1997), the first Professor of Japanology at the University of Vienna after 1965. Until that year, academic Japanology in Vienna was taught and practiced in the Institute of Ethnology (where, at that time, one of the centers of German historical ethnology was to be found). In 1965, an independent institute for the study of Japan and Japanese culture and society was established, and SLAWIK became its first full professor. It was the Japanese ethnologist Oka Masao, who spent some time at the University of Vienna, and "enticed" SLAWIK to ethnology and prehistory (cited in Kreiner 1997: 3). In 1952, SLAWIK passed his second doctorate, with a thesis on the role of property marks in the society and culture of the Ainu (SLAWIK 1992), without having been able to visit Japan to collect data for this work. He first visited Japan in 1956-1957, and started collecting ethnographic and prehistoric material at once, but, nevertheless, his research and his interests were characterized by the use of written sources which he did not analyze philologically, but which he used as "quarries" to collect data upon which to base his ethnological reasoning. And these interests were indeed far-flung. Always reflecting SLAWIK’s early association with Oka Masao, they included Japanese prehistory, encompassing Japan’s early relations with China, Korea, and Southeast Asia, as well as the still-unsolved problem of Yamatai. But SLAWIK also wrote about the world-view and society of the Ainu; about linguistic problems in early Japanese and the origins of the Ainu language; and about Shintō and folk religion in Japanese rural areas (e.g., touching on the problem of the sacral visitor, marebito).7

SLAWIK’s discontent with the then-current understanding of academic Japanology as philology soon made itself felt in the re-organization of studies and the nature of scientific work in the new Institute of Japanology. His long connections with ethnology, its theory and methods, also contributed to this re-organization. A stay in Japan of at least two years became obligatory for all students, with the aim of not only learning colloquial Japanese, but also of collecting material for their dissertation. Thus, fieldwork – as the summarizing term for a variety of methods used in ethnographic data collection – became part of the Japanological curriculum in German-speaking countries for the first time. Radiating from Vienna, ethnological reasoning and ethnographic methods became important parts of the study of Japanese culture and society in German-speaking countries, and at least two scholars deserve explicit mention as main proponents of the ethnological approach in research and teaching.

Several important ethnographic projects in Japan were initiated by students of SLAWIK.


7 SLAWIK’s most important works – though excluding his second doctorate thesis on the property marks of the Ainu – have been translated into Japanese and published in SLAWIK 1984.
The first of these students to be mentioned here is Josef Kreiner (born in 1940 in Vienna), who conducted fieldwork in the islands of Amami Ōshima (see below 3.2) and became, without doubt, the university teacher who was the most influential in disseminating ethnological theories and ethnographic methods in German Japanology. Kreiner studied ethnology at Vienna University and was also trained in the methods and theories of social anthropology in Japan. He took over the Chair of Japanese Studies at the University of Bonn in 1977 and subsequently engaged in social and cultural studies of modern Japanese society. (As he is still active in teaching and researching, his main current activities will be described below). Still in Vienna, Kreiner published a second book on the relationship between religion and village society in Japan, Die Kultorganisation des japanischen Dorfes (The Organization of Cult in the Japanese Village, 1969), examining the miyaza (Shinto shrine parishioners) organizations of Central Japan.

In 1967, students and staff members of the Institute of Japanology in Vienna started preparations for a large-scale cooperative research project in the Aso region. After only one year, the funding had been secured (from the Austrian as well as the Japanese side) and the interdisciplinary project could be started. Slawik did research on the prehistory and geography of the Aso region; Kreiner's task was to conduct a village study, in the classic sense of the term, with special consideration towards folklore and religion; Sepp Linhart (who had studied Japanology and sociology) researched social stratification; and Erich Pauer's field was agriculture, including the inventory and collection of agricultural tools. The fieldwork started in 1968 and ended in May 1969. The results of this project filled several volumes and contributed substantially to the knowledge of a region which had been neglected by Japanese ethnology and folklore.8

A second research project, jointly conducted by Josef Kreiner and Erich Pauer, in cooperation with Alfred Janata (Museum of Ethnology, Vienna), originated in an attempt to prepare an inventory of agricultural tools from Japan in the Museum of Ethnology. An overwhelming part of this collection had been brought back to Vienna by Kreiner. The results of this project by far surpassed the original aim, i.e., an illustrated catalogue of the objects in store, as the authors could fall back on their fieldwork in the Aso region and their practical experience with agricultural work there. In addition to the mere description of the objects, several articles published later also included information on the cultural-historical background of the agricultural tools and on the technical processes of their manufacture (including technical drawings by Pauer).9

Nelly Naumann (1922-2000), of the University of Freiburg, was one of those influential scholars who studied Japanology and ethnology (in addition to Sinology and philosophy) at the
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8 The main publications resulting from the Aso project are Slawik et al. 1975 and Pauer 1976; see also Kreiner 2000.

University of Vienna and whose approach to Japan was thoroughly influenced by the Viennese brand of German historical ethnology, the leading proponents of which were Wilhelm SCHMIDT (1868-1954), Wilhelm KOPPERS (1886-1961), Martin GUSINDE (1886-1969), and Paul SCHEBESTA (1887-1967). A strong emphasis on prehistory and an attempt to reconstruct older layers of culture characterized Nelly NAUMANN's ethnological work from the very beginning, as is indicated by the title of her doctoral dissertation, Das Pferd in Sage und Brauchtm Japan (The Horse in Japanese Mythology and Customs, 1959). From the 1950s, she devoted her academic life to the study of Japanese religion from an anthropological point of view. Belonging to the older generation of scholars, NAUMANN was thoroughly trained in the theory and methods of historical ethnology, which made itself strongly felt in her work and formed the background for her occupation with, and her excellent knowledge of, early written sources. The most influential among the numerous publications by Nelly NAUMANN10 were those concerning the religion of ancient Japan (1988, 1994) and Japanese mythology (1996). However, there are also some articles written in English in which her basically anthropological and comparative approach to the "indigenous religion" of Japan — which was her way of saying "Shintō before the influence of Buddhism made itself felt" — can be seen (NAUMANN 1974, 1982).

3.2 Minority Studies

Ainu and Okinawa in European Museums

From the aforementioned interest of Josef KREINER in the study of Japanese material culture, on the one hand, and minorities in Japanese society, on the other, developed a research project on the material culture of the Ainu and the islands of the Ryūkyū Archipelago, examining objects stored in Western European museums. This project started in 1983 and ended in 1988, the first three years funded by the German Research Foundation, then, later, by the Toyota Foundation, Tokyō. During these years, KREINER and three collaborators (Hans Dieter ÖLSCHLEGER, Michael STÖVER, and Michael WEILER) visited more than seventy museums in Europe (except the USSR and the socialist states of Eastern Europe), recording data of nearly 7,000 Ainu objects and 1,500 objects from the Ryūkyūs. In addition, black-and-white photos and transparencies of each object were taken. First, results of this project were published in three intermediate reports (KREINER, ÖLSCHLEGER, and STÖVER 1985; KREINER 1988; ÖLSCHLEGER 1992). In connection with this project, an international symposium on "European Studies on Ainu Language and Culture" was conducted at the Institute of Japanese Studies, University of Bonn in 1987. The proceedings of this symposium (covering language studies, ethnographic studies, and descriptions of Ainu collections in several European museums), as well as reports on the overall state of Ainu collections in Europe and North America, was edited by KREINER (1993). In December 2001, the University of Bonn once again was the host of an international symposium, "Ainu Collections in Europe and North America, Viewed in the Light of Ainu Studies and the Image of the Ainu," which was organized by

10 A complete bibliography can be found in BLÜMMEL and ANTONI 2000-01: 15-22.
KREINER and ÖLSCHLEGER, together with a group of Japanese specialists led by KOTANI Yoshinobu (now of Nanzan University). Results of a project concerning the content and history of the collections from the Ryūkyū Islands in European museums were edited by Josef KREINER in 1996.

Minority Studies I: Ryūkyū

Josef KREINER, one of SLAWIK’s students at the University of Vienna (see above), concentrated on ethnographic fieldwork, in contrast to his fellow students in Vienna who relied heavily on historical and philological methods, as KREINER had come under the influence of Japanese anthropologists during his stay in Japan in the 1960s. He broadened his study of Japanese society and culture to include the people of the Ryūkyū Archipelago, convinced that “Japanese culture can only be fully understood by including [minorities] in one’s analysis” (KREINER 2004: 2). Between 1961 and 1963, KREINER visited Amami Ōshima and collected data for his doctoral dissertation which was published in 1965, and deals with the Noro cult. The author turns special attention to the connections between this cult and the organization of life on the village level. Scientific works on diverse aspects of life on the islands of the Ryūkyū Archipelago dealt with the image of the gods in Okinawan religion (SUMIYA and KREINER 1977, second ed. 1999; KREINER 1983), folk religion in general (KREINER 1968), and on Okinawa art and crafts (see above and KREINER ed. 1992). The historical situation of Okinawa, from earliest times until the present, which is characterized by near-colonial dependency upon the central government in Tokyō and the continued presence of tens of thousands of US soldiers, was made the topic of Ryūkyū in World History (KREINER ed. 2001). The papers published in it were read at an international symposium, “Ryūkyū in the History of East Asia, Asia and the World,” organized on the occasion of the 27th Conference of German-Speaking Orientalists in Bonn in 1998.11 The Institute of Japanology at the University of Bonn finally won recognition as one of the centers of Ryukyuan/Okinawan Studies outside of Japan from the Committee for the International Symposium on Okinawa Studies, which held its fourth international conference at the University of Bonn in March 2002.

For more than six years now, Josef KREINER has no longer been the only one doing research on Okinawa from an ethnological background. Monika WACKER (originally from the University of Munich) did fieldwork on different islands of the Ryūkyūan Archipelago and collected data on traditional religion, especially on the problem of the onarigami (holy women). WACKER’s doctoral thesis, submitted in 1998 and published in 2000, is not only based on her fieldwork, but also includes an analysis of the system of state priestesses in historical times. Although not without flaws, her work has met with positive response in reviews (see, e.g., KREINER 2000-01). WACKER continues her research on Okinawan religion and the onarigami by
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11 The publications of Josef KREINER listed here are but a short-listing of the most important touching upon the topics of Okinawan history, art, and the modern situation. For a complete bibliography up to 2002, see WILHELM 2000.
publishing articles either summarizing her results or introducing new, additional aspects (Wacker 2001, 003).

 Minority Studies II: Ainu

Since 1983, the year the research project on Ainu and Okinawa material culture was initiated at Bonn University, Ainu studies witnessed a certain revival in Germany. Around the turn of the nineteenth century, the Ainu belonged to those ethnic groups attracting attention from ethnologists and the public alike, because of their alleged primitiveness and the enigmas surrounding their geographical origin and their ethnic composition. But when Hokkaido was finally Japanized, the Ainu forming a mere one percent of its population and being culturally indistinguishable from the lower strata of Japanese society, this interest waned, at least in the German-speaking region.

Hans Dieter Ölschlegel, who studied ethnology and sociology at the University of Bonn, devoted part of his research interests to the study of Ainu culture in its different dimensions. He began this work as a graduate student in the research project on material culture of the Ainu and the Ryukyu Islands (see above). Ölschlegel’s doctoral dissertation was partly based on the results of this project: Umwelt und Wirtschaft der Ainu: Bemerkungen zur Ökologie einer Wildbeutergesellschaft (Environment and Economy of the Ainu: Notes on the Cultural Ecology of a Hunting and Gathering Society, 1989). In this monograph, the author analyzes “traditional” Ainu society from a cultural ecological point of view. Ainu culture, as dependent on a highly specialized hunting, fishing, and gathering economy, shows a high degree of complexity in all dimensions of behavior, comparable only to the Indian groups on the Northwest Coast of North America. Thus, the Ainu were far from being (the most?) primitive people living on earth, as they were portrayed by Western and Japanese travelers alike, beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century. Several articles by Ölschlegel (1999, 2000, 2001, 2002a, 2002b) deal with separate facets of Ainu society, be they art, the hunting and gathering economy, or the image of the Ainu in ethnological literature and/or travelogues. By now, it seems clear that Ainu culture originated in situ in Hokkaido and Sakhalin from roots to be sought in the Epi-Jomon and the Okhotsk cultures not earlier than the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The development of Ainu culture can not be understood without taking into consideration the strong connection between it and the surrounding cultures of China, Japan, and, later, also Russia. The gradual “decline” of traditional Ainu culture, whose origin was itself strongly influenced by Japan, began in the seventeenth century with the incorporation of Ainu hunting, fishing, and gathering economy into Japanese feudalism by the Matsumae clan. All attempts at explaining Ainu culture by migration either from Siberia or
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12 For a short, but comprehensive, overview of the so-called “Ainu problem,” see Sternberg 1929.
13 Adam 1991 is a near-complete listing of publications relating to the Ainu in Western languages up to 1990. As can be seen from this bibliography, the overwhelming majority of books and articles was written until the 1930s, their number drastically decreasing afterwards.
the South have fallen short, and the long-held view of the Ainu as remnants of a Caucasoid population is wrong.

**Minority Studies III: Japanese as Minority in the Americas**

A problem often neglected by German Japanologists — if recognized at all — is the presence of Japanese minorities in North, as well as South, America. Only in the United States and in Brazil do these minorities number more than one million individuals, most of them now in the third or fourth generation, and culturally and linguistically completely assimilated. In other countries such as Canada, Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, and Argentina, the number of Japanese immigrants and their descendants is much smaller. Nevertheless, their social and economic importance by far exceeds their numerical strength. Eva KÖNIG, an ethnologist who specializes in South American studies at the University of Bonn, and Hans Dieter ÖLSCHLEGER conducted fieldwork among Japanese immigrants in an agricultural community in Eastern Bolivia, San Juan de Yapacani. The colony was founded in 1955 and therefore offers a good opportunity to compare developments among the agricultural immigrants with ongoing modernization in Japan proper. The results of fieldwork concerning changes in family life and household composition, as well as strategies of adaptation in a new environment, have been published (see ÖLSCHLEGER and KÖNIG 1994, KÖNIG and ÖLSCHLEGER 1998). An originally unintended bonus from this project was a bibliography of works concerning Japanese immigrants in North America in European languages, listing more than 4,000 titles (ÖLSCHLEGER and KÖNIG 1997). A bibliography on Japanese immigrants in South America is in preparation.

**3.3 The Study of Material Culture**

The abovementioned research project on Ainu and Okinawa material culture raises the question of studies of Japanese material culture in general, especially as objects from Japan — be they art, products of traditional crafts, or ethnographic objects — can be found in numerous museums in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. The number of these objects by far exceeds that of any other country or culture in Asia, a fact which might partially be explained by the presence of large numbers of German experts in Meiji Japan, but also by countless travelers for whom a visit to modernizing, yet exotic, Japan was imperative. They all collected or bought objects of Japanese arts and crafts, some of them even robbing graves; and most of the objects finally found their way into museums in Europe. But despite this wealth of sources which might be tapped when doing research on Japanese culture, museum collections, especially ethnographic ones, including those from the Ainu and the Ryukyu Islands, have been neglected almost completely by Japanese studies at universities. The sole exceptions were two Ainu exhibitions in German museums (1987 at the Rautenstrauch-Joest-Museum für Volkerkunde, Cologne, and at the Staatliches Museum für Volkerkunde in 2002), both of which were
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14 On the strange ways these objects come into the possession of European museums, see various articles in KREINER ed. 2004.
organized in connection with the aforementioned research project conducted by the Institute of Japanese Studies, University of Bonn.15

3.4 On Theory and Method in Japanese Studies

Ethnology has always stressed reflexivity, an attempt to clarify the foundations of its own reasoning in order to look for preconceived ideas and for stereotypes which might, if undetected, distort the results of research.16

In 1989, the first international symposium of the newly-founded German Institute for Japanese Studies (Deutsches Institut für Japanstudien), Tokyo, was dedicated to the question whether there are national approaches to Japanese studies, shaped by different historical, economic, political, social, and ideological factors. The proceedings of the symposium were published in 1992 (KREINER and BEFU eds. 1992). In his introduction, Harumi BEFU clearly states the reasoning behind the symposium:

If we are creatures of our culture, as cultural anthropology instructs us, then it follows that scholars of different cultural backgrounds, as much as anyone else, would manifest different interests, different ways of thinking, different outlooks, and different world views, which should cause them to interpret differently what they behold, be it Japan, China or any other country. (BEFU 1992: 15)

This should suffice to make it clear that the intention behind the symposium transcends the study of Japanese society and aims at clarifying the problem of understanding foreign cultures in “objective” terms, without influences from factors outside scientific methods and theories. The solution to this problem, of course, lies at the very base of anthropologists’ endeavor.

The book Japanese Culture and Society: Models of Interpretation (KREINER and ÖLSCHLEGER eds. 1996) is a collection of articles by social scientists from different countries which assess the value of past and current approaches to Japanese culture and society. In this context, ethnology, of course, plays a prominent role. LINHART (1996) has a closer look at the wide array of community studies, beginning with John EMBREE’s Su Ye Mura (1939) and being the most important research strategy with the influx of American anthropologists in the wake of the Allied Occupation troops. LINHART concludes that, given some restriction, this approach still promises valuable contributions to our knowledge of Japan. PORTNER (1996) addresses the problem of conflict in Japanese society from a cultural point of view, and tries to answer the question for its value in dealing with a topic prominent in Japanese Studies whose existence has been denied by generations of scholars. Ruth BENEDICT’s The Chrysanthemum and the

15 Both exhibitions were accompanied by catalogues. See KREINER and ÖLSCHLEGER 1987; and MÜLLER 2002.
16 I will skip here the question if it is possible at all to do “objective” research, research which is not influenced by the historical and social standing of the researcher, current social values, or hegemonic political and economic discourse, to state only a few possible sources of influences.
"Sword: Patterns of Japanese Culture" (1934) is the topic of Ölschlegler’s (1996) contribution to this volume. Although the result of Benedict’s first systematic application of cultural anthropological theory to the study of Japan is still regarded as one of the finest examples of the intellectual product of the culture-and-personality-approach, which flourished in the United States between 1940 and 1955, Ölschlegler (1996: 104) concludes that “[i]n light of various theoretical and critical objections, it seems doubtful that [this study] really promoted the understanding of Japanese culture and society.” The same is true of a few shorter essays on the national character and the psychological make-up of the Japanese written during World War II, and relying heavily on the culture-and-personality-approach and the (Neo-)Freudian school in cultural anthropology.

The organization and development of Japanese ethnology during the last decades of the twentieth century is the topic of Nihon Minzokugaku no Genzai, edited by Kreiner in 1996 (Kreiner ed. 1996b). It is dedicated to Kreiner’s academic teacher, Alexander Slawik, who celebrated his ninety-fifth birthday in that year, and numerous articles in it written by Japanese ethnologists give an overview of ethnology in Japan in three parts: (1) the history of Japanese ethnology; (2) the various fields of Japanese ethnology; and (3) Japanese contributions to the knowledge of different regions of the world.

3.5 Ethnological Studies on Japanese Religion

As we have already seen, the study of Japanese religion—especially Japan’s indigenous religion, Shinto—has been the main topic of some ethnologically-trained Japanologists from the University of Vienna (see above on Josef Kreiner and Nelly Naumann).

Naumann’s most influential student, Klaus Antoni (now at the University of Tubingen) has followed his professor’s interest in the analysis of Shinto in his famous monograph on sake, Miwa, der heilige Trank (1988). Here, we still see the influence of Nelly Naumann in Antoni’s use of classic sources of Japanese religious history to reconstruct cultural history. Later, however, he turned to the problem of religion in general in the context of modern ideology, supported by a study group, “Japanese Religions,” which was founded in 1994. In a contribution to the proceedings of a symposium Antoni organized in 1996 at the University of Trier, he makes clear his cultural anthropological approach to religious studies:

One basic assumption of cultural anthropological research on religion holds that religion is also culturally determined […] (Antoni 1997: 177)

This interconnectedness between religion, on the one hand, and other cultural subsystems, such as politics, was the unifying theme of this symposium. According to Antoni
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17 This article is a revised and shortened version of Ölschlegler 1990 and 1991.
18 For information on this study group, as well as other current activities of Klaus Antoni, see the homepage of the Institute of Japanology, University of Tübingen, http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/kultur-japans/ka_projekte.htm (downloaded Oct. 15, 2004).
(1996: Preface), regarding rituals from the viewpoint of "invented traditions" (as defined by Hobsbawm) allows insights into their social and cultural functions, their origins, effects, and political backgrounds. This, of course, is far away from the traditional philological approach to the study of Japanese religions. The other contributions to this volume cover a wide range of rituals in Japanese religions, from the earliest written sources to the reasons for the establishment of the so-called "new New Religions."

Another main topic of Antoni's work is the problem of Japanese national identity in the modern era, especially in its relation to religion. In cooperation with the aforementioned study group, "Japanese Religions," a symposium on the problem of "Religion and National identity in the Japanese Context" was organized in 2001 (Antoni et al., eds. 2002). Here, again, Antoni (p. 8) advocates a comparative approach in the best anthropological tradition.


Antoni's current project, "Self-representation and Self-understanding of Religious Communities on the Japanese Internet: The WWW as a Source for Japanese Studies," started in 2000. Analyzing the self-representation of Japanese religious communities on their homepages, Antoni - in cooperation with Dr. Birgit Staemmler - tries to answer the question if Japanese web-sites may be used as empirical sources in Japanese studies. First preliminary results point in that direction, and, if verified in the long run, this result would open the door for new research, not only on Japanese society.

Also interested in the Japanese traditional religion, Shinto, Kreiner pursued studies of Japanese religion and, like Antoni, extended his research to include the influence of religion and traditional thought on modern Japanese society. Of foremost interest, of course, is the question of the influence of different religions of Japan on the successful industrialization and social modernization of the country, and on the dark sides of this modernization as well. One attempt at clarifying this problem is a book edited by Kreiner (1996a) in which leading experts on Confucianism, Buddhism, Shinto, and Taoism try to give a synopsis from their respective fields of expertise.

3.6 Japan in Comparative Perspective

As already mentioned, one of the main characteristics of ethnology is its comparative approach. No culture or cultural phenomenon is seen as an object in itself to be regarded separately. On the contrary, the main task of ethnology is often seen as an attempt to explain human cultural diversity by comparing different solutions to the same problem and by relating them to some other classes of phenomena, e.g., differences in the natural environment or in the economy. Seen from this point of view, without comparison, there could be no ethnology.
At the Institute of Ethnology, University of Cologne, Christoph Brumann dedicates his efforts to such comparative research. His most important contributions are his publications on communitarian groups all over the world. In his doctoral dissertation, *Die Kunst des Teilens* (The Art of Sharing, 1998b), Brumann compares forty-three cases of such communitarian groups from North America, Europe, and Japan. Concerning the Japanese cases, he uses data from his own fieldwork, which he conducted in the second half of the 1980s in some communitarian groups in Japan, for his M.A. thesis (Brumann 1991). Later, he published several articles in ethnological journals, either introducing data on these communitarian groups (Ittō-en, Atarashiki mura, and Yamagishi-kai) (Brumann 1992), or concentrating on particular aspects, e.g., their charismatic founders (1996, 1997) and their contemporary development (1998a). Finally, in his doctoral dissertation and later articles (e.g., Brumann 1999, 2003), he places his examples from Japan into a wider comparative context. His main research interest lies in the question as to why some of these utopian groups (not only from Japan) have survived, while others have perished rather quickly.  

A second field of interest to Brumann is urban anthropology. In 1998 and 1999, he conducted fieldwork in Kyōto on the problems of citizens’ participation in the process of urban planning and the conflicts between large-scale construction companies and groups protecting traditional architecture in the city (Brumann 2000a, 2000b, 2002).

### 3.7 Japanese Culture in Monolithic Terms: Florian Coulmas

In direct contrast to Brumann’s comparative approach are the attempts of Florian Coulmas, a full professor at the University of Duisburg and currently Director of the German Institute of Japanese Studies in Tokyo, at identifying and describing a mythical object called “Japanese culture” as a monolithic whole, thereby always creating an impression of disregarding sub-cultural differences on a geographical and social basis, and not taking into account the minorities in Japanese society, the presence of which has made itself felt in increasing degrees through the last decades.

After more than ten years in Japan, Coulmas (1993) published his first book on Japanese culture and society, based on his daily experiences as a foreigner in Japan — not on data gained by thoroughly planned fieldwork. From the very beginning, Coulmas tries to avoid the pitfalls of the so-called *Nihonjinron*-genre, that part of Japanese self-reflection and attempts at constructing cultural and national identity which stress Japanese homogeneity and uniqueness (see Aoki 1990). Coulmas correctly identifies popular stereotypes of the unique characteristics of Japanese mentality and society, e.g., a lack of individuality, as attempts at constructing identity without necessarily reflecting some “objective” truth. Nevertheless, the description given by Coulmas of Japanese ways of thinking always runs the risk of being misunderstood as promoting those very same stereotypes. Opening this book, one reads in the

---

19 Abstracts of Brumann’s publications, as well as a complete listing and his main research interests, can be found at http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/voelkerkunde/institut/brumann.htm (downloaded Oct. 15, 2004).
blurb of individual claims being subordinated to ritual harmony and of feudal traits of the Japanese society still discernible after decades of modernization.

COULMAS’ next main publication on Japanese culture (2000) traces the development of the Japanese conception and sense of time from the mediaeval age to the modern era. In his latest work, with the revealing title Die Kultur Japans (Japanese culture, 2003), COULMAS finally succeeds in setting foot in the realm of traditional ethnology, i.e., the description of the culture of a temporarily- and geographically-definable human population.20 And once again, the author outlines the picture of the Japanese culture as monolithic, without paying sufficient attention to social and cultural subdivisions, thereby always running the risk of — maybe unwillingly — strengthening stereotypes of a homogeneous and unique Japan. But as we will see in a moment, he is in good company.

4. The Culturalist Turn in German Humanities

In German ethnology, the 1960s were of decisive importance: the study of so-called “primitive,” “stateless” or “traditional” cultures was finally abandoned, following the re-ordering of the world during the process of decolonisation, with accompanying changes in the objects of the older ethnologists’ research. The old distinction between “us” and “them,” illustrated by differences in the way of life and thinking which, as different cultures became the subject matter of ethnology or cultural anthropology, become obsolete as no longer feasible in a globalizing world. Instead, one noted a growing interest in the symbolic ordering of the world, a phenomenon which could best be studied by hermeneutical methods. During this culturalist turn, “to understand” became the key word, in contrast to “to explain,” which was, once again, seen as the main task of the natural sciences.21 At the same time, the range of ethnological research widened to encompass the whole gamut of world cultures, including the industrialized societies of the Western world and also Japan — which was, at that time, the only society outside the Western cultural area to have evolved from a rural country to a highly industrialized one.22 Consequently, new problems emerged, e.g., that of intercultural understanding and communication. As we will see, these developments also reached

20 COULMAS (2003: 5-6) subdivides the content of his book into four parts: (1) behavior and social relations; (2) values and beliefs; (3) institutions; and (4) material culture. Seen as a whole, it is not difficult to identify these parts as reflecting the classic definition given by Tylor (1871: 1) of culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society.”

21 Actually, this emerging of “understanding” in the humanities is nothing new. Since Franz Boas (see different articles in Boas 1948), himself a natural scientist who became the founding father of cultural anthropology in the United States, took up German neo-Kantian and historicist ideas of a basic and unbridgeable difference between the methods of the natural and cultural sciences, various schools and currents in ethnology have differed from each other by their acceptance of either “understanding” or “explaining” (reflected in quantitative vs. qualitative methods); for this, compare Harris 1968: 250-89.

22 For the “cultural turn” in German ethnology, see Schiffauer 2004.
Japanology. As already stated, new approaches and theories did not replace older ones, but joined them, thereby creating a multitude of possible ways of dealing with Japanese society and culture, and, of course, making possible conflict between different schools in Japanese Studies.

4.1 "Thick Description" and Japan

To understand a recent contribution to the question of how to approach Japanese culture, it is first necessary to introduce the US-American anthropologist Clifford Geertz and his concept of "thick description" (Geertz 1973). Geertz's starting point is his discontent with the current confusion — even contradiction — in the various attempts at defining "culture" as the subject matter of cultural anthropology. To clarify this situation, he advocates a "semiotic" concept of culture as one of many concepts among which to choose:

Believing, with Max Weber, that man is an animal suspended in webs of significance he himself has spun, I take culture to be those webs, and the analysis of it to be therefore not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretative one in search of meaning. It is explication I am after, construing social expression on their surface enigmatical. (Geertz 1973: 5)

To interpret such a web, one has to isolate its elements, specify the internal relationships among those elements, and finally proceed to the characterization of the whole system in general terms. This characterization can be based on the core symbols, the underlying structures, or the ideological principles of this culture (p. 17). Empirical access to the system of symbols can only be gained by inspecting real events. Ethnography, then, has to be "thick description," giving us the meaning behind the behavior and the symbolic value it holds for members of that society who meet each other in social interaction. This approach is a micro-social and micro-historical one, giving us the possibility of reconstructing the diverse life-worlds of members of a society (Alfred Schütz) and everyday life. The most important contribution of the concept of "thick description" seems to be the great potential it holds for a "theory of action" on the micro-social, i.e., the individual level, not on the level of "Japanese culture," if there is such a phenomenon at all. Thus, it is of great importance, not only in ethnology, but also in history, politics, and other sciences dealing with human culture (see Wilbertz 1994: 122).

Birgit Griescke (1996, 2001a, 2001b), who studied philosophy, Japanology, and geography in Hamburg and Tokyo, advocates the fruitfulness of "thick description" for Japanese Studies. But whereas Geertz aims at describing empirical reality and always reassures himself by relating to this reality, Griescke's approach is soon obscured by her preoccupation with German idealistic philosophy. As Manzenreiter (2003) remarks, her focus is not Japan itself, but writing on Japan. She does not question the existence of cultural systems on the level of nation-states, and for her, it is the main task of Japanese Studies to understand, i.e., to interpret hermeneutically, such foreign cultures. Models or metaphors,
trying to grasp the sense of a culture, are important devices for making understanding and description easier. Thus, it is understandable that Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (1934) is regarded as an outstanding example of scholarship (Griesecke 2001a: *passim*) without even trying to see this book as the product of a certain ethnological school, written during World War II without Benedict having been able to conduct fieldwork in Japan.

Here, we see the difference between Brumann's (see above) ethnological and Griesecke's philosophical approach: Brumann defends the use of the concept of “culture” against critics denying its empirical reality. In contrast, Griesecke postulates this reality at the level of the nation-state without question and argues that it is possible to summarize the essence of every such culture, including Japanese culture, in one metaphor. This reminds one, again, of Ruth Benedict (1934) and her “patterns of culture.” And last, but not least, Griesecke does not proceed to prove the fruitfulness of her approach.

Another proponent of the culturalist approach characterized by hermeneutics is Shimada Shingo, currently full Professor of ethnology at the University of Halle. Just like Griesecke, his main interest is “writing on Japan” or “the process of construction of Japan,” and not Japanese culture and society itself, i.e., the discursive construction of Japanese national and cultural identity in direct exchange of ideas with Western nations. It is necessary to understand these processes to be able to understand the members of foreign cultures. Shimada’s aim is to create a foundation for “intercultural understanding” (1994, 2000, 2001).

### 4.2 Ethnology, Japan, and Intercultural Understanding

“Intercultural communication” is a new and interdisciplinary field of research at German universities, although its founding can be dated back to the book, *The Silent Language*, by the cultural anthropologist Edward T. Hall (1959). Hall was a student of Ralph Linton and, not surprisingly, advocated the position of the Culture-and-Personality-school of cultural anthropology, with its strong influences from (neo-)Freudian psychoanalysis.23 “Intercultural communication” as an academic field at German universities owes much to psychological anthropology, a fact which becomes clear when looking at the definition of “culture” and the concept of the communication process.

The basic understanding of intercultural communication can be found in the following “Policy Statement” of the *Journal of Intercultural Communication*:

The world today is characterized by an ever growing number of contacts resulting in communication between people with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This communication takes place because of contacts within the areas of business, military cooperation, science, education, massmedia, entertainment, tourism but also because of immigration brought about by labor shortage or political conflicts.

---

23 Moosmüller (2000: 16-20) gives a short overview of the history of intercultural communication as an academic field.
In all these contacts, there is communication which needs to be as constructive as possible, without misunderstandings and breakdowns. It is our belief that research on the nature of linguistic and cultural similarities and differences here can play a positive and constructive role.


One proponent of this approach to Japanese studies is Alois MOOSMÜLLER, an ethnologist who spent some time in Japan and now teaches “Intercultural Communication” at the University of Munich. His focus of research is the influence which the social framework of contact exerts on the form of communication between members of two different cultures. One such framework is the multinational enterprise, and MOOSMÜLLER (1998, 2003) is able to show that the different cultural backgrounds of the interacting employees not only profoundly influence their behavior, but also their mutual understanding and, thereby, the process of national stereotyping. The construction of national identity, equally in comparative perspective, is another of MOOSMÜLLER’s topics (1999).

Another approach to intercultural communication and understanding is advocated by Klaus-Peter KÖPPING, an ethnologist at the University of Heidelberg. He studied ethnology and Japanology in the 1960s, and, consequently, Japanese culture and society provided him with important examples for conducting his comparative research. During the first years of his academic career, he was interested in Japanese religion — his doctoral dissertation deals with the relation between the development of new religions and rapid social change in the process of modernization (KÖPPING 1974). Later, his interests diversified, and between 1982 and 2000 he went to Japan several times to do research on the topics of cultural change in general; structures of management in the sōgō-shōsha (general trading firms); and feasts and rituals at New Year. Especially, his way of dealing with feasts (matsuri) in Japan, and in comparative perspective, illustrates his approach and his understanding of anthropology as a cultural science. He sees himself as “playing the role of a mediator between different lifeworlds,” who is “actually impelled to transgress constantly” (KÖPPING 2002: blurb). The anthropologist is a wanderer between different worlds, making intercultural understanding possible. Transgression, on the other hand, is not limited to anthropologists alone, but is a “mode of life extant in all cultures in one form or other,” and becomes an important topic of research for KÖPPING. His original interest in Japanese religion is revived in a project on “Ritual and Theatre at Shintō Festivals,” which he conducted together with Burkhard SCHNEPEL, who did comparative research on “Staging of Power, Authority, and Territorial Sovereignty in Orissa, India” (see KÖPPING 2002; KÖPPING and SCHNEPEL 2000).

---

24 KÖPPING spent decades as either visiting professor, lecturer, senior lecturer, or professor in Japan (1967-1968 Jōchi Daigaku, Tokyō), at California State University (1969-1972), and at the University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia (1972-1984, to name only three postings; a complete list can be found at http://www.eth.uni-heidelberg.de/personen/koepping.html (downloaded Oct. 14, 2004).
4.3. Ethnographic Methods in the Study of Japanese Society

The last development to be mentioned here is the adoption of ethnographic methods to collect data by proponents of other social sciences, e.g., sociology and pedagogics. The number of scholars making use of ethnographic methods has steadily increased during the last decade, and quite impressive results have been published. Susanne KREITZ-SANDBERG, for one, is the first German scholar to use qualitative methods in her empirical research of Japanese adolescents (KREITZ-SANDBERG 1994).

One strong current in German-speaking Japanology is the theoretical discussion of ethnographic methods and their contribution to the understanding of Japanese culture and society. In 1996, several social scientists conducting research on East Asia at the University of Vienna presented the results of a joint research projects on fieldwork in East Asian Studies (see Methoden ... 1996). At the Eleventh Conference of German-speaking Japanologists in 1999, a panel with several speakers was devoted to this problem (see, e.g., GETREUER-KARGL 2001; HEISE 2001). Equally important is a contribution by KREITZ-SANDBERG (2000) to the ongoing discussion of the relative importance of qualitative vs. quantitative methods in Japanese studies.

5. Short Summary

Though it is too early to give a concluding summary of the discussions taking place in German-speaking Japanese studies, it is safe to say that ethnology and ethnographic methods have gradually increased their importance, and that this development has still not yet reached its end.

Starting from philology, it was Alexander SŁAWIK at the University of Vienna who incorporated ethnological theory and methods into the Japanological curriculum. Scholars educated in Vienna disseminated this approach to other universities in the German-speaking region. The importance of ethnology further increased when cultural sciences gained importance and their methods were employed in Japanese studies, too. Today, the situation is characterized by a diversity of theoretical reasoning and methods employed in the study of Japan, the like of which was previously unknown.

However, adoption of ethnological theories and methods does not necessarily guarantee an improvement in research, in comparison to the older, philological Japanology. Approaches where philosophy or Japanology form the background of ethnological studies of Japanese culture and society, especially, are not always able to free themselves from old but, nevertheless, still-existing stereotypes.
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