

Japanese Studies in Australia, Canada and Egypt

Royall Tyler

Visiting Research Fellow, International Research Center for Japanese Studies

(Professor, Australian National University)

Timothy D. Kern

Associate Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies

Suzuki Sadami

Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies

Baxter: Thank you for waiting. We're a little late, and I apologize for that. Welcome to the Nichibunken Evening Seminar. My name is Jim Baxter, and I'm a professor at Nichibunken, working for the Office of Research Exchange here. Our usual moderator, Professor Hiroshi Kimura, had to be in Tokyo today, and he asked me to take the chair in his absence.

This is the 49th meeting of the Evening Seminar, which meets approximately once a month, and it's the eighth meeting in a mini-series that Professor Kimura designed, in which we have discussed Japanese studies in different countries. We've talked in previous meetings about the United States, Russia, the German speaking countries, France, China, Ireland, and last month Finland, Bulgaria, and Belgium. Today we're very fortunate to have three distinguished scholars who can speak about Australia, Egypt and Canada. The publicity describing today's session—our postcard notices and the like—listed Australia, Canada and Egypt in alphabetical order, but I've decided to proceed instead in the order of seniority of our three speakers.

First we'll hear from Royall Tyler of Australian National University, who is spending some weeks as a visiting scholar at Nichibunken completing his much anticipated new translation of *The Tale of Genji*. He's the author of *Japanese Tales* (1987), *The Miracles of Kasuga Deity* (1990), and *Japanese Noh Dramas* (1992). Our next speaker is Professor Suzuki Sadami of Nichibunken, a specialist in modern literature and the author or editor of over a dozen books in Japanese, including *Gendai Nihon bungaku no shiso:*

Korhonen: No, I said it isn't a meaningful distinction.

Kimura: We need a distinction because theory specialists attack you. Many specialists say that you are the only one ... they are attacking ...

Korhonen: They are not attacking. They may be attacking in the United States; they are not in Finland.

Kimura: Okay, all right. So please, continue.

Korhonen: We'd all love to have a lot of money, so we could go to Japan once or twice a year to appreciate its beauties, but one can also manage to do research with less frequent visits.

Kimura: Money from where? From Japan or from the Finnish government? Or from foundations such as the Japan Foundation, or other sources?

Korhonen: The fact is that who pays you also has a kind of say in your publications. Maybe not directly, but there may exist certain expectations... I came here for the first time with Mombusho money, then I have been here three times with Finnish money, and in this time once again with Japanese money. You have to try to keep some kind of balance.

Finland, but I do not know the work of everyone.

It is more difficult to answer about the situation outside of Finland. Your criteria are quite demanding. There is a fair amount of studies published in English. But it is possible that I myself am the most well known Finnish researcher on Japan, and as you know, I am not especially well known. Things take their time.

Kimura: The final question is a very simple one. In your country, in order to promote Japanese studies more, what's the question, or problems and tasks, you have to deal with? Financial problems, or shortage of teachers of Japanese language, for example, or area studies versus discipline theory oriented scholars—that kind of antagonism or attack or criticism of area studies from the theory-oriented, discipline-oriented scholars? Or even factionalism among scholars, or performance of Japanese economy? What are the main problems and tasks you have to deal with in the future, in the coming 21st century? Or are there no problems?

Korhonen: Perhaps the greatest problem for us is that we have to remember to eat and sleep every now and then. But we also need to find someone who is willing to pay us a salary. Because to be a specialist in Japan is not going to guarantee you bread and shelter.

Kimura: So job opportunity—right?—improvement?

Korhonen: Yes. Japanese studies is no career. You have to be a political scientist, or sociologist, ethnologist, historian, art historian or whatever, because those are the fields where you compete with others for positions. And you have to be good in that.

Kimura: Not area studies?

Korhonen: No.

Kimura: But didn't you say that there's no distinction between Japanology and Japan studies in your country?

Mongolian or Korean languages. Japan has been on the sidelines of this tradition. Modern Japanese studies in Finland are very much a creation of the Mombusho, just like Nichibunken. Before I came to Nichibunken, in this sense, I already was a brother of most of you. In terms of Japanese studies, we have the same mother, so to speak.

This means that in Finland almost all Japanese studies in social sciences and humanities have been created during the past 20 or 30 years. Mombusho scholarships are still the normal pattern. We are all individuals. There are no specialized institutes for Japanese studies in Finland. We all act as individuals within our own basic disciplines. We are political scientists, historians, ethnologists, movie or theatre specialists, and so on. As a consequence we are all basically theory-oriented scientists doing more or less empirical studies on Japan, but we may not be engaged in Japanese studies continuously. And for us Japan is not a world of its own, but only a country situated within a larger area. So, because Japanese studies are so new in Finland, many distinctions found in countries with longer traditions do not exist.

Kimura: The fourth question is: In your country, what makes your Japanese studies unique, in terms of what you are contributing to the world academic community of Japanese studies? Can you name some great Finnish scholars, or works written in your language or English by Finnish scholars, or a field? Is there something that makes your Japanese studies unique?

Korhonen: Your question has two parts. In Finland, three names stand out. Tuula Moilanen is an outstanding figure. She graduated from the University of Jyväskylä, but lives now in Kyoto. She is more an artist than a scholar; a hangaka [woodblock artist]. She has written three books about Japanese paper making, old style book binding, and how to make Japanese woodblock prints. She is quite famous in Finland. Another person is Olavi K. Fält of the Department of History of the University of Oulu, and a third is Ilmari Vesterinen from the University of Jyväskylä. Both of them have published interesting and readable books about Japanese history and society. These may be the principal contributions to Japanese studies in

etcetera. And the second approach is what I call just Japanese studies, by which I mean that they are interested in Japan simply as one of the countries in the world, particularly in comparison, in their minds, with other countries, say the United States or the U.K. or Southeast Asian countries. Those who take the second approach, I think, make an assumption that each country has a different culture, and yet, when it comes to politics, administration, diplomacy and economic activities, they have something in common which can be compared with each other, against each other, on same standard or measurement. This has been illustrated in this series of seminars by Tim Kern and also Professor Baxter and others when they talked about studies in Germany, the United States, and other countries. So. . . would you please comment on this distinction between so-called Japanology, on the one hand, and Japanese studies (in which many students try to emphasize the discipline rather than the area, so that they can apply same kind of standard to any country), on the other?

In your own country, can this kind of distinction be clearly recognized or not? Or—I hesitate to say it—but in your country is interest in Japan still just simply curiosity about exotic things, and are students spending most of their time studying language rather than trying to compare Japanese affairs with affairs in other countries?

Korhonen: The distinction between Japanology studies and theory oriented studies is not meaningful in Finland, because we don't have any military interests in Japan. This distinction was, as far as I know, created in the United States after the Second World War, when the country suddenly had to grab control of the world both theoretically and practically. Thus specialized area studies and general theories of the international system were created as mutually complementing parts of a whole, but represented by two different groups of people. We do not have this distinction in Finland at all. Also we do not have a specific body of knowledge oriented especially to Japan or Japanese culture, and which would have long roots in the academic world.

We have a fairly distinguished historical record of linguistic studies in Finland, but the researchers have mostly concentrated on Arabic,

Kimura: No, you can speak more.

Korhonen: There is nothing especially negative about Japan in Finland, I think. General interest is, let's say, quite high. Of course we know that Germany or Russia are near to us and very important, but people are interested in the outer world in general, and Japan is one of the countries that comes up regularly in the news. People do not have particularly deep knowledge about Japan, but they know where it is. They know something about the country where the Nissans and Toyotas come from. Finnish images of Japanese people are particularly coloured by Kyoto, because the old song 「上を向いて」 was translated into Finnish as "Geisha Kiotosta" (Geisha from Kyoto). It was published in the 1960s.

Now geisha is not what you think. It is something quite different in Finnish. Finns do not know very many Japanese words, but they know geisha. They also know the word samurai, and that samurai is man. Geisha is woman. Thus geisha must be the wife of a samurai, or his loved one, or girl friend.

Why me? Why did I become interested in Japan? Kurosawa Akira and Hokusai. I liked these two very much. I also wanted to do foreign studies after finishing my Master's degree, and I wanted to go somewhere far away. Japan is far away. A further reason was that Mombusho gave me money for this.

Interest in Japan? It is not in decline. There never was a peak, so there does not have to be a fall. It could be the same, or it could be increasing, gradually. This is related to the other question: compare interest in Japan to interest in other countries. There is more interest in China than in Japan, and also interest in Southeast Asia is growing faster than interest in Japan. Japan may be a big market theoretically, but it is difficult to enter; Southeast Asia and China definitely stand out much more clearly in terms of the national interest. Thank you.

Kimura: Thank you. The next question is one of the most important, in my mind. Namely, I'd like to distinguish two ways of studying Japanese. First is Japanology, by which I mean that people get interested in Japanese affairs, mainly for exotic reasons, and particularly they are interested in learning languages, culture, folklores, tradition and etcetera,

number also does not mean very much in itself. It includes people in various disciplines who have written something about Japan. I do not know most of these works, because they are not related to my field. The core of researchers that have written particularly much on Japan is much smaller, including at least Olavi K. Fält, a historian, in the University of Oulu; Rein Raud, who specializes in literature in the University of Helsinki; Ilmari Vesterinen, an ethnologist, and myself, both in the University of Jyväskylä. The number includes also people like Annamari Antikainen, an international relations specialist in Åbo Akademi University in Turku, who has written about Japan as an external actor in ASEAN. Japanese studies do not have any boundaries in terms of basic disciplines.

As for institutions: Japanese studies are carried on in most Finnish universities, with those institutions just mentioned being perhaps the most important. But it is carried on at various levels, it is of various kinds, and it is taking place in varying times. Similar comments apply to collections of books on Japan. We have no outstanding libraries in this respect, but there are some good collections in the Universities of Oulu and Helsinki.

Associations: Well, there is no organization called Finnish Association of Japanese Studies. It just does not exist. It is not needed, and it would be composed of too few people. We have an association of East Asian Studies. Its membership is basically national. Then we have the Nordic association, which includes Sweden, Norway and Denmark, in addition to Finland. It is called the Nordic Association of Japanese and Korean Studies (NAJAKS). That would be all.

Kimura: Thank you very much. The second question is also not a very academic question, but still I am very much interested in asking this question. First of all, personally, why did you decide to enter into Japanese studies? Then, in general, in your country, is people's interest in Japan very high or low in comparison with those interested in China, Korea or other Asian countries, for example. And how about the trend? Has interest in Japan been decreasing or going up very rapidly, particularly, again, compared with interest in China?

Korhonen: Three minutes again?

Professor Ari Pekka Korhonen: First I want to tell you something about Finland ...

Kimura: About Finland? Your country?

Korhonen: Yes.

Kimura: But. . . I'm sorry. . . Finland is so well known.

Korhonen: This is relevant.

Kimura: Oh, really—but may I ask you to be careful of time. You see, for each question we only have three minutes.

Korhonen: Oh. (Laughter.) One basic fact.

Kimura: Okay.

Korhonen: Three basic simple things about Finland: One: the population is five million; a little more than Kyoto ...

Kimura: Very little.

Korhonen: ... but not much more. So we are not talking about many people. Two: because we are a small nation, we are oriented towards learning foreign languages, because foreigners in general are not oriented towards learning Finnish. Three: there are no special military, political or economic interests towards Japan, which means that the number of people interested in Japan is surprisingly big. About the number of students studying Japanese I can tell you the figure 150, but it does not mean anything without qualifications. Some of them are studying Japanese with the intention of learning the language really well, but most are not, for their own reasons. They simply may be interested in taking a glimpse at a little known language.

The number of researchers can be said to be something like fifty, but this

Japanese Studies in Finland

Ari Pekka Korhonen

*Visiting Associate Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies
(Professor, University of Jyväskylä)*

Professor Kimura Hiroshi: Since last October we have been conducting a series of seminars, or a “round table,” that focuses on Japanese studies in various foreign countries. We have invited foreign scholars to speak here. Today, I’d like to organize this seminar in a slightly different fashion, conducting it in the format of an interview.

Could members of the audience pick up the questionnaires that are on the table just outside this room? The way in which we’d like to organize today’s seminar is as follows: I have previously handed to our speaker five questions, starting from basic and progressing to more difficult and profound ones, about Japanese studies in Finland.

Our guest today is Ari Pekka Korhonen from the University of Jyväskylä in Finland, who this year is Visiting Associate Professor at this Center.

So, the first question is a very basic one: In your country how many students do you have in Japanese studies programs, and how many scholars, just approximately, do you have, who are in full time positions specializing on Japan, and how many students are studying Japanese language? That’s the first part of the first question.

The second question is: could you describe one or more academic institutions in which research on Japan is carried out? And also, hopefully, libraries with collections of works in Japanese or works on Japan.

And thirdly, could you identify or introduce to us academic or other organizations promoting research on Japan—for example seminars, symposia and team research projects?

(Kokusai kôryû kikin Nihongo kokusai sentâ, 1994), pp. 177-183.

University of Leuven:

<http://akira.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/>

University of Gent:

<http://www.rug.ac.be/>

University of Liege:

<http://www.ulg.ac.be/cejul/>

Mercator Hogeschool:

<http://www.mercator-hs.be/>

kanji and example-sentences is shortened, leaving more time for students to take on other texts of their own interest and thus promoting active study.

5. Tasks for the future

In contrast to Belgium's French-speaking students of Japanese, their Dutch-speaking counterparts do not have access to a text book for the study of Japanese language. Ideally creation of such a textbook would contribute to the promotion of Japanese studies in Belgium. However, given the minor status of Dutch as a European language and problems related to the commercial viability of such a project, it is likely that students will have to continue to make use of English-language material.

Moreover, another promoting factor could be the introduction of Japanese as a selective foreign language during the latter part of secondary education, prior to the commencement of university studies. The study of language is still to a large extent tied to Japanese studies as a broader field of study. Offering young people the chance to acquire a taste of Japanese, especially in the light of Japan's growing international importance, would greatly increase awareness of Japan's role in the world and contribute to a more balanced view of the country in Belgium.

Finally, while Belgium has produced a superb group of scholars specializing in Buddhist studies related in part to Japan, the need exists to further overcome the traditional Oriental studies paradigm. More scholars have to be trained in order to take a wider and more interdisciplinary approach in the study of Japan and the teaching of subjects related to contemporary Japanese society. It goes without saying that an expansion of the study program is accompanied by rising costs, and conflicts with limited funding. In the near future an increase in financial backing from private companies might become an inevitability.

Reference material

Vande Walle, Willy. "Berugi ni okeru Nihongo kyoiku no genjo to kadai." *Sekai no Nihongo kyôiku: Nihongo kyôiku jijô hôkoku hen 1*

oriented approach.

4. Outstanding contributions to Japanese studies by Belgian scholars

First, Belgium has sent a large number of Catholic missionaries to Japan, and quite a few of them have become leading scholars in their field. To give just one example, Father Willem Grootaers was a pioneer in dialectology and linguistic geography in Japan. He led the drafting of a linguistic atlas of the country, a project which was initiated in 1955 and completed in 1974.

Second, Professor Willy Vande Walle of the University of Leuven is engaged in a project studying the history of political, economical and commercial contacts between Belgium and Japan during the Bakumatsu and Meiji periods, focussing on the hitherto neglected role of one of Europe's smaller countries in Japan's modernization process. During the second half of the nineteenth century Belgium was the most industrialized country on the European continent. Contacts between the Belgian government and the Bakufu as well as the Satsuma domain started already in the 1850s, and was followed by the Iwakura Mission's visit to Belgium in 1873. Consequently the Bank of Japan was modelled on the structure of the Belgian National Bank in 1882. The goal of Professor Vande Walle's research project is to show that also smaller countries could form alternative models for development of certain sectors of Japanese modernization.

The widespread use of the internet as a teaching tool might be pointed out as another valuable contribution to the promotion of Japanese studies. Reference material such as visual documents are accessible on the net and students submit term papers on the department's designated web-space. In addition the Kashira-project deserves some interest. Kashira (<http://akira.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/kashira.html>) is the name of a local mailserver, designed to automatically generate vocabulary lists, Japanese characters and character combinations. The project, which started in November 1997, became the first mailgloss-system for Japanese language teaching in Europe. Teachers can access the server in order to assess and prepare texts for classroom use, and generate lists of words and idioms. Students on the other hand can use Kashira as a tool for acquiring and developing language skills. The time-consuming process of looking up

and scholarships. The balance has now tilted in favor of China once more, the country now being viewed as a highly promising business market and likely a future economic giant.

However, exactly due to the decreased interest in Japan as an economic superpower, students might tend to feel more free in their choice of determining a more specific field of study. A look at the themes of graduate dissertations shows a wider range of topics including daily-life and local history, popular culture such as anime and manga, and art forms beyond the "traditional" sphere, such as Buto.

3. From Japanology to Japanese studies

This tendency to specialize in less traditional fields can be linked to the more general evolution from the classical "Japanology"-oriented area to the more interdisciplinary scope of Japanese studies. The study of Japan in Belgium has long been intrinsically connected to the subject of Buddhism. This trend is still visible at the University of Gent, where research led by Prof. Pol Vanden Broucke mainly focusses on Japanese Buddhism, in particular the philological study of the doctrinal and ritual texts of esoteric Buddhism (mainly Shingon), in addition to heterodox Shingon Buddhism of the Tachikawa School, Buddhist art, and Japanese classical literature influenced by Buddhism. Prof. Willy Vande Walle of the University of Leuven as well started out as a specialist on Buddhist art. Finally, also in the French-speaking part of Belgium most professors concerned with Oriental studies concentrate on Buddhist philosophy and languages.

However, the re-organization of the curriculum at the University of Leuven in 1986 clearly shows the shift from traditional history, art and religion oriented Japanology to the more interdisciplinary Japanese studies. Language does remain the basic element of the program especially during the first two years of study, with fourteen class-hours of Modern Japanese in the first year and twelve in the second-year. However, students now have a choice between a cultural-history major and an economics major. In the newly-created option a theoretical background is provided in fields as diverse as law, economics, international business and management, linguistics, and political and social sciences. This would probably define Japanese studies at the university as a mix between area-studies and a more theory-

ers; and scholarships are offered by the Japanese Ministry of Education (Monbusho) in cooperation with the Flemish Fund for Scientific Research (FWO). The University of Leuven moreover has a cooperation agreement on university level with the Osaka, Kansai and Kyushu Universities, and on department level with the International Research Center for Japanese Studies.

2. General interest in Japan and Japanese studies

In general it can be said that interest in Japan remains superficial. Japan's economic rise in the 1980s certainly contributed greatly to a growing interest in local business practices and economical organization, and has led to an increased media attention on relations between the EU and Japan. However, the lack of general news and background information on daily life and culture in Japan remains salient. What does catch the media's attention is news from Japan of the spectacular, exotic or weird kind, confirming the image of Japan as "the Other".

This serious lack of information contributes to the fact that a student's interest tends to be aimed at the Far East or oriental studies in general, rather than at Japan and Japanese studies in particular. The student's ultimate choice for either Japan or China for example, is greatly influenced by political or economical happenings and situations in the East. This becomes obvious when we compare the number of freshmen enrolled in the Japanese studies program of the Leuven University since 1986. The growth of the Japanese economy during the so-called Bubble-era and the increased investment of Japanese companies in Belgium at the end of the 1980s caused a steady increase in first-year students. When the 1989 Tien An Men incident and China's tainted international image gave rise to a declining number of students choosing China as a field of study, Japanese studies for the first time took over the leading position within the department, with the number of freshmen even peaking at 60 during the following years. However, the burst of the Japanese economic bubble has recently led to a decline: the total of first-year students has dwindled over the past three years to twenty-seven in the academic year 1999-2000. Not only did interest in Japan's economy weaken, the re-structuring of the Japanese economy has also caused a decline in funding and sponsorship for courses

growth of the program into a fully-fledged four-year program of Japanese Studies in 1986. Students at the University of Leuven enrolled in the Japanese studies program in the academic year 1999-2000 numbered eighty-nine.

Also the University of Liege (CEJUL: Centre d'Études Japonaises de l'Université de Liege) in the French-speaking region of Belgium offers an undergraduate course in the field of Japanese studies since 1991. Furthermore, the University of Gent (Rijksuniversiteit Gent, RUG) has included Japanese language in its curriculum since 1958. The University now presents a four-year program in Japanology as part of a larger program of oriental languages and cultures. Belgian students aiming to work in the business world connected to Japan can now focus on translation and interpretation techniques, and study Japanese business culture, leading to a Master's degree in Japanese studies at the Mercator Hogeschool in Gent. Finally, few other institutions such as the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL) offer courses in Japanese language and (business) culture as choice subjects.

Libraries with collections of books in Japanese and works on Japan such as those of the Universities of Gent and Leuven enjoy the support of the Japan Foundation. The former university library possesses an important collection of Buddhism-related works. The latter unfortunately suffered from a division along linguistic lines in 1966, when the unitary Orientalist Institute including the library was split into a French-speaking and a Dutch-speaking part.

Given the limited number of programs in Japanese studies at Belgian universities, the number of scholars specializing in the field is also restricted: an estimated five scholars in full-time positions, and thirty to forty others doing work that requires training in Japanese studies, such as assistants and lecturers. No separate Belgian organization for Japan-specialists exists, but most scholars in the field gather at the four-yearly conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies. Finally, in addition to the before-mentioned Japan Foundation and Satsuma Foundation, several several other organizations promote research on Japan in Belgium, in the form of financial assistance or student exchange. The Honda Foundation offers sponsorship for courses, books and scholarships; the Konishi Foundation provides support to enable universities to invite guest lectur-

Japanese Studies in Belgium

Bart Gaens

Lecturer, International Research Center for Japanese Studies

1. Current situation of Japanese studies in Belgium

The study of Japanese language and culture in Belgium has enjoyed growing popularity over the past fifteen years and is included in the curricula of several universities and colleges. Yet, only three institutions offer a program in Japanese studies as an undergraduate major. The University of Leuven (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, KUL) in the Dutch-speaking part of the country certainly has the most elaborate curriculum in Japanese studies.

In fact, Oriental studies in general has a long history dating back to the sixteenth century in the area now known as Belgium. The University of Leuven's College of the Three Languages (Collegium Trilingue) was founded in 1517 in order to instruct Latin, Greek and Hebrew to theology students. Although Oriental studies later expanded to include Arabic and Aramaic, interest in Far Eastern studies remained undeveloped, given the lack of colonial interests in the region and the faculty's primary goal of exegesis of the Bible. It was not until 1928 that the study of Japanese language and culture appeared on the curriculum of the Faculty of Theology and the Faculty of Letters. This was thanks to Tokyo-industrialist Baron Satsuma Jihei, who funded the institution of a chair to study the history of Japanese civilization. The so-called Satsuma Chair led to the establishment of an independent Orientalist Institute of Leuven in 1936, offering a two-year study program leading to the degree of "Licentiate of Oriental Philology and Philosophy". Within the Institute a course in modern Japanese was added in 1963. When Oriental studies developed into a department with a four-year curriculum within the Faculty of Letters at the end of the 1970s, Japanese studies finally received greater attention. At the time Dr. Willy Vande Walle was in charge of the courses on Japanese language, culture and history, and he was furthermore at the basis of the

students there increase. Some years more than 100 students enter these courses. The lecturers are volunteers from JOCV and from our department. Most of the students of these courses are university undergraduate and postgraduate students from other departments. Such as Medical Studies, Engineering Studies, Historical Studies and Archaeological Department. 80% of 文部省 grants were received by these students. And if we talk about this year, 90% was given to these students. I think that this is right policy. Being very small country, Bulgaria cannot provide enough work places for specialists in Japanese Studies.

Now I would like to say some words about the regular support of the Japanese authorities such as The Japan Foundation, The 大阪万博基金, The 笹川平和基金, The Japanese Ministry of Education and Japan Embassy in Sofia. Because of this support all institutions in Bulgaria engaged in Japanese studies have very good facilities, language laboratories, and libraries which contain several thousand volumes. Of great importance also is dispatching of native Japanese lecturers provided by The Japan Foundation and JOCV. In most cases Bulgarian and Japanese lecturers work together and such work gives very good results.

At the end I would like to say that the situation in Japanese Studies in Bulgaria depends heavily on the economic situation in the country. I'm still optimistic and believe that as soon as economic situation in Bulgaria will become stable, the process of emigration will stop and our promising students who are enrolled in post-graduate programs in Sofia University and Japanese Universities will begin the academic activities together with the elder generation. Moreover, there are a lot of exciting scientific projects waiting to be developed in future. For example comparative research on ancient Japanese history and history of Mediterranean countries. I hope that well-known Japanese scholars will join the scientists from Sofia University in this future project.

dren demonstrated great interest to Japanese language studies, the teaching became systematically. And the department of Japanese Studies willy-nilly became a patron of the school and was forced to provide teachers. Along side with lecturers from department of Japanese Studies there are native Japanese teachers from JOCV. Children at that school unexpectedly speak really good Japanese. And when speech contests are held in Bulgaria the winners are always children from this school. Every year about 20 pupils enter the Japanese language class. Its pity that only a few of them can continue to study Japanese language at Sofia University at the department of Japanese Studies. In order to enter the University students have to pass entrance examination. The test is foreign language. The foreign language can be either one of western languages such as English, French, German, Spanish and Italian or Russian. Some years ago there was a great discussion about Russian language as entrance examination, along with western languages. And those who were in pro-Russian position in Ministry of Education won. So till now students can pass test in Russian.

The problem of pupils of Japanese language class is that they are good in Japanese but not in other languages. So often they can't pass entrance examination. Japanese language is not included in the list of foreign languages. Some years ago Secretary from Japanese embassy asked me why we could not decide this problem and include Japanese language into the list. There are two main reasons. First is that the number of those who would like to pass Japanese test is very few. On the other hand, if Japanese language will be included into the list, other eastern languages like Turkish also should be included. And one of the urgent ethnical problems which is not solved until now, is the relationship between Bulgarian majority (Christians) and Turkish minority (Muslims) Probably because of that University Authorities don't want to include either Japanese or other eastern languages into the list of entrance examination.

Veliko Tarnovo University organised Japanese Language Courses at the Department of Applied Linguistics in 1996. The lecturers from our department at Sofia University and Japanese volunteers also teach there. This is also very promising institution for development of Japanese Studies in Bulgaria.

After the establishment of Japanese Studies Department in 1990, the public open night courses were not abolished. Every year the number of

Sofia University. That's Chinese and Korean Departments. Both departments included in curriculum as second eastern language Japanese. The students of the Chinese Studies Department and Korean Studies Department expressed high interest in Japanese language, Japanese history and culture. But as lecturers at the Japanese Studies Department were very few they could not provide the whole scale of Japanese language teaching to students of Chinese and Korean Departments.

Ten years ago Sofia University was the only institution where Japanese language was studied systematically. From the beginning of 90s the economic situation in Bulgaria became very dramatic and at the same time a real boom of learning of foreign languages began. That's because in the present difficult economic situation many young people want to emigrate from Bulgaria. In 1990 East European iron curtain was risen. During next two years a lot of Bulgarians immigrated to USA, Canada, Taiwan and West European countries. But in two or three years those countries were frightened by the huge number of immigrants. And only really high specialists could obtain resident status in those countries. So some years ago a rumour began to circulate in Bulgaria that emigrants to USA and Canada with Japanese language qualification, rank second after computer programmers in their opportunity to obtain the Green Card and have the resident status. This rumour spurred up an interest in study of Japanese language.

However, the main reason behind the establishment of Japanese language courses or including it into the curriculum of other philological disciplines in major Bulgarian universities was the interest exhibited by the Japanese themselves, namely by JICA and JOCV. It is a well-known fact that the Japanese government and Japanese public organisations put effort into spreading the knowledge about Japan and into teaching the Japanese language all round the world. In 1993 an agreement on co-operation on the governmental level was signed with JICA and JOCV. In the same year the first group of Japanese volunteers came to Bulgaria. Next year under the request of JOCV co-ordinator the Japanese language became to be taught in main universities of Bulgaria and in some grammar schools.

In 1992 the Japanese language became to be taught at one of Sofia grammar schools. Pupils at that school begin to learn Japanese Language from the eighth form. So they are approximately 14 years old. At first it was no more than experiment, but as both parents (especially mothers) and chil-

at the Department—Turkish Studies. Another languages—Arabic, Persian, Armenian, Chinese were taught as elective units. There were also the public open Night Courses, where the same languages were taught. The number of students was limited to 24. Which was the amount of booths in the language laboratory at that time.

In 1973 some graduate students of Leningrad University, Department of Japanese Studies, had been appointed as a part-time lecturers and number of students at the Japanese Language Course increased. The next year (1974) by the initiative of the Vice-Director of the institute of Balkan Studies, who was acting as a head of Department of Oriental Studies simultaneously, the courses of Japanese literature, history and introduction to Japanese studies were arranged, and the night courses became more academic. For a long time these night open public courses aimed to increase the affinity of Bulgarian people with Japan, to enliven interest to Japan, while introducing Japanese culture to broader audiences. The activity of Sofia University is devoted to two main problems. First: Teaching process, writing teaching materials and research on methods of teaching Japanese language as foreign language to Bulgarian students. Second: Translations. In 70-80s the translation of some books on Japanese history, literature, including classical literature, classical poetry, 俳句, and modern prose were published. For example, 枕の草子、問わず語り、俳句、川端康成、有島武郎、芥川龍之介、谷崎潤一郎、and also SF by 小松左京、森村誠一. It would be interesting to say that all these books were widely read and always sold at once. At that time the number of specialists in Japanese was very few and I think that the main task of the Sofia University was to prepare a new generation of specialists.

So in 1990 the Japanese language chair was established. In the beginning students entered Japanese chair every second year, but since 1993—every year.

Up to 1991 higher education in Bulgaria was free of charge. But recently the economic situation became worse and now higher education is free of charge only partially, and even in state universities some students pay for their education and tax is rather high. But even in this situation, the number of students in Japanese Studies Department is increasing constantly. So, we can say that the interest for Japan as a country and also for Japanese studies is rather wide. In 1992 two new departments were established in

papers for the purpose of their own research work. But I was surprised that they did not know how to pronounce Japanese words, how to read characters—they knew only the meaning.

Since 1970 many Bulgarian students studied in Japan on the 文部省's students exchange scholarship program. For a long time the Bulgarian Government preferred to give scholarships to the students studying natural science and engineering, rather than to those studying philology.

Between 1970 and 1990 approximately 90% of Bulgarian students in Japan were studying electronic engineering, economics and medicine. Now, not Bulgarian government but 文部省 itself make the selection, but the principle of the distribution of scholarships is the same. Out of ten scholarships offered each year, eight are granted to students from engineering speciality and only two to students from Japanese Studies Department. It seems to be a right policy.

From 1973 Japanese studies in Bulgaria were concentrated in two institutions—Sofia State University and Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. The main focus made by Bulgarian Academy of Sciences is in political and economical studies. I would like to say some words about the specialists working in Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. Most of them graduated from Moscow State University and then continued their post-graduated education there. Well-known scholar Prof. I.Latyshv supervised many of them. That means their research themes were connected with the topics popular in the USSR, such as relations between China and Japan, relations between Russia and Japan and so on. Having returned to Bulgaria most of the specialists continued the same researches, but I think, those themes were not very important for Bulgaria. Only specialists in economy did research important for Bulgaria itself. For example, management of small and medium scale enterprises, labour-manager relations and so on. Recently in the so-called Quality Assessment Centre several workshops are carried out in co-operation with JICA. And many of Bulgarian managers studied in Japan, in JICA headquarters in Tokyo.

As for Sofia University, Japanese studies date back to 1968. In this year Mr. **Nacho Papazov**, who was an ambassador in Japan at that time, invited Ms 下瀬川 慶子 to teach Japanese language at Sofia State University.

So, in 1968 Miss 下瀬川 began to teach Japanese Language at the Department of Oriental studies. In those days there was only one speciality

In other countries such as Russia, Germany, France, there are enough institutions engaged in Japanese Studies. But taking into consideration the geopolitical location of Bulgaria, for a long time the government did not consider it important to encourage the development of Japanese studies. And although there was the institute of Balkan Studies in Sofia, no institute of Japanese Studies existed. At the same time Japan also did not express any interest to encourage Japanese studies in Bulgaria.

Until the 1970s research on Japan was carried out in some institutions, such as, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Social Sciences and others, but the scholars from these institutions were not specialists on Japan. They worked mainly using research of Russian academics. Probably the first step for setting up the Japanese Studies in Bulgaria was to dispatch Bulgarian students to Russian universities at the end of 60s and to establish Japanese language courses. Japanese language courses were established for the first time in 1966 in the Centre for Science & Technical Information. The first teacher was 金子暢良. I personally was not acquainted with him and don't know how and for what purpose he came to Bulgaria, but according to the opinion of the students, who attended his courses, Mr. 金子 was a rather good teacher. Many of the students, graduated from these courses worked for a long time as translators of scientific papers in the fields of chemistry, agriculture, electronic engineering and others. Apparently, Mr. 金子 loved Bulgaria and at the end of 60s he asked the Bulgarian authorities to give him Bulgarian citizenship. There was a great deal of talk about this in Bulgarian Academic circles. Even it was said that Mr. 金子 probably was a Japanese spy. It seemed strange to Bulgarians that somebody wanted to immigrate to Bulgaria. But I can say that the living standard from the end of 60s till mid-80s was quite high in Bulgaria, higher than in Japan at that time. May be it was the reason of his request. Anyway, Mr. 金子's request was rejected. That means that to receive Bulgarian citizenship was as difficult as to receive Japanese. Finally Mr. 金子 returned to九州. Now he is a professor at九州大学, Faculty of Languages and Cultural Studies. According to one student who stayed for a year in九州, Mr. 金子 still likes Bulgaria and regrets that he could not stay there forever. It would be interesting to say, that the students graduated from the courses of Mr. 金子—in most cases they were experts in the different fields of sciences—could translate very accurately the scientific

表1 ソフィア大学古典新言語学部における外国語学習者数 (在1990—1991年)

学 科	年 生					合 計
	一 年 生	二 年 生	三 年 生	四 年 生	五 年 生	
英語学科	108	154	170	94	86	612
ドイツ語学科	76	59	49	51	42	277
フランス語学科	61	51	62	63	43	280
古典ギリシャ語学科	20	8	5	9	3	45
アラビア語学科	15	18	11	10	10	64
スペイン語学科	15	14	17	21	18	85
日本語学科	9	0	0	0	0	9
ハンガリー語学科	8	6	10	6	5	35
トルコ語学科	7	10	9	6	8	40
インド語学科	7	7	3	4	10	31
イタリア語学科	7	6	11	9	9	42
ルーマニア語学科	6	4	3	4	3	20

古典新言語学部全体に占める日本学科学生の割合:0.6%(学部総計:1540名)

表2 ソフィア大学古典新言語学部における外国語学習者数 (在1992—1993年)

学 科	一 年 生		二 年 生		三 年 生		四 年 生		五 年 生		合 計
	無料	有料									
英語学科	97	1	102	3	121	0	144	0	107	0	575
ドイツ語学科	40	1	71	4	87	2	57	0	32	0	294
ギリシャ語学科	10	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
アラビア語学科	8	5	7	6	18	0	12	0	5	0	61
日本語学科	8	3	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	20
中国語学科	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
古典ギリシャ語学科	7	0	12	0	10	0	5	0	7	0	41
トルコ語学科	4	2	9	2	4	0	8	0	6	0	35
インド語学科	5	1	0	0	7	0	4	0	4	0	21
ルーマニア語学科	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	3	0	9
ハンガリー語学科	0	0	7	1	6	0	6	0	5	0	25

古典新言語学部全体に占める日本学科学生の割合:1.8%

(学部総計:無料1069名、有料37名、合計1106名)

表3 ソフィア大学古典新言語学部における外国語学習者数 (在1999—2000年)

学 科	一 年 生		二 年 生		三 年 生		四 年 生		五 年 生		合 計
	無料	有料									
英語学科	101	1	97	7	78	18	76	12	86	13	489
ドイツ語学科	75	5	51	12	66	13	66	6	39	3	336
ギリシャ語学科	26	3	22	7	13	14	13	5	9	8	120
アラビア語学科	27	0	13	10	13	8	8	8	7	6	100
ベルシア語学科	12	1	4	3	8	2	5	3	0	0	38
日本語学科	0	0	12	9	17	7	10	0	7	1	63
中国語学科	14	1	8	5	10	4	9	3	16	0	70
韓国語学科	9	0	13	2	11	4	7	0	0	0	46
古典ギリシャ語学科	9	0	6	0	12	0	8	0	5	0	42
トルコ語学科	23	5	11	11	17	4	8	3	10	3	95
インド語学科	12	0	9	5	7	4	4	2	7	1	51
ルーマニア語学科	13	0	12	5	5	0	6	0	3	1	58
ハンガリー語学科	16	1	10	5	10	3	8	2	3	0	58

古典新言語学部全体に占める日本学科学生の割合:4.03%(学部総計1563)

表4 東洋言語文化研究センターの講師数

学 科	常勤講師	非常勤講師	合計	学生数	講師一人当たり学生数
トルコ語学科	11	10	21	95	4.53
アラビア語学科	12	12	24	100	4.16
インド語学科	6	5 その内一人のインド人	11	51	4.63
日本語学科	5	8 その内三人の日本人	13	63	4.85
中国語学科	5	8 その内三人の中国人	10	70	7.00
韓国語学科	4 その内一人の韓国人	7 その内一人の韓国人	11	46	4.18
ベルシア語学科	4 その内一人のイラン人	0	4	38	9.5

Japanese Studies in Bulgaria

Lyudmila Holodovich

Visiting Associate Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies
(Associate Professor, Sofia University)

ブルガリアにおける日本語教育センター



western interpretations.

Japanese study of Irish history often gives a sharper focus to features in Irish history, which are a source of revisionist or post-revisionist debate in Ireland, and where informed outside observation is important: it seems to stress a surprisingly high degree of dependence on external trade, the absence of local rights by rural communities, and the sheer scale of structural change in rural communities over the nineteenth century.

The ultimate object would be to explore these themes, and to make them the basis of a collaborative book exploring some of these themes from the history of both countries. This could be preceded by a small conference: however its timing and funding would be a matter for later decision.

It had been hoped to get state financing for this project. Unfortunately, the large funding available in this year's spring has been changed in emphasis to concentrate on large projects rather than on smaller ones. It is however likely from internal resources in Trinity and some outside supplementation that it can be launched on a more modest basis..

¹ B.K. Marshall, *Academic freedom and the Japanese imperial university 1868-1939* (Berkeley, 1992), pp.110-111, 119-120, 160-2, 184.

² Niki Kenji, "Japanese studies in the US; historical development and present state", *Kyoto conference on Japanese studies*, vol. IV (Kyoto, International Research Centre for Japanese Studies, 1994), pp.127, 128,131.

³ James W. White, *Ikki: social conflict and political protest in early modern Japan* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1995), pp.78, 302; see also p.191.

The object of the project is: (a) to identify the concepts used in historical study, (b) to examine how they variously enhance or handicap interpretation, and (c) to develop or redefine them in a comparative sense, using Irish and Japanese history as the basis. While comparative themes have been widely pursued either explicitly or implicitly, they can prove misleading by being applied simplistically to historical situations, or the similarity of concepts often conceals some of the key differences in the actual historical contexts. The problem may arise either in their application to actual situations or simply into a misreading of analyses by a literal acceptance of the terms, which originated in one context and are never perfectly suitable for a second one. It is one might say a peculiar problem of intellectual globalisation.

A notable case is Maruyama's study of political thought, which often seems to distort Japanese history by an application of western philosophical concepts to the defining of Japanese politics, resulting in a somewhat forced seeking in history for western-style behaviour in Japanese political action. To take another example, the expansion of Japanese foreign trade in the early seventeenth century was part of a world-wide growth of foreign trade at the time: however, the similarity of language and phenomena conceals real differences (this has an important knock-on effect on the debate as to whether *sakoku* or "national seclusion", introduced in the 1630s. was damaging, and leads to a more favourable interpretation than is customary of both the motivations and results). The schooling system was much more dynamic than assumed because it lacked the centralised institutional basis which at least intellectually was common within European societies (a feature comprehensible to Irish students, but overlooked either by students from western societies, or by Japanese who model comparisons on western ones). Comparisons of archival and fiscal systems have surprising implications for understanding. In general, it may be added that the study of Japanese history in the west has been conducted in several countries (principally two, the United States and Britain) with a past of imperial and colonial expansion: this itself has an impact, sometimes obvious, sometimes more subtle: what this means is that study conducted by personnel from a non-colonial power has itself sometimes a surprising liberating influence on standard

VI

Comparative studies in history

The development of studies necessarily raises questions of comparison. I will confine myself to the area I am familiar with: history. Comparative history sounds good and it is fashionable. However, it is far from easy to conduct, and comparative conferences between two different groups do not advance our knowledge greatly. The conferences produce collections of good and readable essays. But on the specifically comparative theme the progress is often limited. Over the years I have been involved in four such conferences of Scottish and Irish historians, and some five of Irish and French historians. The results, while not a failure on the basis of conventional comparison with other such meetings, have greatly disappointed in terms of getting to grips in depth with comparative studies. The smaller the country and the less the diversity of scale between two countries, the greater the success in terms of interaction. Thus, the Scottish contacts have had a permanent ongoing result; the French contacts have had a smaller and less tangible one. Japan, big and different, presents the problems on an even greater scale

At the moment, with comparative work in mind, a project on "Comparative themes in history" is being considered under the tentative title: "Comparative concepts in history: a case study based on Japanese and Irish history."

Concepts are "traded" internationally in an intellectual sense. Concepts which originate in one culture are used either in interpreting or in describing social and cultural phenomena in another culture: this reflects many things, for instance the spread of western ideas (e.g. notably the influence of German philosophy in Japan), or simply an effort to explain to outsiders in terms familiar to them the phenomena in another society. However, the consequence is either that the explanation of events is forced into a straitjacket, or similarities are assumed by transplanting familiar terms from one context to another.

abroad for students who want to have a good general training in a foreign country, but it is less than satisfactory for students who want to learn Japanese (and who can in the right circumstances learn it very rapidly indeed). It should be noted however, that as Japanese is the first foreign language of many Chinese students coming to Japan, and they often have a good command of it, they provide a good environment for western students determined on language progress. However, it is not realistic to throw students, with a mere two prior years' study of the language behind them, into ordinary lectures. I am not sure how best that can be handled. Likewise, if there is an exchange basis with Japanese universities, a not dissimilar problem arises with Japanese incoming students, who would face the same problems in reverse.

An aspect of a semester or of a year abroad, already referred to, is the cost. The School of Business Studies in Trinity College sends up to 10 students to Senshu each year for a three-month stay (the overall costs are in the region of £3000 to £5000 per student). These are not at present language students. However, precisely because it is a elective possibility open to a very large class, it is possible to find students whose family or personal circumstances do not deter travel. In the case of students whose primary interest is Japanese culture however—where we are dealing with a small number of students, a situation quite in contrast to a small number of places open to members of a large class—one can not assume that private means and interest in the language go side by side. I confess that I do not know how we solve this problem, but I do not think Japanese studies will work satisfactorily unless assistance towards the costs can be provided in some way.

Undergraduate studies of course are essential. However, in envisaging the future, the prospect of developing post-doctoral work is also envisaged: e.g. invitations to Japanese in different areas to spend some time in the college, primarily to develop research contacts, but in some instances also to play some part, while they are in Ireland, in general teaching. That brings one on also to the question of comparative study.

tutorials in the Chester Beatty. This will prove a useful resource in devising a full blown course in the history of Japanese art. Currently the planning of a course in the history of art which would parallel the existing course in Japanese history is being projected.

There are two problems which arise in planning Japanese courses. The first is that if a four-year structure of Area studies is devised, it by definition creates something of the isolation which affects Japanese studies throughout the west. There is real conflict between the need to concentrate study of a difficult area, and the aspiration to draw into study of Japan students from a wide range of disciplines or backgrounds. Some of the problems arise from the fact that student choices of future studies and careers are not well defined at the outset of their university studies. How can one accommodate a student whose interest in Japanese studies emerges only in the course of his four-year programme of undergraduate studies?. Teaching in a full-blown four-year course is dependent by definition on a specialist intake: I think the regular intake will be small, and will also - something which cautions against either premature complacency or feelings of failure—vary very widely from one year to another. There is a case for seeking to create as an adjunct to a four-year structure a framework which makes it possible for students to begin in their third year: in other words to chose a Japanese vocation halfway through their studies. Their language learning will necessarily be small. However, more important than that is the motivation of students, and the prospect of highly motivated students with a wider background who may pursue their Japanese interests after they complete their primary degree.

The second problem to my mind is the need of study in Japan, a requirement probably of a year spent in Japan (in the third of the total four years of study). That brings up the question of how they can be catered for in Japan. One aspect is simply the economic cost for students. Another is that international centres are far from reassuring if English is the general vehicle of communication, or if they are switching to English as the best vehicle for teaching outside students (western and Asian alike). There is a tendency too for western students to be accommodated with other western students. All that may be satisfactory for an easy-paced year

Irish, one German). One problem is that, with little or no knowledge at the outset, they have to choose recent subjects with much literature in European languages. Two of the three students promise to be a success; one of them shows a striking linguistic aptitude. There are two observations which I would make. First, the Mombusho, faced with a need of making economies in the wake of the economic crisis in 1998, framed its policy for placing its foreign students in an insensitive and impractical way. This is especially so in the case of humanities subjects, where particular teachers and source bases of information are important. It was not without its benefits, though unintended. The student who was sent to Yamaguchi is the student who made the most progress in Japanese. The source base was limited there but he was in a totally Japanese-speaking environment. That does raise a central language problem in relation to the language training of students. While the Mombusho provides an essential and very welcome half-year language course before academic study begins, the teaching is not motivated by a powerful driving force to make as much progress as possible. The teaching is far too easy paced, and the approach needs to be recast.

V

Japanese Studies in Trinity College, Dublin

Having introduced Japanese combined with business studies, we are now in Trinity College contemplating the development of studies leading to a four-year programme of area studies. I am the chairman of a working group on this issue, and we hope to have finished our scheme and estimated the requirements by this autumn. There are several problems that arise. One is the question of resources, and that is a subject of importance, though not I think the most serious one. The bigger questions are intellectual ones, also the different alternatives in structuring courses, and the availability of expertise. We have of course that benefit of the Chester Beatty Library, which has a magnificent collection of Tokugawa art, probably the best in Europe. That is already a resource for the existing history course in Japanese history. In one term the students taking the course are divided into two groups for tutorials, half the total class attending a term's

books) from 1811 have not been integrated into the overall picture of Japanese policy and administration. How much reference is there in western text books (and for that matter in Japanese ones) to Sugimoto, Katagiri, Shuzo Kure, Uehara? The story is also divided into a tale of clashes between different philosophies. This is largely meaningless. Sadanobu's purpose in 1790 was essentially to strengthen or tidy up central administration. From this time the Hayashi family were brought more centrally into the picture, especially in foreign policy (though all policy is of course, because of a poor documentary base, hard to study for the Tokugawa period). It meant in essence an eclectic use of the services of the Hayashi and of Takahashi's Translations Bureau. If this was more professional than in the past (and it dealt very effectively and without conflict with the Golownin jiken), it was still open to professional rivalries, in other words factionalism. In fact, the problem with administration was less inadequacies (though they existed) than interference from opinionated outsiders. The *rangakusha* of the late 1830s can be cast in this role of opinionated and interfering outsiders (and the issue at this stage, one should remember, was the highly technical one of coastal defence, not the administrative one of diplomatic risks): this contrasts, under the assumption that *sakoku* was inherently foolish, with the halo of sanctity or virtue which they invariably and undeservedly enjoy. Hence by the late 1840s, they were well and truly frozen out, and for very good reasons, and Japanese administration had become more unitary, better able to respond to crisis. It was further professionalised in 1858 with the Hayashi, themselves a form of contracted service to the bakufu, in turn being replaced by an administration of officials directly under the control of the roju. Moreover, the weight of foreign affairs had been progressively shifting from Nagasaki to Edo from 1806-7 onwards. The Resanov affair in 1804 was the end of the glory days of Nagasaki diplomacy: the process of centralisation had begun. These comments may seem a digression, but they are not in the sense that they are features argued in the book I have been writing and which is nearly finished. It in turn grew out of the lecture course I began in 1988.

In that course, the emphasis was put on Tokugawa times rather than on recent times. The course has produced three *mombusho* students (two

not from misery as usually argued, but from improvements in society. That is interesting as an argument, but as he presents it, the argument has simply been shifted from an economic context to a political one. It is the state, not the economy, which is falling apart: he presented not simply a negative view of the Japanese state but a sweepingly negative image: "by the middle of the century the state had for all purposes capitulated to popular resistance" and "in the mid-nineteenth century... respect for the state was at an all time low".³

The Japanese state was however far from this condition: what was the purpose of the *Tsuko-ichiran* for instance? It is used as a documentary source, but rarely integrated into the political and administrative framework. It was an ambitious task launched in 1849 in preparation for an inevitable challenge, one which was anticipated. It also enabled the head of the Hayashi family to lead the Japanese deputation to meet the Americans in 1854. Were the negotiations a triumph of western diplomacy, or where they a triumph of Japanese diplomacy? I incline to the latter. Japan negotiated well with the west precisely because it was, despite the context of the *bakuhan taisei*, a coherent and well-organised state, and was in the process of reordering itself to meet new challenges in a world in which the old certainties of *sakoku* no longer held.

Because study of Japan has often been isolated from wider study of administrative institutions, and more particularly because it has been cast in a context of ideological divides, the administrative story that can be read from the surviving Japanese documents has not been seriously teased out. In a sense with the appointment of the five *gaikoku bugyo* in 1858, the Japanese administration went in a radically new direction. (While of itself a positive and necessary step, it of course added to tensions within Japan as it had implications for the future shape of the *bakuhan taisei*). Yet radical though the step was it was but the culmination of many smaller changes. Again the surviving documents of the *bugyosho* in Nagasaki help to give one an impression of how Japan functioned. In fact, their scale suggests that there is a case for reappraising the importance in the *bakufu* of the Nagasaki *bugyosho*. Moreover, the study of Dutch and the operations of the Banshowakaigoyo (or Office for translating barbarian

ically under or because of *sakoku*. Even Thomas Smith for instance on occasion seemed to say that Japanese foreign trade grew rapidly simply because *sakoku* ended (in other words, the post hoc propter hoc principle). It is not difficult to show that foreign trade would not have grown at an earlier date, and that when it did grow after 1868, it did so because of radically altered circumstances in the north Pacific (the resonances of which exist even in our own day). The image of Tokugawa performance and policy alike tends to be negative . Conrad Todman's text book, much admired and rightly so because of providing for a large cultural background and a long chronological spread (reasons why I strongly recommend it to my own students), often projects , beside many favourable comments, a somewhat negative overall image of the Tokugawa economy.

It is important to identify the assumptions involved in the study of history. Japanese studies at large tend to be an ingrown community. Japanese history also tends to be taught by specialists; in addition, Japanese historians who study western history do not teach Japanese history. In other words both Japanese and foreign historians of Japan seem to represent a group who approach issues in isolation from general historical study. Historical or economic models from other areas of study are sometimes brought into the picture of course, often however very artificially and on a slight knowledge of their implications. These models were and are arguably not relevant to explaining Japanese history. The most notorious example is Maruyama Masao who quotes Hegel on the second line of the first paragraph of his most famous book. Thereafter he tied himself in knots trying to explain why Japan did not behave like European society. Maruyama is more interesting to us to-day as a Japanese intellectual who began to teach in the late 1930s and to cope with the pressures of politics at that time than as a scholar of that past. The basis of his historical study is tied up too with the reliance on Ando Shoeki as a great thinker of Tokugawa Japan. There is too the interplay between Maruyama and E.H. Norman, the latter more and more a totally discredited figure. Again on a different plane, the peasant unrest or *ikki* theme is false. Aoki's statistics of *ikki* are hard to take seriously, and Borton's long essay in the 1930s studies, still often quoted in English sources, is chronically simplistic. Recently, the American scholar James White has argued that *ikki* sprung ,

tions raised by western relations with Asia that nineteenth-century events in China, and, in more recent times, the Great Pacific war and its aftermath suggested.

IV

Non-linguistic problems in Japanese studies

The general problem is all the more serious because even if teachers have linguistic competence, knowledge is often western-oriented, and can falsify understanding. It is particularly insidious in this context, because much writing in Japanese history has itself been heavily influenced by western values and assumptions. For instance, *sakoku* is often seen as an unnatural policy. In fact, it can be seen as rational, and only with the presence in Asia of outsiders in growing numbers in the nineteenth century did it become a policy which was likely to prove impractical. I know of no western book which regards *sakoku* as a rational policy, though it has to be said that on certain economic and political assumptions it was so. The debate within Japan from the late eighteenth century, reflecting a change in external circumstances, likewise was rational, especially if it is divested of the ideological content and divides in which both western and Japanese historians have usually cast it. The question was in essence a simple one: was the external danger serious and, if serious, how far should Japan go in making concessions in order to avoid war? Some historians—Ronald Toby and others—argue that *sakoku* as a clear-cut policy did not originally exist: only countries with a christianising zeal were excluded from Japan, and the policy as generally understood, was a new or redefined one of 1800 and later. They are correct in stressing that the original *sakoku* was itself simply a series of measures in a crisis-decade (1630s), not a complete policy. In any event there is no clear-cut documentary basis for the reasons suggested for the Japanese rebuff of the English approach in the 1670s (the fact that the English king was married to a Portuguese princess). Moreover, the discussion of policy in 1800 arose in a context of coping with problems: it makes more sense to see Japanese policy as clear cut on the principle, and divided on the question on the scale or seriousness of the external challenge. Japan also is taken to have suffered econom-

to China (September 2000) included education among its priority ends. University College, Dublin, recently launched a Centre of Asian Studies. However, the lecture at the inaugural meeting was given by an Irish newspaper correspondent in China (a very good one, I hasten to add). The China perspective was dominant, the concern was primarily with the economic significance of events, and with the benefits which would be reaped by taking an interest in them. Again on this occasion reference to generating serious study of Asian society or languages was scarcely in evidence.

All this brings one to the third point, the prospect of studies being conducted in global English, the spread of an insidious belief that English can be the vehicle of study of the east, and that the creation of western linguistic competence is wholly secondary. The development of exchanges of itself is of course welcome, and there are, it goes without saying, positive elements in creating new centres of Asian studies, or in enhancing the flow of students between Asia and Europe. However, from the point of view of serious academic study, it has the danger of perpetuating or even deepening a superficial study of society, and of keeping alive a western-centered emphasis in teaching and writing. There has certainly been a proliferation of courses in Japanese history in history or economics departments (revealingly, they tend to be largely courses on economic history). Outside the small number of centres which had already developed serious Japanese studies and which, if new, were founded rather early in the post-1945 period, courses have been prompted by Japan's success in the 1980s and by the advice being given at that time that European management should be remodelled on Japanese lines (that idea is certainly not in fashion at this moment as recent events have provide that Japan is fallible like the rest of the world and that Japanese success could hardly be explained simply by a succession of wonder businessmen or by harmony in the work place). Thus, the courses concentrate on the period from the late nineteenth century, and the text books with few exceptions are geared to the history of the last hundred years. The courses were thus dominated by current times, and ultimately by the single question as to why did Japan industrialise successfully. If taught on this basis and by people who know no Japanese the dangers of oversimplification are enormous. There is also far less attention than there should be to the whole range of political implica-

Japan nor Britain (if we except an English professor of globalisation!) were represented at the meeting. In other words, the two countries of the Eurasian land mass who have the most successful programmes were absent. Japan already has highly developed programmes of exchanges, which had wider perspective than the aims of this conference, and Britain could not but be distrustful of a programme motivated in part by an urge to balance movement not only into a more even two-way flow but by a shift of some of the movement from English-speaking to non-English-speaking countries.

Second, interest in Asian studies, and I have chosen to use the word Asian at this point rather than Japanese, tends to go in cycles. The interest was strong in the late 1980s, reflecting the extremely high prestige of Japan's technological and economic success; it declined significantly in the mid-1990s to a nadir point just after 1996 or so, and is growing again at the moment. Student interest reflects external perceptions in society, which in turn are driven by ever shifting views of the importance of countries and hence of the utility of knowledge about them. In the 1990s, apart from Japan's economic problems, interests in the west have been influenced even more directly by a perception, true or false, that the 21st century would be China's century, and that contacts with China would be the most fruitful. One aspect of this is of course simply a resurrection of a belief that had influenced policy in the nineteenth century, that the size of the Chinese market is so huge, that it will prove a source of vast returns to investment and endeavour, and that it was important to get in first, or at least on the ground floor as China's century came upon us. In the narrow cultural field, China's importance is illustrated by the number of Chinese students abroad especially in the US where the number of Chinese Ph.D. students is quite striking. Britain has sought also to attract this outflow and has had much success in doing so. It has greatly expanded the British Council role and staff in China, and a figure of 2000 scholarships a year by Britain was mentioned at the Fontainebleau conference. Even in Ireland, with minimum effort to develop language teaching tailored to Chinese students and an almost total lack of policy to attract them, some 2000 Chinese students come each year for language-learning courses, and, recognising this demand, a recent Irish government mission

narily high intellectual competence, and often, despite the war-time background against which their competence had been nurtured, a remarkable sensitivity to Japanese culture. One has to think only of Donald Keene or Louis Allen, to appreciate the importance of their later contribution to understanding of Japan in the west. It has however been concluded by one observer that even in this favoured area most of the development took place in the 1940s, and some reservations have been expressed about the linguistic competence of students "after the generation from the U.S. military language school [which] produced the most studious and genuine body of disciples in this field".² In recent times, the upsurge in Japanese students in Australia, which sees its future in the Pacific, is very noticeable and welcome, though the strength of this upsurge makes it unusual in the English-speaking world.

The backing for Japanese studies in depth does not seem strong in Europe. The ASEM conference, held in Fontainebleau in November 1999, on maximising student flow between Asia and Europe brought out how limited was the emphasis on language. The importance of language teaching and of developing teaching in depth of Asian studies was, to put it simply, ignored. Perfunctorily some speakers conceded that it was desirable, but did not pursue the issue or put priority on the development. These moreover were European; Asians at the conference displayed not such interest at all, and seemed to take it for granted that contacts would be in English. The conference, organised by the Singapore-based secretariat of ASEM was to a large degree driven in an Asian perspective by an urge to give Singapore a higher profile in cultural exchanges, and in a European perspective by an urge to maximise the flow of Asian students to European countries. The European stress was on the implications of the fact that the United States attracted the bulk of Asian students going abroad, and that generally Asian students were likely to go to English-speaking countries (United States, to less extent Britain, and even Ireland). The task therefore for Europeans was to even up the terms of exchange (as they had of course economic and political implications) and to ensure that non-English-speaking countries attracted more of the movement. The politics of this meeting were interesting. China played a low-profile role (no doubt sensing an anti-American urge behind the meeting), and neither

they actually go to Japan. That limits the range of work that they can choose: they will perform be limited at least at the outset to choosing subjects in which many of the sources are in English.

Moreover, specialist programmes apart, the language problem means that the teaching in many, although of course not in all courses on Japan in Ireland or in Europe, is superficial. Not only may the students not be learning Japanese but they are often taught in non-linguistic areas by people who themselves have no knowledge of Japanese. Hence much teaching will reflect a rather general interest, it will be superficial, and it will ultimately be dominated by western values. If not all students are taking language classes (and there is no reason why they should), it is all the more important that those who teach them can at least read Japanese. However, even in the country in the west in which Japanese studies are most developed, the USA, of 500 lecturers teaching Japanese history, Japanese reckon that half of them know the language. In history that in turn compounds the limited and superficial knowledge of Japan. In particular, study tends to concentrate on the twentieth century, more accessible in readily available literature and apparently more relevant because it touches on recent problems. It also tends to concentrate on the question of why Japanese industrialised rapidly. Hence it deals with superficial questions, is based on western and at times patronising assumptions (notably the imitation one), and disregards the Japanese past as an essential part of the story. Arguably, such an approach perpetuates old assumptions rather than creates teaching which leads to real insight

Even in the USA, the western country with the most comprehensive interest in Japanese studies, the range of recruitment of teachers has often been narrow. In the post-war upsurge in Japanese studies, many of the scholars were of Japanese origin, or sprung from parents who lived in Japan or were themselves married to Japanese. These things are of course in themselves strengths rather weaknesses, but ones which emphasised a rather narrow base for recruitment. Moreover, the post-war development of Japanese studies enjoyed an once-off artificial support from the war-time necessity of creating a corps of western officials with a knowledge of Japan. There was then in 1945 a small corps of people with an extraordi-

speakers in the United States, Britain or Ireland in learning other languages. There is unfortunately a qualitative difference in the motivation which prompts, say, young French men and women to acquire a knowledge of English, and the relative lack of interest in foreign languages among Irish, English and American students. This shows up very strikingly in the movement of Socrates students, i.e the excellent EU programme intended to enlarge the number of students spending one year out of their undergraduate studies in an university in another European country. The preference by Socrates students by and large is strong for places in English-speaking universities; and in Britain and Ireland there is a serious imbalance between a large inflow of students and a much smaller outflow of students: in other words there is a persistent structural deficit in the balance of student linguistic trade.

This linguistic problem also affects the development of language teaching in Japanese or in other Asian languages. In proportion to the many Asians who speak English, and English is ever more the global language of transcontinental communication, it becomes harder to convince European students of the value of mastering a language entirely from outside the European linguistic groups. Global English is to be deplored: whatever about the superficial ease in communication it creates, its effects in purely academic terms are likely to hinder the proper development of serious and well-informed study.

III

Linguistic problems in the development of Japanese studies

There are several problems in relation to Japanese studies which strike one. The first is the question of language. The role of global English apart, Japanese is perceived as a difficult language (though for a European, a language with only two irregular verbs can not be described as in all respects difficult). A practical problem in building up an interest in Japanese studies is that, unless good prior Japanese language teaching exists, students at present will have no knowledge of Japanese when or if

would necessarily remain small. There remained a need both to develop Japanese studies elsewhere, and to extend teaching to the humanities. A criterion would also be that one should aim not only to teach students a range of knowledge, but eventually that some students should go on to do graduate work, preferably in Japan so that in the future there would be a small group of academic specialists, who as far as possible would also have a command of Japanese, and who would at a later date be able to teach from first-hand knowledge courses in humanities subjects.

A Japanese Studies Committee was established in Trinity College in 1989. The first outcome of that was to provide language teaching within the university. That teaching has been successful in the sense that it has now lasted a decade; it is now conducted at three levels, which means that some students have persisted over three years. However, very few undergraduate students have taken the courses, because their study programmes are already heavy, and attendance at the courses does not give any academic credit. In Ireland as well as in Britain, knowledge of foreign languages is poor. The same problem has arisen even with European languages. Hence, increasingly in recent years language courses for which credit can be obtained have been designed to fit into teaching programmes: in particular full-blown degree structures courses integrating language and special study (a language and law, a language and business studies; a language and engineering etc) have been devised. There is still however an urgent need to ensure that students acquire and improve a knowledge of at least one foreign language. In both countries the capacity has fallen noticeably behind enhanced linguistic skills in other European countries. Of course, in Europe increasingly this has taken the form of students learning "global" English, and knowledge of French, for instance, among Spanish, Italian, Scandinavian and German students has fallen quite dramatically. Three decades ago by and large one dealt with professors and civil servants of the older generation in Italy or Spain for instance who spoke their native language, and French as their first or only foreign language. English is a part of a process of linguistic globalisation, in which English is coming to be seen as the world language: this encourages other students to learn English and hence to become effectively bilingual.

Perversely this has reinforced the existing poor record of existing English

understand Japanese history of going back well before the Meiji period. Travelling in Japan, one became aware that, while Japan's success in the mid-1980s was in some measure due to the circumstances of the decade, it also drew on strong historical roots. I had read almost two decades earlier a remarkable book by Ishikawa Shigeru, *Economic Development in Asian Perspective* (Tokyo, Hitotsubashi University, 1967), which underlined the fact that at the time of the Meiji Ishin, output per hectare was as high as a century later in the 1960s in many parts of Asia, a cautionary lesson indeed against assuming as economists at the time did in the west that Japan's development could be easily and effortlessly reproduced in other countries. While not a historical text, it implied strongly that Japan's history was different to the model of a less developed country in which in the west its history was often cast, and hence after reading the book I began to give Japan more attention in a course which in the 1960s I gave on economic development to students in economics.

The historical basis of Japanese success was very evident: as a society it had a coherence, and its modern success was based less on imitation (the patronising western explanation) than on its own inner resources, human and economic. I began to teach myself Japanese, and then decided to teach a course in Japanese history. That course began in the autumn of 1988. It was until recently I think the sole humanities course in Japanese studies in universities in the republic. At much the same time, courses in Japanese language began to appear. The emphasis was however on Japanese language linked to business. There have been two such courses in the Republic, one in Dublin City University, the other in the University of Limerick. The former course has been highly successful with an intake of 10 students a year (though, apart from a course in specialised translation work, it has never outgrown the link between Business and Japanese); the latter has been less successful.

The overall situation of Japanese studies was unsatisfactory. Japanese was taught in only two universities, and solely in the context of Business Studies. That was itself of course a big advance, and the universities concerned deserve warm congratulations in taking the first step in an area making serious demands on students, and in which student numbers

interest in Ireland, and slower to develop. The Olympic Games of 1964 gave Japan much publicity and some focus in Ireland; in that decade also, scientific organisations began to hold some of their international conferences in Japan, which of course were also attended by Irishmen. Hence, a modest corpus of knowledge of Japan began to develop, and especially in the sciences there are a significant number of people who have at least visited Japan for this reason on one or more occasions in a lifetime. As tourism developed, no real current of Irish tourism to Japan developed: a measure of this is the fact that the long lists of air fares in Irish (or for that matter British) newspapers still rarely quote fares to Japan. The primary reasons for the lack of growth of course is that Japan is seen as a very expensive country the hotel prices quoted in comments are often of hotels of the level of the new Otani or the Four Seasons in the Chinzan-so (which would strike fear into the average Japanese as well and empty his pocket)! It is also perceived as a country in which the foreigner would run into serious language difficulties: in contrast to Japanese tourism to Europe group travel in the reverse direction is very small. In all these circumstances it is hardly surprising that scholarly contact itself was slow to develop. In the 1960s and early 1970s, I think the only Irish scholar with some first-hand knowledge of Japan, who also met Japanese scholars in Japan, and on whom they regularly called in Ireland was Roger McHugh, primarily a specialist in Anglo-Irish literature. In history there were no contacts (though one or perhaps two professors did visit briefly Ireland around 1970). Irish Historical Studies, of which at the time I was treasurer had a single subscriber in Japan at the outset of the 1970s. That subscriber was Matsuo Taro. Others began to appear later.

My own awareness of Japan began only from the time that Professor Matsuo, though already a university lecturer, decided to register for one year as a student in Trinity College in 1972, and it became a serious interest only from the time of my first visit in 1985. While the visit was mainly confined to Tokyo, I went as far afield as Kakunodate, then a much more remote and unknown place than it is now, to visit the thatched samurai houses, and Hagi, because of its association with Yoshida Shoin. Both visits were instructive. So was the magnificent museum of Japanese history in Sakura. These visits convinced me of the need in seeking to

have published books, and Hearn himself is of course a subject of ongoing debate and polemics. An article in the *Japan Times* on 20 Jan. 2000 shows how this argument is capable of ongoing development. It is in a sense now an academic industry. Hearn can be seen also as fitting into the interest in the exotic or unspoiled. While he is usually seen as an interpreter of Japan, his significance in some respects springs from trends in literature, which sought to look at unspoiled life and values. Perhaps Hearn has been isolated too much in debate in Japanology, also in the complexities of his life and the contradictions of his statements and instability of temperament and views, and has not been looked at sufficiently as a teacher of literature, and a rather good one apparently. He was essentially, despite a Japanese wife and an involvement in Japan, an international man of his age, and corresponds closely to the themes which come up in Loti (notably in *Pêcheurs d'Islande*), in Synge and Yeats, Lady Gregory and so on. Moreover, his influence in Japan, through his lectures at Todai, was related to the rise of a Japanese interest in world literature, just as in another medium, painting, work like Asaichu's seems to reflect a not dissimilar interest (even down to his Japanese painting—quite different from his French painting—which captures old houses and rural scenes). They fit, despite the nuances in their work, into a cosmopolitan rather than national setting (Chamberlain, a figure in the Hearn saga, great scholar of Japanese culture though he was, does not really fit into it), and perhaps conveniently in terms of Japanese awareness of outside literature around the figure of Natsume Soseki. Because Hearn was temperamental, and his moods varied, it is perhaps too easy to pay more attention to superficial things in his life and his fluctuating opinions rather than to the wider context. In other words, Hearn studies would gain from being put in a wider context.

II

Irish study of Japan

Hearn is the association with Japan which is now fairly well known in Ireland. That brings me to the main topic of this talk: What of the Irish interest in Japan? It was much smaller and more superficial than Japanese

young Japanese scholars to-day to appreciate how difficult intercontinental contacts were even into the early 1970s, and how little direct personal contact many distinguished scholars had had with Europe. Otsuka, Professor Matsuo's professor and mentor, a great figure in European history in *Today*, for instance, visited Europe once only and then, late in his career, in 1962 and briefly.

There were of course others in the 1960s who were beginning to have an interest: some were specialists working quietly in their own institutions, others were anxious to create a network of scholars, Japanese and Irish, like Professor Doi of Nagoya who with little financial support was to publish for many years an excellent journal of Celtic studies, *Studia celtica japonica*. The number of scholars interested in Ireland is still not large of course, but the measure of vitality of this interest is less its numbers than the fact that it has created students, and there is now a corpus of young scholars who visit Ireland, and who research Irish topics. This interest is of course much more evident in literature, where Yeats and Joyce stand in some ways preeminent in the English-language literary influences in Japan. But more modestly—much more modestly—it also exists in History. The measure of that is of course the appearance of monographs of quality in Japanese, and regularly articles on Irish subjects in periodicals. I can think of a half dozen books in Japanese on Irish studies in the last eighteen months. Japanese study of Ireland is now in a second generation, and some of these scholars of the second generation are now old enough to be instructing students who will, we hope, provide a third generation.

This pattern of growth of course corresponds to the general post-1945 development of Japanese universities. The Irish interest is a small segment of a serious and very broad study of the outside world. The one exception within Irish studies in Japan is of course study and research in Anglo-Irish literature, where the knowledge of English and the importance of Anglo-Irish literature in English studies world-wide combine to give it a range and strength which can not be matched in other aspects of academic study. Lafcadio Hearn is of course another theme. This is a theme in which there is an interest on the Irish side. Sean Ronan and Paul Murray

been in Ireland, and how little contact existed between the two countries at the time of his first acquaintance with Ireland in 1972. There was, he noted, only the presence each year of a Japanese student financed by the Irish government, and a very few Japanese scattered across the Dublin Institute of Advanced Studies, University College Dublin and the New University of Ulster. The student in 1972-3 we can identify as Matsuoka Toshi, engaged in studies in the Irish language, who was later a colleague in Hosei Daigaku, a fluent speaker of Irish and a researcher in medieval Irish. Among the others in the Republic of Ireland he met were Professor Imaeda Kuni who was at the Institute of Advanced Studies, and Dr and Mrs Ushioda (Dr Ushioda was a member of the Department of Chemistry in University College, and his wife was part-time curator of the Japanese collections in the Chester Beatty Library). These were the only Japanese in academic life in Dublin. There was also a department of Japanese in the New University of Ulster Coleraine; but forming part of the British system, it had little wider impact in Ireland, south or north. When Matsuo arrived in Dublin in 1972, he had no advance practical knowledge, no introductions to the universities and no details of their requirements for student admission, simply a plan of studying in Ireland. He arrived in Ireland in April, when in Japan a university year was beginning, but in Ireland one was already coming to an end. He was turned down in one university which he had approached as he saw it as the one best provided to make contact with the dominant cultural and religious tradition on the island. As a result of this rejection, he then applied to Trinity College, which he had seen as an Anglo-Irish institution and where at that time, as he later noted, more than half the students were protestant and many moreover non-Irish.

In 1990 he recalled the extent of the changes since his first visit in 1972. Compared with some 30 Japanese in Ireland in the early 1970s, there were about 500 at the later date. In 1972 there had been no Japanese contacts with the modern history department in Trinity; at the later date there were one or more Japanese in the department every year, and one had submitted a Ph.D. thesis in 1990. In his 1980 book, *Airurando mondai no shiteki kozo*, he recalled that in the field of economic studies he was the first Japanese historian to make a long stay in Ireland. It is impossible for

attracted many students. He did not have a direct personal interest in Irish history. He was primarily interested in Weberian historical thought, and in early European economic history. A collection of his essays was put together and a translation published in 1982 as *The spirit of capitalism: the Max Weber thesis in an economic historical perspective*. Otsuka, like others at the time of the Occupation and afterwards, was also concerned with Japan's place in the modern world and with the western countries with which Japan would have to compete in the post-war world and whose history would provide lessons for Japan's success, even survival. Hence he was, as a post-war teacher in the age of reconstruction interested in British history. Interested in such, he was necessarily aware of the Irish question, perhaps the major nineteenth-century problem of England. Hence he had one of his students, Matsuo Taro, study the Irish question and England as a Ph. D. subject. From this came Matsuo's interest in Ireland, which, after he completed his thesis, became a country which he studied in great detail. He was already well-informed about Ireland when he arrived in 1972, and at that time he spend two years in Ireland. He was interested primarily in rural history, but at the outset, given the English perspective of some of his preceding study, he was also interested in other aspects of Irish history which bore on Britain: he already had an absorbing interest in the northern problem: with the help of a librarian he compiled a bibliography of the soaring volume of writings on the question, and his own later studies (additional to his work on rural history) were to cover not only current northern events but the historical background and the rural roots to the Orange Order. He is in my opinion the Japanese who has come closest to Oshima Shotaro in the range and depth of his Irish knowledge. A collection of his essays, published in Japanese, brings out the range of his interests (but it was so wide that it does not cover it fully). His final article moreover, one that appeared just after his death in October 1997 was an essay on Otsuka.

Japanese who knew Ireland were few; those who visited it apart from known cases such as Yanaihara and Oshima even fewer; the long period of war, the high costs of travel, international economic problems all combined to slow the development of an interest. Matsuo was to remark in a paper reporting his 1990 visit how little knowledge of Japan there had

The late Professor Matsuo has written at length of it ("Researches on Irish land laws undertaken by Japanese Bureaucrats facing the tenancy question in the 1920s", *Hosei shirin*, vol.xlvi (1978).

Who was the first Japanese who visited Ireland? As in the case of the first Irishman to visit Japan, we can in no way be perfectly sure. It is far from clear that Japanese came to Ireland to study in Meiji times. This question has been asked on several occasions by Japanese. I can find no evidence of such cases, and the college records are structured in such a way that if students were not reading for a degree, their presence was not recorded or at any rate not recorded in the formal record which survives. There were therefore perhaps no examples of the sort of movement of students that can be found from Japan to Scotland, for instance. Of course such students were prompted by the prestige of the physical sciences in Scotland, and Irish universities were not the leaders in these areas.

In academic study of Irish themes, the first serious scholar was Oshima Shotaro, later professor of English literature in Waseda University. He was also one of the first foreign scholars to appreciate Yeats' significance. He visited Ireland, and renewed the contacts in the three years he spent in Oxford at the end of the 1930s. He knew Yeats and among his many books he later wrote a magnificent *Gendai Airurando bungaku kenkyu* (published in 1956). Yeats dedicated a poem to him, and Shotaro also published a collection of his own poems in English, many of which were on Irish themes.

However, Shotaro and Yanaiharu aside, active Japanese academic interest in Ireland is substantially post-war. It can be dated of course to the continued growth of Yeats studies in Japan (in which Shotaro was central) and to the invitations to Professor Roger McHugh, a specialist in Anglo-Irish studies in University College, Dublin, to Japan. I think McHugh visited Japan on a number of occasions, and his address to the Japan Yeats Society in 1970 was the occasion of a poem by Oshima dedicated to him. An interest in Irish history began much later than that in Irish literature. Indirectly it seems to lie with Otsuka Hisao, who was such an influential figure in the postwar development of European history at Todai, and who

later some Irishmen in Meiji service, but this is a relatively small aspect of the total outside presence in Japan. The late Sean Ronan, a retired Irish ambassador, has over the years sought to document this aspect.

Some interest in Japan recurred at the end of the nineteenth century. Lafcadio Hearn's books were purchased at the time in Ireland. As the Trinity College Library had English copyright privileges, it rather rarely purchased English-language books from outside Britain and Ireland; however the American first editions are in the library; Synge the dramatist was aware also of Hearn and his work. Yeats had an interest in the *no* theatre and wrote *no* plays. All this testifies to a fashionable interest in Japan, not to a wider or deeper one. There was moreover scarcely any attention in Ireland to Hearn after the first decade of the century until the 1970s or even 1980s when interest grew rapidly. His name is now well known, though knowledge of his work has not quite kept pace with awareness of his name. It is arguable whether Yeats understood *no*, though its sparseness of style undoubtedly had resonances for some one wanting to write theatre, as Yeats did, in dignified and poetic language.

What of Japanese interest in Ireland? Ireland or Irishmen featured in a few novels. The first serious interest in Ireland may have come at the end of the 1910s because of the parallels between Japan's involvement in Korea, and Britain's simultaneous problems in Ireland. There are two recent studies of this interest. One is "Yanaihara Tadao and the Irish question: a comparative analysis of the Irish and Korean questions, 1919-36" by Susan C. Townsend in *Irish Historical Studies* (Nov. 1996), and the other "Yanaihara Tadao to Airurando: fukin kara mita kokumingaku" by Saito Eiri in *Rekishi no naka no gendai: seiyo- Ajia-Nihon*, edited by Nakamura Katsumi (Minuruwa shoten, Kyoto, 1999). Yanaihara was of course a professor in Todai, who was the compiler of the *Catalogue of Adam Smith's Library* (Iwanami Shoten, 1951): some may be aware also of him as one of the parties involved in the conflicts in the Economics department of Todai in the 1930s.¹ He wrote about Ireland as late as 1936. In the 1920s Japanese official concern with land reform led to study of the Irish land reform of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries by Ko Sawamura and Okuda Iku in the Ministry of Agriculture.

Japanese Studies in Ireland

L.M.Cullen

Professor, Trinity College

I

Historical and cultural ties between Ireland and Japan

What were the relations between Ireland and Japan before Meiji times and in the Meiji period? Japan featured in Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* which was published in 1726. It was written therefore before Kaempfer's account of Japan was published. What was the source of his interest and knowledge? This is a small but intriguing point. His close ties with London may have made him aware of Sir Hans Sloane's acquisition of the Kaempfer manuscripts and of the imminent publication in 1727 of the translation. There was some writing again at the beginning of the 1850s. In between these dates, Arthur O'Connor and Wolfe Tone, two revolutionaries of the 1790s, referred briefly to Japan in their writing. The 1790s and 1850s were periods when an interest in the north Pacific and in Japan respectively were fashionable. The Irish interest was slight, but it somewhat paralleled western interest at large, more particularly in the timing.

Who was the first Irishman to visit Japan? We have to make a distinction between seeing Japan and the first landing in it! Ambrose Sutton, the second in command of La Perouse's squadron, the voyage of which was prompted by curiosity about the cold waters to the north of Honshu, certainly saw Japan in 1787, but did not land. Probably the first Irishman in Japan was Willis, medical doctor to the British legation. Willis was an interesting man; a friend of Satow, the Westerner who in the 1860s mastered the language more quickly and more completely than any other foreigner at the time; both men were out of sympathy with Harry Parkes, the impatient and aggressive head of the British legation. Willis helped to care for the Satsuma wounded in 1868, and hence knew Saigo. There were

founding of the Chuka Minkoku (Republic of China), Japan refused to use this official Chinese name in its diplomatic documents, and instead called China the Shina Kyowakoku as a way of denying its full legitimacy. The increased American influence in the Chinese government that was a byproduct of the return of Chinese students from the United States—symbolized by the political marriage between the Japan-trained nationalist leader Chiang Kai-shek and the Wellesley graduate Song Mei-ling in 1928 at a turning point of Chiang's unification and modernization programs—also made Japan feel uneasy about its share in China. (Song's father was a Christian missionary. Her brother Song Zi-wen, a graduate of Harvard and a Ph.D. from Columbia, was for years the Financial Minister. During WWII he was China's Foreign Minister based in the US and played a key role with first lady Song Mei-ling in lobbying President Roosevelt to support China. For Chiang Kai-shek, getting married to Song Mei-ling and making the connection with her family was so desirable that he even agreed to be converted to Christianity.) A series of conflicts from the "Twenty-one Demands" of 1915 to the "Manchuria Incident" in 1931 finally led to the second Sino-Japanese War of 1937-45, and Chinese studies of Japan in this period were predominantly studies of the enemy, except such cultural studies done by Zhou Zuoren, Dai Jitao and others based on their personal experiences. And this situation was going to last until the 1960's as consequences of the influence of the Cold War. I've already mentioned the major changes and gradual developments since then. It is my sincere hope that China's study of Japan in the 21st century as a whole will follow these changes and developments to become a meaningful study of a partner as well as a competitor in a positive sense.

I would like to stop here and make some concluding remarks, or offer a very brief historical overview. China probably has the longest history of Japan studies in the world, because early Japanese history was recorded in China's dynastic histories. But generally speaking until the late 19th century Japan was considered a so-called "Eastern barbarian" state and the level of its civilization was perceived as not as high as contemporary China. Only a relative few open-minded writers and scholars were aware of the merits of Japanese people and their culture. For example, the famous Tang poet Li Bai (Li Po) valued his friendship with the talented Japanese student Abe no Nakamaro, and the famous Song scholar Ou Yangxiu praised the Japanese technology of making fine swords and Japan's role in preserving ancient Chinese books. During the Ming Dynasty, the Japanese pirates and Toyotomi Hideyoshi began to challenge the Chinese world order in the East Asian region, and China was greatly disturbed and shocked by these "troublemakers." Therefore some Chinese scholars began to take Japan seriously, and a number of books on Japan's history and culture were produced. During the two decades before the Sino-Japanese war of 1894-95, China studied Japan as both a potential rival and a potential collaborator, because both countries then were trying to gain big-power status in order to survive in an increasingly imperialistic world in which the law of the jungle prevailed. As you know, contrary to the expectations of some Western observers, China lost its war with Japan. But this was not due to the significant difference in the number of battleships and cannons, rather it was because of its weakness in training of troops, poor coordination among regional military leaders, and inferiority of its network of military and political intelligence. After the war China came to a new appreciation of Japan's success in modernization and sent hundreds of students to Japan for westernized training and preparation to adopt Japanized western legal and educational systems. But unfortunately Sino-Japanese relations got worse again after the collapse of the Qing dynasty in 1911, and finally another war was fought, mainly because of Japan's unceasing expansion on continental China and the rise of Chinese nationalism and American influence in China. When China became a republic rather than a Japanese-style enlightened monarchy in 1912, the republican form of government symbolized China's departure from the Japanese model, and it was a big shock to Japan. Partly because of China's disorder, for about two decades after the

the case of Jiang Baili, which in my view illustrates best one end of this spectrum that may be called a tightness antagonistic acculturation; and the case of Zhou Zuoren, which exemplifies the other end of the spectrum that may be called reciprocal acculturation.” And finally she concluded that “both the cases of Jiang Baili and Zhou Zuoren, therefore, reaffirm and reject at once the argument of the existing scholarship. Indeed, Jiang Baili came to Japan with the goal of modernization, and became politicized there, and left Japan westernized. Yet the pattern of his thought and behavior differs little from that of a traditional loyal statesmen, therefore, culturally, it extends an existing mode rather than breaking from it.”

“Zhou Zuoren came to Japan with a similar goal, but he was not politicized in the same way as Jiang or other radical revolutionaries, whose aim was cast at either replacing or strengthening the existing state power. He did not become westernized, either. But his seemingly retrogressive fascination with premodern Japanese literature originated from a more inclusive cosmopolitan spirit, which was potentially a powerful alternative to the narrowly focused, state-centered, and conflict-oriented nationalism. From Japan he returned with a firm conviction: beyond nations there is culture and humanity.”

It was true that Zhou married a Japanese woman and loved Japanese food, clothes, and houses. But I'm not going to dwell on the food and clothes, rather I would like to touch Zhou's perception of Japanese houses as quoted by Lu. Zhou said, “I like the Japanese style house very much. It is not that I only like ancient stuff. . . . What I like is its usefulness that especially suits simple life.” In his eyes the four-mat, yonjo or yojohan (laughs), furniture-less tatami room in a boarding house served all kinds of purpose with a short-legged small table for writing, which is the kotatsu, “the whole room became a big desk for paper and books.” “It could be a spacious living-room to entertain six or seven guests and allow them to sit wherever they pleased.” “There is no need for a sofa, because one can lie down right there when one is tired. It converted to a bedroom when bedding was taken out of the closet and laid out on the floor.” On the contrast, a “Chinese apartment made one feel confined, as little space is left after bed, table, chairs, trunks and shelves are put in.” These passages clearly showed Zhou's appreciation of the Japanese values and sensibility.

bronze mirrors” with the name of a Chinese era. Professor Hu Xinian made a good point concerning the political sense and cultural talents of the kentoshi, the Japanese envoys and student monks to the Tang China. Professor Ren Hongzhang discovered some indirect but interesting relations between the Emperor Kangxi of the Qing dynasty and the Shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune of the Edo period. Professor Tan Ruqian, originally at Chinese University of Hong Kong and now at Macalester College in Minnesota, compiled a comprehensive bibliography of Chinese translations of modern Japanese books and recently wrote an article arguing the Chinese indebtedness to modern Japanese culture. Professor Wang Xiangrong studied the Japanese teachers hired by the late Qing government, in Beijing as well as in local provinces, emphasizing their roles in China’s modernization programs. And finally at National Taiwan University in Taipei, Professor Huang Junjie has organized several research projects on Japanese Confucianism, in which I am also involved.

I’m not going to give further details about these contributions. Rather I’d like to introduce a junior scholar who takes a postmodern approach to Sino-Japanese relations in the modern times. A graduate of Fudan University and a Ph.D. from Cornell, Lu Yan is now teaching at the University of New Hampshire. I met her in May 1999 at a workshop held at UC Santa Barbara, and was impressed by her paper. She made a comparison of Jiang Baili (1882-1938) and Zhou Zuoren (1885-1967), two Chinese students in the late Meiji Japan. Jiang was awarded with a fine sword by the Meiji Emperor in recognition of his outstanding records at the Rikugun shihan gakko (The Military Cadet Academy). Zhou was a brother of the famous writer Lu Xun (Zhou Shuren’s pen name), and he himself was also famous for his writings. I want to read some passages from her paper.

Lu wrote that while there were two “assessments [that] defined Japan’s role differently, they seem to be built on similar assumptions. Both place Japan within a political narrative of Chinese nationalist revolution and Chinese modernization, thus Japan is perceived more objectively as either a medium or a place, or more subjectively as a willing benefactor in that process.” What she was trying to do is to “test the limit of its scope and to venture into the possible realm beyond.” She pointed out that “with a wide spectrum of that experience in mind, the essay focuses only on two cases:

Meiji Restoration, entitled “Japan’s decisive Century” (Nihon o ketteishita hyakunen). As the party’s general secretary, Hu showed his attention to Japan’s modern experience and his enthusiasm in modernizing China by recognizing Yoshida’s essay.

Third, a conference I personally attended in Zhengzhou in 1983 was important. The conference theme was the modernization experience of the major western powers. Professor Luo Rongqu at Beijing University introduced the development of the modernization theories in the United States, and I made a presentation surveying its spread in Japan and other western nations. But right before the conference, the conservative CCP leaders launched a political campaign to “clean the spiritual pollution from the West.” I remember we were able to have open-minded discussions on the first day. But when the secret news arrived at the conference hotel, from the second day, people began to be close-mouthed on the sensitive issues in order to avoid trouble. Otherwise, you were likely, you know, to be charged. So it hasn’t been easy to look at things Western objectively at all times in China. Sometimes the progressive leaders would encourage you to do so, but sometimes the conservative leaders would stop you from doing that.

Next, I’d like to talk about some efforts made by Chinese scholars to discover the originality and merits of Japanese culture. I think it is possible to characterize their attitude as “free from Sino-centric or Euramerican-centric views.”

I guess I should divide the Chinese scholars into two groups of the senior scholars and the junior scholars. The senior scholars’ contributions are mainly in the history of Sino-Japanese relations, and they were trying to take a more balanced view of that history. Because ancient Chinese historians had recorded the early Japanese history in the histories of Han and Wei and so forth, contemporary Chinese scholars are still benefiting from these source materials. This is also because they have solid reading knowledge that prepares them to handle the materials. But the important change has been that they not only look at the early Japanese history from the traditional viewpoint of the tributary system, but they are also trying to look at it from the viewpoint of cultural and economic interchanges. For example, Professor Wang Zhongshu offered an influential hypothesis on the puzzles of the location of Yamatai-koku and the producers of “the hundred

know, and especially those from Shanghai. First I want to mention the earliest departure from the official ideology, which was the recognition of the high growth of postwar Japanese economy in the early 1960s in China. In East Asian region, the early 1960s was a very difficult time in terms of the Cold War tension between China and Taiwan, and also between China and Japan. Most scholars then were using Leninist theory on imperialism to analyze Japanese economy and politics. But Professor Jiang Zehong at Fudan University published an article in 1962 in the "Journal of Economic Studies" that recognized the high growth rate of the postwar Japanese economy. Japan had just started take-off then, and the doubling-of-income plan was fulfilled some eight years later, around 1970. Right at this starting point of the take-off, Jiang was already aware of it. But the more important thing here was that his article, although doubted and criticized by some conservative scholars and editors, was supported by Premier Zhou Enlai as well as Liao Chengzhi who was in the charge of Japan affairs. And that was why Jiang was able to publish his article openly. There was at this time a sort of division even at the highest level of Chinese government, and such leaders as Mao Zedong were still in the grips of a revolutionary fever; but leaders like Zhou Enlai and Liao Chengzhi began to open their eyes to the West and to neighboring Japan.

Second, again in Shanghai in the early 1960s, Huang Yifeng and Jiang Duo published an article making comparisons between the Meiji Restoration and the Chinese self-strengthening movement in the late Qing, and recognized the successful experience of Meiji Japan's modernization programs. Recognizing Japan's Meiji Restoration was not something new. The late-Qing reformers including Emperor Guangxu already took Japan as an example for the Hundred-Day Reform of 1898, and Sun Yat-sen, the leader of the 1911 revolution and founder of the Republic of China, also stated from a broad East Asian perspective and held that the Japanese revolution was the first step of the Chinese revolution, and the Chinese revolution was the second step of the Japanese revolution. But it was not easy for Huang and Jiang to maintain such a view in the political context of the early 1960s. Here I would like to mention a leader's name called Hu Yaobang, who lost his position before the Tian'anmen incident. Hu praised an essay written by Yoshida Shigeru for the 1967 edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* on the occasion of the hundred anniversary of the

want to come to Japan to study, but sometimes they have to face such sensitive history problems.

The next point I want to make is some problems in the academic world. First problem is the Eurocentrism and Americentrism. The Chinese basically tend to worship the West and Western civilization. Although Japan has successfully taken in Western culture and technology, most Chinese think it was only a watered down version, but not a genuine one. Therefore, they consider that learning from Japan is just a short-cut to learn from the West, but never take Japan seriously. For example, there is such an organization in Shanghai called "The Japan Chapter of the Association of Returned Students from Europe and America." Why "Japan Chapter"? That's very strange, right? "Ou-Mei tongxuehui Riben fenhui" (writes on the board), this is Europe, America, and this is Japan, OK ... "Ou-Mei tongxuehui Riben fenhui" (keeps writing on the board, audience laughs) Why are students returned from Japan treated as part of the students return from Europe and America? It's incredible. So you can see the point I just made, the Chinese think the Western Civilization is a genuine one and modern Japanese civilization is just a watered-down version.

The second problem is rather a sort of old fashioned or out of date Sinocentrism. The 1996 poll has showed that most Chinese thought that Japan received heavy cultural influence from China. And some Chinese scholars tend to liken Japan to a container: in ancient times Chinese stuff was put in; in modern times the European and American stuff was put in. They never realize Japan's originality and its own value. This sort of problem is also revealed by an old phrase called "dobun doshu," meaning the same race and same writing system shared by China and Japan (writing). The same writing systems means the kanji system. Even kana also derived from the parts of Chinese characters, right? So they don't pay much attention to understanding Japan's originality and characteristics, only trying to figure out the similarities and to identify the Japanese way of copying the ancient Chinese culture. That's the sort of old-fashioned Sinocentrism.

The third problem is the official ideology. Here I mean Marxism-Leninism and other dogmas which also influenced the Chinese attitudes toward Japan.

However in the scholarly world there have been changes in the approaches toward Japan. Here I mainly use the examples I personally

There was a December 1996 poll conducted by the Chinese Youth's Development Foundation and the "Chinese Youth's Daily" newspaper office. 15,000 fully valid questionnaires were selected out of 100,000 received. The respondents were from almost all nationalities and provinces in China, and their average age was about 25 years old. When asked "what does the word Japan suggest to you?" 51% replied "cherry blossom," 58% said "Bushido," 47% "Mt. Fuji", and 6% "Oshin." (Audience laughs) Yeah, there was "Yaohan," too. Then 17% responded by identifying "Yamaguchi Momoe," 49% by "electronic products," 45% by "Atom Bomb on Hiroshima," and 81% by "Sino-Japanese War," 13% by "Aum Shinrikyo and Chikatetsu sarin jiken," 84% by the "Nanking massacre," 36% by "solidarity and diligence of Japanese," 6% by "Kawabata Yasunari" and 15% by "Tanaka Kakuei." So you can see here a sort of ambivalence and complexity in the responses.

To the question of "From what countries and regions has Japan received cultural influence?" 44% answered "America," 29% "Europe," and 91% "China," 9% "Korea," and 11% "Southeast Asia." When asked "What should we learn from Japan?" 88% responded by "business management," 89% by "science and technology," 54% by "national identity and consciousness," 90% by "diligence and devotion," 5% by "strict boss-follower relations," only 2% by "the political institutions." So, you can infer what is the average Chinese perception of Japan. They think they should study Japan's technology and business management, but not its culture as a whole.

Incidentally I would like to mention the latest issue of the "Ryugakusei shinbun" a newspaper for Chinese students in Japan. This is a bi-monthly, and here is the February 1 issue. On the one hand, there is a report about a rapid increase of Chinese students in Japan. The total foreign students in Japan now is around 55,000, about half of which are from China. The number from China has exceeded South Korea and Taiwan. But on the other hand, there is a report warning that "It's no longer peaceful at Osaka Center for International Peace," because this public facility was permitted to be used by the Japanese right-wing groups to hold a conference at which they claimed that the greatest lie of the 20th century is "the so-called 'Nanking massacre.'" But the conference was protested by several Japanese and Chinese groups in the country. So, you can see that Chinese students

came true in spring 1986. After 4 years of efforts, I published several articles in the major journals in my field and completed my dissertation entitled Kaitokudo Shushigaku no kenkyu (A Study of the Kaitokudo Neo-Confucianism), which later was published by the university's newly established press in 1994.

During my years at Osaka University, I participated in an international symposium on Tokugawa intellectual history and was in the same panel on the Kaitokudo with Tetsuo Najita, Professor at Chicago University who later served as the president of the AAS. Knowing my wish to understand the status of Japan studies in the United States, he kindly arranged a lecture tour for me in fall 1988 to visit a number of leading American universities, including the University of California at Berkeley, Stanford, Chicago, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Cornell, Princeton, Columbia, Yale, and Harvard (because of the tight schedule, I was not able to give the same talk at Stanford and Yale, but I had pleasant conversations with professors there). It was before the Tian'anmen incident of June 1989, and I could clearly see during my travel from west coast to east coast that American scholars were listening to my introduction of the current status of Japan studies in China in the eager hope of getting hints about where China was heading. I was fortunate to get to know Professor Marius Jansen then, and he later invited me to be a visiting scholar at Princeton in 1990. Professor Jansen and Professor Martin Collcutt then recommended me to Harvard as a postdoctoral fellow at the Reischauer Institute of Japanese Studies. In 1992, I got a tenure-track position at Bridgewater State College in southeastern Massachusetts, which is about 30 miles away from Boston. Its predecessor was one of the oldest normal schools in the US, where Izawa Shuji (1851-1917), the father of modern Japan's normal education and music education, had studied for two years in the mid-1870's as a government-sponsored student. I taught courses in East Asian history and Western civilizations for about four years there and then transferred to Kansai University here in Japan.

I think my personal experience in some ways revealed the gradual development of the Sino-Japanese relations in the post-war period. Now let me move to the second part of my talk, which I call "Ambivalence and complexity: popular and scholarly attitudes toward Japan."

First I would like to introduce the popular Chinese perception of Japan.

Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences. Through “buntsu” (exchanging letters) arranged by the “Chugoku ni hon o okuru kai” (a private Japanese organization for sending used and new Japanese books to China to enhance mutual understanding), I got to know a Japanese gentleman called Masaki Yutaka living in Kawasaki City. Knowing that I was interested in Japanese history, he kindly sent me a dictionary and a bibliographical guidebook. However, when I told my section head at the institute that I had a Japanese pen friend, he warned me, saying that “be careful, do you know his real background?” You can see from this that China opened its door gradually, with caution, to the outside world. That Japanese organization also held a contest on writing essays in Japanese, and my piece won the “Fukutake prize.” Fukutake Tadashi (1917-89) was a leading Japanese sociologist who had taught for thirty years at Tokyo University and served then as an advisor to the organization. The prize included his two books on sociology with his own signatures, which was nice.

In 1982, I got into the graduate school of Fudan University for advanced training. My advisor Wu Jie (1918-1996) was a prominent Japanologist and economic historian in China who had studied at Kyoto Imperial University and Tokyo Imperial University during the wartime. He held the history seminars in Japanese and introduced details of the Japanese academic world. So I got to know something about the Todai school and the Kyodai school, as well as the Kozaha and the Ronoha, even before my initial visit to Japan.

My wife was then selected for further training and enrolled in the graduate school of Osaka University after finishing a one-year training course at the so-called “Ohira Gakko,” the center for training China’s collegiate Japanese teachers in Beijing set up by the Japan Foundation based on the agreement signed by the Prime Minister Ohira Masayoshi and the Chinese government in late 1979. For collecting materials for my master’s thesis on Anglo-Japanese relations and also in order to join my wife, I came to Japan for the first time as an exchange graduate student at Kansai University in late 1984. Guided by Professor Oba Osamu, I made use of the fine collections at the university. At the same time I contacted Professor Wakita Osamu at Osaka University for possible doctoral study with him. He promised that if my master’s thesis were good, he would then consider accepting me as a Monbusho scholarship student. Fortunately my dream

she read the opening paragraph of my essay aloud to my classmates as a way of recognition, I was very proud of myself then.

One of my classmates was a good friend of mine. His father was a prominent engineer who had a chance to visit Japan and brought back a portable transistor set. Because I had liked radios from my childhood and had experience of making a crystal set myself with the help of my father, this Japan-made transistor radio, highly neat and portable, was very impressive to me, showing an example of the advanced Japanese technology. But when I tried to look inside it, my classmate warned me. He said his father had told him that if you try to disassemble it, it will break immediately," because the Japanese want to keep the secrets of making this sort of exquisite products (laughs).

The personal incidents I have just mentioned show that there were various non-official Sino-Japanese contacts in the 1950's and 1960's. In September 1972 the PRC and Japan restored official relations, following U.S. President Nixon's surprise visit to China, and the Shanghai Broadcasting Company quickly started a radio course on Japanese language. I was then working at a state farm on Shanghai's suburban island, because China was in the midst of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution" and Mao Zedong's policy was to "reeducate" the untrustworthy intellectuals and students by sending them to the countryside. Following the radio course I began my Japanese learning. I remember some texts were very political, including such slogans as "Mo shuseki banzai" (Long live Chairman Mao) and so forth. But after all I got a chance to master a-i-u-e-o, the basics in Japanese language, in that difficult time and place.

Shortly after my job transfer to the Shanghai Youth's Palace Library, Shanghai became a sister city of Yokohama (in November 1973) and Osaka (in April 1974). Many Japanese visitors came, and the Youth's Palace located in the city center was one of the big attractions to them. Those groups came by airplanes used the group name of "Yuko no Tsubasa" (Wings of Friendship), and those by ships used the name of "Yuko no Fune" (Friendship Boat). So I had some chances to talk with the Japanese directly.

After the Cultural Revolution, I was able to receive my college education, and then worked as an assistant researcher at the History Institute of

going to talk about the changing Chinese attitudes toward the study of Japan from my personal experience as well as from the broad Chinese context.

First I would like to introduce myself. I was born in 1951 in Shanghai's Hongkou district. Before the war, the Hongkou district was a sort of Japanese concession, but I wasn't aware of that fact until I reached my teens. The district is well known because there is a nice memorial park dedicated to the famous Chinese writer Lu Xun (1881-1936), who lived his last ten years in the district. Japanese audiences might be interested in the fact that Lu had studied in Japan in the late Meiji period, when he was a young student. There is also a Korean school in Hongkou. So it is rather an internationalized area.

Although there were no official relations between Japan and the People's Republic on the mainland, there were non-official contacts and trade relations between the two countries. My earliest memory about Japan involves some plastic toys made in Japan. I remember it was around 1956, when I was a five-year-old boy, that my mother attended a Japanese industrial exhibition held at Shanghai's Sino-Soviet Friendship Hall. She bought a plastic ball and so forth. Plastic was then a sort of new material, so the beautiful ball attracted me very much.

In 1964 I became a junior high pupil. The school I attended was a key high school attached to Eastern China Normal University. Located in the same Hongkou district, its campus was originally a Japanese school compound. Sometimes, I saw the principal accompanying a few old Japanese visitors. They walked around the campus, trying to identify some old buildings and facilities.

Around 1965, a number of films were produced in China to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of the end of World War II, or the victory in the anti-Japanese and anti-fascist wars. After viewing a film called "Fighting in the Tunnels" in a nearby cinema, we were asked by our Chinese language teacher to write reflections on it. I liked writing and wrote this time a fairly good piece, which began with a Chinese idiom called "Jingxin dongpo," meaning that my "heart and soul were astonished" by the film. The teacher was an excellent instructor and had once showed a model class (which was with my class) to over 200 teachers in her profession. Because

Changing Chinese Attitudes toward the Study of Japan: A Historical Perspective

Tao De-min

Professor, Kansai University

James Baxter: Let's begin. I'd like to welcome you to the 46th in our series of Nichibunken Evening Seminars. This is a series that Professor Kimura has long been responsible for, and this year we're using this forum to compare and contrast Japanese studies in different countries. We've already talked about Japanese studies in the United States, Japanese studies in Germany, Japanese studies in Russia, and Japanese studies in France. This evening we're very pleased to be able to talk about China. We have two people to present to us, two distinguished scholars, one from within Nichibunken, one from Kansai University. Professor Yang Xiao-Jie, who is a visiting scholar at Nichibunken this year, is on his way back from a trip to China but hasn't returned to the Center yet, so we're going to go ahead without him. Our guest from Kansai University, Tao Demin, will start us off with a discussion of changing Chinese attitudes toward Japanese studies in China, drawing from his personal experience. I will say only a little about his background, because he's going to tell you about his own life and I don't want to make him repeat, but you should know that he has a very broad background. He began his life and work in China, of course, and then came to Japan to study in Osaka, and then went to the United States, I guess initially as a Postdoctoral Fellow, then as a faculty member in a college in Massachusetts. Three years ago Prof. Tao returned to Japan and took his present position at Kansai University. Prof. Tao, we're delighted to have you with us and we look forward to hearing your story and your analysis of Japanese studies in China.

Demin Tao:

It is an honor to be a speaker here at Nichibunken. However, I'm afraid my English is deteriorating, as I have been teaching in Japanese at Kansai University in recent years, so please bear with me (laughs). Today I'm

Audience member : Let me ask a final question. I have been waiting for this moment. One of the questions we have been asking to all the speakers in this series of Evening Seminars is this : What is unique or distinctive about Japanese studies in your homeland, compared with Japanese studies in Japan or the United States or elsewhere? What distinguishes French specialists in their approaches to Japanese affairs, or to Japanese studies? And second, what's the contribution of French scholars to the whole global body of academic work on Japan?

Robert : I am a bit at a loss to give an answer, but I will connect it to a previous question, the individualism Inaga-san was speaking about. We have in Paris a research team which was organized by Bernard Frank and is now headed by Harmut O. Rotermond, with about 30 members. We have no clear-cut research agenda and everybody, belonging to one or the other teaching or research institution I tried previously to describe, pursues their own research, but we have a few meetings a year which we use to exchange views on our work. One or two colleagues are asked each time to make a summary of their researches and we discuss it. It would be impossible to have everybody working on the same project, but somehow we find that we have many things to say to each other and that everybody's studies shed some light on the others'. In more than one way, it would not be exaggerated to say that for many of us the study of Japanese culture is more an art than a science. Which explains why most French specialists in Japanese culture are reluctant to use English; almost no one among us can hope to write decently in English; it would then be a mere instrument, just like when you write on some hard scientific matters, nuclear physics, palynology and the like. I would rather say that they mainly aim to be in sympathy with their subject and give it an accurate expression. If you read the historical outlines written by Bernard Frank or Jean-Jacques Origas, you will see there is almost always an appreciation on the style of their predecessors, and on the way they had of penetrating the culture; these scholars are thus judged as artists too, or rather "hommes de lettres". I realize that such a view may seem furiously "*dépassée*" now, but I think it still can be held. Japanese studies are still very much a part of the humanities in France. But this is only the opinion of a Frog sitting in the bottom of the well.

who came to Japan and then later went to Harvard?

Robert : Yes, yes.

Audience member : ...the personal friend of Natsume Soseki.

Robert : Yes, yes.

Audience member : There is a book written by Mr. Kurata Yasuo....

Robert : Yes, it is still available, it's a very good book and possibly the only one written on Elisséeff in any language; the exact title is *Eriseefu no shôgai* (Chuokoron, Chuko shinsho). Serge Elisséeff started his career in France, then went to the United States, but eventually came back to Paris, where he ended his life. One of his sons, Vadim Elisséeff was the curator of the Guimet Museum of Asiatic Arts.

Audience member : In the case of Edwin O. Reischauer, he was able to read Chinese, as well as Japanese. And it used to be that in order to learn Chinese history, students had to learn Japanese, as well. I knew a professor of Chinese history when I was in England, and he felt he had to know Japanese, because there are many valuable studies on China by Japanese scholars. Is the same case true in France? Do scholars of Chinese subjects feel they need to learn Japanese?

Robert : It was very much the case until recently in Buddhist, Chinese and Far-East studies. Japanese was surely one of the main scholarly languages in those fields. It's becoming unfortunately less and less true now. It may be partly due to the soaring amount of publication of secondary literature in English, without forgetting that scholarly literature in Chinese too has been constantly growing for the last twenty years, and a knowledge of modern Chinese is becoming necessary.

Still, such a long-term project as the *Hobogirin*, the encyclopædia of Buddhism according to Chinese and Japanese sources, which got started in 1924 and the eighth fascicle of which will be published shortly, shows that all has not yet been said and done in this perspective. There indeed remains a huge amount of research there to be developed between Japanese and French scholars.

ture to say that it's superior to what is to be found in English; that means that there is an interest for Japanese literature out of proportion with the size of the reading public. Inaga-san has spoken about the famous Pléiade collection published by Gallimard; the head of this collection for many years had been an enthusiastic lover of Japanese literature. We owe him the publication in this series of two volumes of works by Tanizaki Junichiro, more than 3000 pages. The same amount will be devoted to Ihara Saikaku, to be published in the near future. So we cannot ignore this craving for all levels of Japanese culture.

On the other side, the scientific and technological demand is not the same at all. In a meeting I attended last December in Tokyo on French-Japanese scientific cooperation, there was quite a telling example: in some very high-level Japanese laboratory, in physics I think, there were twenty American researchers, about ten Britons, and only one Frenchman. Everybody asked the French side the reason why, and the French answer was that... the Japanese don't speak enough English! This language problem did not seem to bother the American and English scientists. It seems that the French simply do not imagine yet the need of a full scientific cooperation with Japan. On the other hand, I know for instance a French plastic surgeon who studied in Japan and is now quite successful in Paris. Perhaps there will be more people like him in the future.

Audience member : You mentioned that when President Mitterrand visited Japan, he encouraged Japanese studies in France. At that stage did he suggest that French young people should know about Japanese culture, as well as about economics or the political situation?

Robert : I'm afraid I don't remember precisely what he said. But, as I've told you, it was after his visit in Japan that the *agrégation*, the state-held examination for Japanese-language professorship was established. In order to become an *agrégé*, you have to study classical and modern literature and take an option in economics or sociology. But the interest of the general public, perhaps I should say cultivated public, for Japanese culture is quite independent from political incentives.

Audience member : May I just confirm that Elisséeff is the same person

Audience member : Would you take notice of the literature by European scholars, or would you say, well, it's much more important to read the Japanese?

Robert: It all depends on which side of your studies you value most; primary sources, as a rule, must have priority. In Buddhist studies, be it Chinese or Japanese studies, specialized literature in Japanese is overwhelming, and you can hardly hope to master it. In other fields, there is very good material now in English, and even French or German, but nothing yet to supersede Japanese.

Audience member : France has been famous for Chinese studies. How do you feel Japanese studies compares with Chinese studies in France? What is the status of Japanese studies and those French scholars who are engaged in Japanese studies? That's my first question. My second question is, "Which aspect of Japan are French scholars interested in?" And—I'm sorry—a third question is, "Are French researchers enthusiastic about learning English for communication and for presenting their research results?"

Robert : When I was still thinking I had two hours' time ahead, I wanted to make copies of the recent French publications on Japanese studies or matters pertaining to Japan. There is quite a number of translations of novels and poetry, some research monographs, and then a whole six pages of *manga* translations. An impressive number of students pick up Japanese for reading comics in the original, and use them as exclusive practice material. In some way, *manga* are connected with the Internet, informatics, modern music, in a word to modernity, or even "post-modernity", whatever it might mean. Even people without any knowledge of Japanese insist on reading *manga* in the original! There is thus a whole subculture being born around Japanese as a super-modern language. So you have here quite a different facet of the role of Japanese studies.

Now, you know that the reading public in France has always been rather limited, much of what Somerset Maugham wrote about it in his *A Writer's Notebook* still obtains today. You could even say, according to some survey research, that the illiteracy rate is growing. Nevertheless, the sheer amount of translations from Japanese into French is impressive. I would even ven-

tourism in France for example, which can provide at least part-time jobs. I know of some very bright undergraduates who make quite a decent living guiding Japanese tourists through the mysteries of nocturnal Paris. As for teaching jobs, those who can get the *agrégation* are sure to be given a post in school or high-school, the others must stick around for a number of year before finding something, either at school or at the university, but more often than not those jobs hardly provide a living. I would personally think that it's somewhat easier to find some kind of work with Japanese than with most European languages. The problem is more at a general level of orientation in French studies; the ratio of students graduating in technology in Germany, for example, is devastatingly superior to France: something like 10 to 1, or so I've heard. The fact is that French students seem invincibly drawn to humanist studies. I remember that about 25 years ago, a best-seller book exposing the shortcomings of French society asserted that there were 12 persons graduating each year in Assyrian studies and that no country in the world could possibly secure a living for so many Assyriologists. I'm sure that now the rate of production of Assyrian scholars is still higher, without speaking of Egyptologists, specialists of modern German or Russian literature, and so on. It's a common view now that we have too many students in the humanities, though many still make a difference between studying, which is still largely a matter of personal taste, and getting a job, something outside academe, but there's no denying that things are changing rapidly.

As for your second question, and if I may speak from my own experience, I attended the first congress of the European Association of Japanese Studies (EAJS) in Zurich in 1976 and after that in the Hague in 1982 and I enjoyed it very much, but I cannot deny that when I have to choose between going to Japan or China and going to any other place in Europe or the West, I do not hesitate to choose the Far-East, simply because I feel that even a short stay there is worth weeks of study elsewhere. Most of my friends and colleagues seem to feel the same. It's not a question of language, although I'm sure I don't approve too much of the monolingualism that's prevailing now in a field that should by essence be plurilingual. And let's not forget that a congress of the EAJS was organized at the Sorbonne, in the mid-'80, by Hartmut O. Rotermond.

versity on a sufficient scale, be it Cambodian or regional Indian cultures.

I will just end my presentation with a general observation. Even if there is quite an impressive number of students of Japanese who study this language in order to “do business” with Japan and to get into the real life of firms and enterprises, the fact remains that a majority of them prefer to choose classical or modern literature. I know from some remarks I overheard that Japanese diplomats or staff of Japanese cultural centers in Paris feel a bit frustrated by that state of things. They would prefer students to engage into the study of “real”, economic Japan and resent the paucity of the demand in those matters. Although there are very able young scholars researching and teaching Japanese economics now, like Claude Hamon or Bernard Thomann, most of those who study the Japanese economy prefer to enter private firms, or go into the diplomatic service, to staying in academic institutions. That is the main fault of Japanese studies in France, if we should call it a fault.

Audience member : I was quite surprised by the sheer numbers of students majoring in Japanese studies in France, as shown in your handout. My first question is, What are those students doing for jobs? Do you have any idea? And my second question is about French Japan specialists' activities outside France. In European Japanese studies meetings, France doesn't seem to be so well represented, for instance in the EAJS (European Association for Japanese Studies) or the European Japan Experts Association that was, I think, initiated by the EU. I don't think I've ever met a French colleague. I have met Greek and Italian colleagues, and British of course, but no French. I would like to hear from you why—is there less interest from the French side, or is there a language problem, or...?

Robert: Well, for your first question: as you know, the French unemployment rate, although somewhat diminishing, is still one of the highest of the European Community, and until now, there has been quite a wide discrepancy between the subjects students graduate in and the demands of the job market. I'm sure that a degree in Japanese is no magic key to employment, but still I think that those who have one are rather better off than in many other subjects. There is a variety of activities, connected with

Française des Etudes Japonaises (SFEJ) is situated there too. Those who want more details on the French japonisants and activities in Japanese studies should consult the yearly newsletter (*Bulletin*) of this society. Every other year the SFEJ organizes a congress of Japanese studies attended by an impressive number of people and the transactions of the congress are published a few months later, giving a fair overview of the current state of scholarship.

The prestigious Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS) has always been a hothouse for Japanese studies. I can only name a few of the scholars engaged in research there: Patrick Beillevaire on Okinawa culture, Jean-Pierre Berthon on new religions, Jane Cobbi on material culture, Nicolas Fiévé on historical urbanism, Josef Kyburz on religious ethnology, Simone Mauclair on historical anthropology, Eric Seizelet on law, etc. I can only apologize for those I forget to mention. One of the most wonderful advantages of the CNRS, and a matter of envy for all those outside, is that the researchers there are utterly free to pursue their own studies without having to teach, nor is the urge for publishing as insistent as I'm told it is in the United States for example. Scholars there are masters of their own research, although they are all members of research teams.

Much of the same atmosphere prevails in the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), certainly one of the most extraordinary research institution devoted to oriental studies in the world. I would hardly agree with the one who described it somewhere as "the most sophisticated weapon of French imperialism", because, if anything, and whatever may have been the purpose of those who created it, the EFEO, which celebrates in 2000 its first century of existence, fostered a whole array of oriental scholars opposed to colonialism (I will simply mention the name of Paul Mus). I mentioned earlier Noël Peri and Claude Maître, who both were members of this organization. This year sees a number of very young research fellows entering the EFEO in the field of Japanese studies. Both EFEO and CNRS provide ideal conditions for research, with no teaching obligation, the main difference between them being that EFEO expects its members to carry on their studies in the relevant countries of Asia rather than in France. They both provide a career for scholars in fields not taught at uni-

Renan, who studied Judaism and Christianity as any other historical phenomenon. Now, of course, the militant anti-religious edge of the section has been considerably attenuated and the recent problems concerning the relations between a lay state and religious minorities, mainly Islam, have raised a new interest for our department from some political spheres. The successor of Charles Haguenauer, who was in charge of Japanese Religions, as I told you, is now my friend and colleague Hartmut O. Rotermond, whose chair is now called "Religions populaires du Japon" and who is studying religions and modernity at the beginning of the Meiji era. Mine is called "Japanese Buddhism", and I devote most of my lectures to the study of commentaries in the Tendai tradition, together with an introductory course in *kanbun*. Compared to most other places, our Ecole is a minor paradise, a Pure Land of study: the professors there, who are called *directeurs d'études*, have two hours a week to teach, plus one hour of students' supervision or introductory course. The courses are given in the form of seminars (which explains the adjective "*pratique*" in the name of the EPHE, quite a laughing matter for our outside colleagues, given that most of the subjects are most unpractical), the professor being supposed, so to speak, to pursue his own research before the eyes of the students. Most of them are undergraduates who intend sooner or later to write a doctoral dissertation, but there is yet quite a number of enlightened amateurs attending regularly.

The Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) was formerly the sixth section of our EPHE, which has now been independent for more than thirty years. It is a most active place for the sociological study of Japan under the direction of Augustin Berque, who was a visiting professor here at the Nichibunken a few years ago. He is in charge of a research team specializing in urbanism and environment in Japan.

As I told you, there is no professor in charge of Japanese studies now at the Collège de France, but the study center organized there by Bernard Frank on the basis of Charles Haguenauer's library and called the Institut des Hautes Etudes Japonaises (IHEJ) is thriving and functions as a gathering place for most of Japanese scholars in Paris, under the thoughtful guidance of Mrs Matsuzaki-Petitmangin. The liaison office of the Société

course in business Japanese. In a meeting we had last year of colleagues in the field of Japanese studies, the number was said to be around 10,000 people, which would be a credible number.

At the INALCO and the universities, professors have a status defined as “*enseignants-chercheurs*”, something like “research-professors”. That means they are both teachers and researchers and have to divide their time between both activities, which is easier said than done, given the paucity of means. For each professor to have his own study-office, as we see in most Japanese universities, would be an impossible dream certainly not to be realized in any foreseeable future.

Besides these full teaching institutions, we have another, variegated array of organizations which can be defined as more research-oriented, which does not mean that the people there are better researchers than their colleagues at the university. Let me begin with the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE), to which I happen to belong. It was created at the end of the 19th century and is still located for the most part inside the Sorbonne. It is now divided in three departments, the first one treating earth- and life sciences; I will not speak of it here. The two departments (or “sections”, as they are called in French) which shall detain us now are the fourth and the fifth (an old numeration which no longer reflects reality, as often in France, but which has been kept since last century; the first department is thus called “Troisième section”). The Fourth Department or “Quatrième section” is devoted to historical and philological sciences (Sciences historiques et philologiques). That’s where Bernard Frank was teaching before entering the Collège de France; he was succeeded by Francine Hérail, the translator of the *Mido kanpakki* of Fujiwara no Michinaga and a well-known specialist of Heian. She is now retired and has been succeeded by Charlotte von Verschuer, a specialist in relation between China and Japan during the Nara and Heian periods. The Fifth Department or “Cinquième section” is called Section des Sciences religieuses. This very name is now a matter of debate, but most of us are rather attached to it. Actually, this section was constituted in 1885 on the ruins of the department of theology, much as a sign of independence of religious studies from the Catholic church. The first head of the department was the famous scholar Ernest

1999 , about 15 years after the Japanese one.

Now let me try a very brief outline of the teaching and research institutions. The foremost place to learn Japanese is of course the School of Oriental Languages (now known as INALCO: Institut national des langues et civilisations orientales). Although created under the monarchy, its definitive status was delineated after the Revolution. Under the reign of Louis XIV and until the beginning of the 19th century, mostly Near Eastern languages were taught: Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Armenian, then came Chinese, and about twenty years later, in 1863 as we have seen, Japanese. The Ecole des Langues Orientales was for a very long time the only place in France where you could study so many Eastern languages, and it had thus a good start ahead of other institutions. Even now, it is the place where most students want to go when they wish to engage in such pursuits. I thank Ms. Watanabe for having so kindly xeroxed the list of registered students in Japanese at the INALCO: you can see that the number rises from 41 in 1960 to 1,560 in 1984. I remember that when I registered as a student there in 1967, ours was the first year to reach the 100 students level. I had a talk last summer with my friend and colleague Prof. François Macé, head of the Japanese department there, who told me that there were about 1,800 students registering yearly in Japanese. So the progression is not so fast now, being steady around that number, but it still makes Japanese the language with the greatest number of students at the INALCO, above Chinese and Arabic. Of course, it does not mean that we have around 1,500 students graduating every year in Japanese, but still their number is quite high, something like 200 a year getting some kind of degree in Japanese language at the INALCO only. The main other place in Paris where they teach Japanese within a full academic organization is the department of Far-East languages at the Université de Paris 7, which can boast around 200 students for Japanese. And there are now universities outside Paris, in cities like Lille, Lyons, Bordeaux, Toulouse, Aix-en-Provence, which deliver at least the *licence* degree in Japanese after three years . The total number of students of Japanese in France is very hard to assess, if you must take into account all the private foundations, some religious ones, like Tenrikyo, being very active in the field, and many private or public business schools making a point of honour of having some

unfortunately, his love for languages led him a bit astray here, as he chose to translate that chapter in medieval French, which made it well nigh impossible to read for most people, and drew him rebuke from professional medievalists, for mixing grammatical forms of different periods. Charles Haguenauer was the teacher of a whole generation of French *japonisants*, indeed most of those who are now over 60. Two of his foremost disciples were René Sieffert and Bernard Frank. The former had been in charge of the teaching of Japanese at the School of Oriental Languages (INALCO), on which I will say more later, while Bernard Frank was the first specialist in Japanese studies to be appointed a professor of Japanese Civilization at the Collège de France, generally held to be the highest educational institution in France. There had been no chair of Japanese language or culture in the Collège since its foundation in the 16th century, although one of the first teachers there, the Renaissance scholar of Hebrew and Arabic Guillaume Postel, wrote a few pages about Japanese religions, thus being one of the first to mention this country in France. In his inauguration lecture at the Collège de France, Bernard Frank spoke about the description of Japan by Postel.

Unfortunately, after Bernard Frank's untimely death in 1996, there has been no successor to his chair of Japanese Civilization. It is to be hoped that it will be provided again, as the other teachings on China, India and Islam have suffered almost no break since their creation. Another very important step has been taken in the recognition of Japanese studies as a full discipline in Academe, and that was the creation of the *agrégation* in the Japanese language. The *agrégation* is a state examination for the status of full professor at the high school level. There are of course *agrégations* for all the traditional school subjects (Latin and Greek, literature, history, etc.) as well as for a number of languages, starting from the main European ones like English and German to Russian, Arabic or Hebrew. One of the results of the visit of President Mitterrand to Japan in 1982 was the creation of the *agrégation* in Japanese language, which was done around 1986. To succeed at this rather difficult examination means that you are provided with a teaching post at high school level for your whole career, with the obligation for the State to create such posts if they don't exist yet. It's a surprising fact that the *agrégation* in Chinese language was created only in

were research fellows at the Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient, last entry on the next paragraph of the outprint (in Japanese: *Kyokutô gakuin*). They came to Japan, knew Japanese, used Japanese historical sources for their researches, and in some way, they could be considered as forerunners of these studies in France, but they did not leave any disciples.

Many seem to agree that the basis for academic Japanese studies in France was laid by Serge Elisséeff. He came from Saint Petersburg to Paris in 1921 and stayed there until 1947, I think. At that time he was called to the United States, where he really launched Japanese studies. His role in France was not as eminent as he deserved, for he had no official academic post. But he started lecturing in Japanese civilization and language when he came back to France in 1957, in what was later to become the EHESS, the School of Social Sciences.

The first fully appointed professor of Japanese studies at the Sorbonne (in 1953) was Charles Haguenauer, who knew Serge Elisséeff and, I think, even started learning Japanese with him. He then taught at the department of Science of Religion at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE), thus launching studies in the field of Japanese religions. Charles Haguenauer had a wonderful command of Japanese. I met him only once or twice, but I saw letters by him in Japanese and they were written beautifully. He mastered not only Japanese but a host of other languages, all the main tongues of Asia and Europe and some African languages too. He was probably the first in France to devote entirely such a broad range of scholarship to the elucidation of Japanese language and civilization. His magnum opus, *Origines de la civilisation japonaise* (Paris, 1956), is a wonderful treasure trove of anthropological and linguistic lore that can only be mastered through repeated readings, as there is no index and the general plan is quite luxuriant, but it is still a rewarding study. It remains one of the main sources for the problem of the origins of the Japanese language as a scion of the Altaic family. Although as distinguished a scholar in this field as Roy Andrew Miller has rather harsh words against this work, the fact is many of his own arguments and evidence are already to be found in Haguenauer. He was not uninterested in Japanese literature too, as we can see from his translation of the chapter *Kiritsubo* of the *Genji monogatari*;

second paragraph), rather than the latter. It does seem that Pagès knew more Japanese than Rosny, who had been mostly schooled in the classical Chinese language as a disciple of the famous sinologist Stanislas Julien. Perhaps many here have read Fukuzawa Yukichi's famous autobiography, the *Fukuo jiden* : in the relation of his travels in Europe and France, he recalls that Léon de Rosny came to meet him twice, around 1857, first in Paris, and the second time in Le Havre port, where Rosny went especially to see Fukuzawa on his way to England. It is rather of a surprise, for those who consider Rosny as the father of Japanese studies in France, to read that, according to Fukuzawa, he spoke very good English and "some Japanese". Judging by the few lines I could read written by him in that language, we can say that is Japanese was nothing to speak of. But he was very enthusiastic about Japanese studies, and availed himself very much of the wave of Oriental and Japanese fashion at the time.

Léon Pagès built his scholarly name on his translation of the famous Japanese-Portuguese dictionary made at the turn of the 17th century, which he revised according to a Spanish translation. This French revision is much more clear than the original and is still a reference book for late medieval and pre-modern Japanese language.

Michel Revon knew some Japanese, but I mention him here because he compiled, mostly from other European translations, the first anthology of Japanese literature in French, from the *Manyōshū* to the Meiji era. This work had a great influence on writers and artists, even outside France, as we see that Venceslau de Moraes, the Portuguese equivalent of Lafcadio Hearn, who came to Japan at the turn of the century and died in Tokushima in 1929, drew most of his knowledge of Japanese literature from Michel Revon. The recluse life he chose to live in Shikoku in his last years was inspired, it seems, by the text of the *Hojoki* he found in Revon's anthology.

The next two names, Noël Peri and Claude Maître, were both real connoisseurs of Japanese language and culture. They were both attracted by Buddhist and artistic studies, the former being a Buddhist scholar, the latter a specialist in art history. Although they did not teach Japanese, they

language to another. It's been two days now that I am trying to speak aloud in English when I am alone, in order to get started and at the risk of passing in the eyes of bystanders for more perturbed than I already am, but it did not give much of a result, as you can hear. Fortunately, I still had time to prepare this outprint here, with an outline of my talk and some proper names written down. The second reason is that, trying to specialize in the study of Japanese Buddhism, I have no vantage point to cover the whole of Japanese studies and research going on in France at the present time, precisely in a period when these studies have grown beyond any individual's reach.

Let me begin with a historical introduction, relying heavily on outlines already published, especially those by Prof. Bernard Frank and J.-J. Origas.

I want first to make some very brief points, and then attempt a general description. We have to explain first the very confusing educational organization, simply to understand why it is so difficult to make a definite outline of Japanese studies there. There are simply too many different research institutions, research centers, higher and highest teaching facilities to try to embrace them all. Some of these institutions are connected by various research programs and there are too many different research teams to try to number them all. French cultural and scientific activities, especially in oriental studies, have traditionally been centered on Paris, but this is changing now, and there is quite an impressive number of scholars in various provincial universities, with specialized journals being published outside Paris.

The first thing to say is that compared to other fields of oriental and Asiatic studies, in France as in other European and Western countries, independent Japanese studies seem to have a much shorter history. It all depends, of course, on what we understand by Japanese studies. We can see that Léon Pagès, the second name in the historical figures in the outprint, made a bibliography of Japanese studies in Europe between the 15th century and 1859, and that he found already 658 titles to mention. That's quite a lot and shows that Japan was not by any means a terra incognita at that time. But it does seem that the first ones to tackle the Japanese language in a more or less serious way in 19th century France were the two names here: Léon de Rosny and Léon Pagès. Unfortunately, if I may say so, it was the former who was appointed the first professor of Japanese at the Ecole des Langues Orientales de Paris (now INALCO, first name in the

Present State of the Japanese Studies in France

Jean-Noël A. Robert

Visiting Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies
(Professor, Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes)

James Baxter : Welcome. This is the 45th in Nichibunken's Evening Seminar Series, and we are honored to have Jean-Noel Robert with us.

Prof. Robert's regular position is at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (EPHE) in Paris. This year he is a visiting professor at this Center. A specialist in Nara Buddhism, he is the author of a study of Tendai in the ninth century, and he has also written about Nara art. He is an expert on the Lotus Sutra, and has translated Kumarajiva's Chinese version of that sutra into French. He has made presentations to conferences on poems by the monk Jien that constitute a commentary on the Lotus Sutra, among other topics, and he has published a textbook on *kanbun*. Recently he has been a contributor to the updated edition of the *Historical Dictionary of Japan*, in France.

When I think of Prof. Robert, the first word that occurs to me is "prodigious," in the sense of being wonderful or marvelous, a prodigy, some kind of amazement. He speaks Chinese and Tibetan, not to mention Japanese, and momentarily you will discover that he is the master of a stylish, subtle, and supple English. We're delighted to have him talk to us about the present state of Japanese studies in France.

Professor Robert : Thank you very much, Jim, for your kind introduction, something of an overpraise –*homegoroshi* – I'm afraid, and usually people are terribly disappointed by the real thing after having heard such words. I must confess that until 20 minutes ago I was a very happy man, as I thought my talk was due for 6:00 and I had still two hours to prepare some materials. Then, at 4:00 pm, it transpired that it was not 6:00 but 16:00, which explains the 20 minutes delay, for which I apologize.

Today's subject is very hard to treat for two reasons, the first one being my poor command of English, especially when I have to shift from one

or less similar. That is the proof that cultural and political borders of Nara Japan coincided.

M.V.Grachov (IOS) told the audience about provincial bureaucracy in Nara period and A.N.Mesheryakov developed a thesis that the reason for initial rising of Fujiwara clan might have been their inclination to Chinese learning which they used as an instrument for political struggling with those who favoured Buddhism mostly (imperial family first of all).

Other prominent studies included A.M.Gorbilev's (MSU) report on Shugendo: (focusing on the concept of sacred space in *Shozan engi*), E.M.D'yakonova's analysis of the literary role of story-tellers in *rekishi-monogatari* and some others (there were 16 reports in all).

Visiting the conference I had a strong feeling that Russian Japanology is recovering from the long period of Soviet isolation and the economic turbulence of recent years.

Let me sum up what I have been talking about. The situation in Russian Japanology depends heavily on the present-day situation in the country and inherits some tendencies of the previous period. The most flourishing area is studies of ancient and medieval Japan, especially publishing primary sources. There are some young and quite promising people in the area and the elder generation is still active. The situation is worse in modern studies and I expect it will take quite a long time to recover.

years. We can only be satisfied that the elder generation is so active but at the same time regret that new names are so few. 4 or 5 years ago the situation seemed almost desperate because there were no people who would like to enrol into post graduate studies.

Now I am a little more optimistic. The Institute of Oriental Studies (IOS, Russian Academy of Sciences) held this year the first conference on traditional Japan (including Meiji). Before that Russian Japanologists didn't have a forum of this kind. Even three or four years ago the situation was so that nobody thought that such a conference could ever be held. The main problem was the lack of enthusiasm among the younger generation which tended to choose more "practical" business careers. Now the situation seems more optimistic and more post-graduate studies are in progress. So among the participants all generations were represented.

The major part of the speakers specializes on ancient Japan. That was the main feature of the conference. As is well known, in Europe and US studies on ancient Japan are not very popular now (that reflects the present day tendency to consider important only that time when I am living). And in the fundamental *Cambridge History of Japan* most of the authors were Japanese—just because in the West there are not enough competent experts now.

To give you an idea what kind of research are being done now I shall mention briefly the themes of major reports presented to the conference.

The conference was opened by S.V. Laptev (Moscow State University) who was speaking about recent development in anthropology focusing particularly on craniological and dental studies of Yayoi man. The theme of E.S.Baksheev's report was the practice of temporal burying (*mogari*) with comparison with the same type of burying in Oceania and Asia.

Then came five reports on Nara Japan. E.K.Simonova-Gudzenko (MSU) presented the results of her computer study of place names in "Man'yo:shu." According to her there were six regions which toponyms are mentioned in "Man'yo:shu:" most frequently: Kinai itself, the Kanto:valley, Echizen+Echigo, Izumo, Setonakai region, Northern Kyu:shu:. It was very stimulating to compare this to the distribution of place names mentioned in *Shoku Nihongi*. That was a theme of report by E.B.Saharova (IOS). This post-graduate study is not finished yet but it seems that the distribution of place names in both writing sources is more

them are outdated now) but some translation projects are unique. I can mention for instance the translation of Chinese version of Lotus Sutra, Prof. Goreglyad's translation of *Kankai Ibun*, or the translation of *Shoku Nihongi* I am working on now. I once was talking with one Japanologist who is famous for his competence and affiliation with Communist party both (and that's unusual as it does not go together very often). He told me that comparing the political and economical situation in the SU and Russia he was desperately dissatisfied with everything what was happening in Russia but must admit that the number of recent translations from classical Japanese literature outnumbered greatly those that had been published in the whole period the SU existed.

There are several reasons for that. First of all the translators being devoted to their subject are working hard quite conscious that you cannot get rich by this sort of activity but their strong conviction is that the best and most fundamental way to understand Japanese culture lies in introducing primary sources (it seems that in the West this conviction is getting weaker now). Second is the quality of reading culture among many Russians who still enjoy "difficult" reading and don't feel puzzled before a book with some words and names you don't recognize at once. Third, is that there is a stable segment of the audience which simply likes Japanese classical literature just because it is so good. Though book-sellers know that these books can't be very profitable at the same time they know they are profitable and they stimulate publishing houses to order new translations. Some of them are published with the help of JF and some of them not.

Though there are some translations of the modern literature there are relatively small in number (by modern literature I mean the literature of the current century of which very soon we shall address as "the previous century") though there were some huge projects such as the collection of Akutagawa Ryunosuke and Abe Kobo (both in 4 volumes). To my mind the major obstacle in better introducing of present day literature is financial. Now there are very many books on the market and to introduce a completely new author needs time and money. Nobody wants to take the risk. Second is that publication of current literature involves copyright problems.

But what is common in these translations of classical and modern literature is that they were done by people who are famous in the field for many

(Oriental faculty in MSU, some other faculties of MSU, Institute of Far East, St.P. State Univ., Vladivostok University, Khabarovsk University, Yuzno-Sahalisk, Hmelevski private institute in StPb, etc. not considering some smaller places where there are only 2-3 scholars). Japanologists in Russia are concentrated in universities, research institutes of Academy of sciences, museums, libraries and archives. The book cites Germany top in Europe as having 350 specialists, then comes UK (241), France (203) and Russia (175). This book cites 175 specialists in Russia on Japan but the list of members of the Russian Association of Japanologists gives the figure of 500 persons and you should keep in mind that many professional teachers of Japanese language are not members of this Association. So I think the book does not reflect the quantitative side of present day Russian Japanology. But that's not the fault of JF but the fault of Russian scholars and institutions who were too lazy to fill in the forms the JF asked them to do. That reflects the long history of Soviet isolation from the world. And many people still do not feel much commitment to the international community of scholars.

The quantity of books published on Japan is not so small either. Here is the catalogue of recent Russian books on Japan that you can buy. It lists 56 books. The next issue published just a little bit later adds 12 new items. Though these catalogues are quite incomplete they reflect main tendencies in Russian Japanology, tendencies that reflect strategy of survival. The number of monographs is relatively small. That's especially valid for modern Japan studies (I think that's because the elder generation of scholars of political and economical studies, the generation that continue to dominate is not competent enough and has nothing to say). Much effort is put into textbooks and reference materials. What is surprising that translations of classical literature takes such a big share. There are translations of *Kojiki*, *Nihon Shoki*, *Nihon Ryoiki*, *Kagero Nikki*, *Sarashina Nikki*, Sei Shonagon, Kamo-no Chomei, *Kenko-hoshi*, *Murasaki Shikibu Nikki*, Utaawase, *Hogen Monogatari*, various collections of tanka and haiku poetry, renga, Fujiwara Teika, Yosa Buson, Kobayashi Issa, Masaoka Shiki etc. Some important translations are already or almost completed and will be published in near future (*Kogoshui*, *Okagami*, *Shinkokinshu*, *Torikaebaya Monogatari*, *Taiheiki*, Gozan Bungaku Chinese poetry, Basho's diaries, etc). Most of these books were translated into Western languages earlier (though some of

changes in Russia were more rapid and dramatic than in the US or Germany. So one day (to be more precise in December of 1991) the Japanologists in the SU found themselves in a different country, a country called Russia. Now they were free to speak up and to write what they want. But, sure, they were not free from the traditions of Soviet Japanology. The problem was what and how to speak. In another words we can define the problem as intellectual surviving. Besides that the problem of physical surviving was quite sharp too because in most cases academic or university salaries were (and are) not enough for even a modest style of living.

So everybody had to make his choice.

The first one was to emigrate. In most cases that's not an emigration in the strict sense of the word because most scholars are maintaining Russian citizenship. People just got some kind of financial support (mostly from the Japan Foundation) for doing research, then find a job in Japan. In most cases that's not Japanology—they are teaching Russian language and Russian literature. Nobody in Japan will take them to teach Japanese history or literature because of language ability and because our methods of teaching are so different. As these Russian scholars are busy with teaching what they never thought to be their profession (and that's quite frustrating) and people around them are not interested in their Japanese studies their activity in Japanology is declining though some of them are trying their best to be present on the map of Russian Japanology. What's worse for Russian Japanology is that they do not teach in Russia and there is a great demand in Russian universities for qualified people able to teach Japanese history, literature, anthropology etc.

The second possibility is to teach in Russia and get as many classes in different places as possible. I know one person who has between 30 and 40 lecturing hours a week. Needless to say, doing that means you don't have enough energy and time to do your own research.

The third possibility is to do both, i. e. live basically in Russia, from time to time go Japan, earn some money, save it to come back and continue your research project in Russia and teach reasonable hours. That's my case.

I've checked these 2 volumes of *Japanese Studies in Europe* published this year by JF. It is not complete and it says there are 10 Russian institutions engaged in Japanese studies. To this list I can add at least 14 institutions

first rate modern prose (Abe Kobo, Oe Kenzaburo, Kawabata Yasunari, Akutagawa Ryunosuke). No Western country had a privilege to be presented in the SU with so many writers which had nothing to do with communist ideology. And all these books were widely read. My book of translations of medieval Buddhist legends (which for censorship reasons was called "Japanese Miraculous Stories" because the word "religion" was a kind of taboo) was published in 70 thousand copies and sold out at once (I know a person who stole a copy from the library because he could not buy it). Some books were even circulated in samizdat (such as translations of Daisetsu Suzuki's writings on Zen Buddhism).

Among these books on the Japanese culture there were good and bad both. But their societal function was the same—they filled the lust for something different, different from cruel and dull world in which Soviet people had to live. That's why so many Soviet intellectuals know Japanese culture quite well, but at the same time there were many people lecturing to whom it was often a terrible torture, because audiences expected from you a kind of spiritual revelation. And if you tried to be more rational they would be really disappointed and think that you didn't understand what's really important. As it was a kind of escapism for many people who were fond of reading on Japan this country was for them a kind of Utopia, too.

And for people who were writing on Japanese culture or literature Japan was not just a field of purely academic activity. Japan presented a possibility to write honestly, to be proud that you are not "with them" (official culture). To study classical Japan was an intellectual privilege, a source of finding self-identity. And no doubt people engaged in these studies were quite different from the usual type of a little boring "scientist." Many of them were gifted in literature, were writing poetry and fiction. But their knowledge of Japan was often not adequate as most of them had never been to Japan and books (mostly foreign and not always competent) were the only source of information. At the same time we should admit that these scholars and books formed an interest to Japan, an interest that is not lost even now.

And what's happening now? As it was clearly shown in the reports of Professors Baxter and Thränhardt the Japanology in the US and Germany depends heavily on what's happening in the society and in the country. This is true for Russia too. Or it is even more true for Russia because

prison. And almost all of the accurate books on Japan were published by scholars who had been educated before the revolution. Almost nobody of them had a chance for teaching and the previous tradition was in fact broken.

In the Soviet period the main focus was made on political and economical studies. Anna-Maria told us last time that it was very difficult in Germany in the '60s to study modern Japan. The situation was just opposite in the SU. I entered Moscow State University (MSU) in 1968. My main interest was in ancient Japan. I was allowed to write my student's report on ancient Japanese Buddhism only once. Then they told me that was enough and I had to study the history of 20th century. It's true that situation in St. Petersburg was different. And that was a reason why Japanologists in StPb kept saying that people in Moscow are dealing only with political studies and in Soviet times it meant that you were dealing with propaganda. And that was true and most of the Soviet studies of modern Japan are of no more value than the paper they were printed on. Now most of these monographs can be used as a primary source for the reconstruction studies of official ideology in the SU and not as a source of information on Japan itself. The situation was really very strange because there were quite a lot of people teaching and working in the universities and research institutes but the quality of research was in most cases poor. As nobody among people who made decisions was interested in defining the real present-day situation, the knowledge of Japan can be considered as not accurate.

But there was another dimension of Japanology, too. It came to surface in the '60s. Strange enough, but in fact Soviet leaders in the bottom of their hearts liked Japan. They liked it because the Japanese political system and culture managed to do what could not be achieved under Soviet regime. I mean impressive economic development, people obeying the orders of the government, social order, young people obeying elders, low rate of crime and divorces and culture so distinctly different from American that was condemned. In a sense Japan was for Soviet top ranking officials a kind of Utopia too. So they allowed people to write on Japan very positively comparing to the US, Western Europe or China. There were some books published on the customs of the Japanese, art history, studies and translations of Japanese literature including classical poetry and

Japan than about knowledge of it. In fact the geographical position of Japan and the politics of isolation were stimulating such ideas : Japan was very distant, she was an island in the ocean, almost nobody had a chance to visit it, she was situated in the East (and Russians at that time were seeking an ideal place not in the West as they do now but in the East). Estimating the whole situation of Russia's knowledge of Japan we must admit that at that time the information on Japan was very scarce as it was in the whole of Europe too.

The next turning point was 1855 when the diplomatic relations between Russia and Japan were established. Russians began travelling to Japan and many of them were writing on Japan. There were diplomats, sailors, those engaged in natural sciences, merchants, missionaries, etc. There were quite accurate reports on the present day customs of the Japanese and of many things that could be verified by seeing them but lack of knowledge of written language prevented most of these people from understanding historical and cultural background of this country. And it was understood quite soon that without academic research the situation in the country could not be grasped. In this period the foundations for academic studies were laid.

The first chair of Japanese philology was established in 1898 in St. Petersburg University. The teaching of Japanese language in Vladivostok began in 1899.

The next turning point was the Russian-Japanese war. As it often happens the war stimulated in Russia interest towards Japan and Japanese studies. After the end of the war Russian Japanology produced many first-rate experts on Japan (such as Nevski, Polivanov, Elisseeff, Konrad, etc.).

You know what happened then. As in other fields of academic (and not only academic) activities Japanology declined in quality. Some of the leading scholars emigrated (say, S. Elisseeff), some of them were put into prison. Others had to compromise. But in the first years after the revolution and even in the '30s some good and accurate books on Japan (especially on Japanese literature) were published but in fact it was a kind of agony. Though a huge plan of translations was compiled in 1937 it was not accomplished as most people capable to do such work were put into

Japanese Studies in Current Russia : Inheritance and Inheritors

Alexandre N. Mechtcheriakov

*Visiting Associate Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies
(Head, Department of the Culture of the Ancient East,
Russian Academy of Sciences)*

It seems that the life in Japan is designed in such a way that everybody has to apologise every time you have to communicate. So I want to apologise first, too. I am not an expert in the history of Russian Japanology. I didn't have all necessary books at hand. I don't know the situation in political and economic studies. So my report will be sketchy, impressionistic and personal.

The studies of Japan and Japanese language have a good and long tradition in Russia. The first school of Japanese language was established in 1705 in St. Petersburg. And that was the starting point of what may be called Japanology. After that from time to time Japanese sailors came to Russia because they lost their way. Some of them were brought to the capital and taught Japanese (first in capital, then in the city of Irkutsk). First dictionaries were compiled in 1736 and 1782. Some Russian sailors including military vessels came to Japan too. One of them was captain Golovnin who was put by the Japanese officials into prison and spent in Japan several years. After being set free he wrote a very clever and accurate book. Which was one of the best in Europe for his time. In the collection of books of Pushkin who is considered a genius of poetry there is a literary journal with an article on Japan too. So Russia was quite conscious that such country as Japan existed. And that's valid not only for officials and intellectuals. Even many peasants knew the name of Japan. But the quality of their knowledge of it was really poor. I'll give you only one example of that. Russian peasants like peasants everywhere had their kind of Utopia. And some of them thought that the ideal place of justice and happiness was in the "Land of White Water" which they placed on what they called "The Island of Japan." Certainly it says more about their ignorance of

times causes misunderstandings in the sense that advanced students in the German system are not recognized as students working on a graduate level with scientific aims.

From Japanology to Japanese Studies

In all of Germany there exist some 40 chairs of Japanology or Japanese Studies. While the term Japanology ("Japanologie") was used at the time of establishment of such chairs in the fifties and sixties, "Japanese studies" is mostly used for more recent establishment of departments. The change of name represents a change of contents as well: the classical subject of "Japanology" focused mainly on cultural, literary and philological aspects of Japan before the Meiji-Restoration, while Japanese Studies are concerned with present-day Japan. The methods employed here are sociological, political or economical. In short, Japanese Studies are organized as regional studies, employing the scientific methods of the relevant disciplines. It was mainly in the seventies and eighties, that chairs with this orientation were founded. The rise of this new trend was emphasized by the establishment of a new scientific association, the German Association for Social Science Research on Japan (Vereinigung fuer sozialwissenschaftliche Japanforschung), in 1988, which since then has organized yearly conferences on important topics related to recent developments in Japan. Examples of this are the following:

- Eurocentrism in Research on Japan
- Social Policy in Japan
- Individualization in Japanese Society
- Small Government in Japan—Model or Anti-model?
- The Yen—Economic, Political and Social Dimensions of a Currency
- Reforming Japan
- Japan in Comparison—Perspectives on Comparing Japan

The website of this association can be visited for further information under the following address:

www.jdzb.de/vsjf.htm

ing, mainly on a loan basis.

A second big difference from the Japanese or American system lies in the way university is organized: except for language training, the courses can be freely chosen according to the student's own interests. This has to do with the fact that students in philological or social science departments are rather free in combining majors and minors. For a Master's degree they need to have a major, e.g. Japanese studies, and two minors, e.g. Chinese Studies and political science, economics, literature, philosophy, comparative religion or comparative linguistics. It is recommended that the minors be chosen in such a way as to complement the major, in factual as well as methodological respect. So for students interested in literary aspects of Japan, the first choice would be to combine Japanology, German literature and Sinology. For students concentrating on sociological aspects of modern Japan, Japanese studies could be combined with political science, economics or politics of East Asia.

German university-education is oriented very much on teaching scientific methods and gives a good scientific training from the very first day of studies, while neglecting the aspect of teaching facts. The idea behind it is to teach the student how to do research or where to find information, rather than teaching her/him facts. As the "Gymnasium" has lasted for nine years with rather strict schedule oriented towards general education, this is completed before students enter university and there is no need at the university level to study general subjects. University training is meant to give specialized courses only.

Traditionally, there is no B.A.-degree in Germany, but presently some universities are starting to offer such degree on the basis of a more structured curriculum with a credit point system along American or British lines, in order to adjust to internationally transferable university curricula. But the normal way up to now is to study for about 6 years and finish with a M.A. degree. Unnecessary to say, this leads to German students finishing academic training and entering the job-market at an advanced age. On the other hand, it should be pointed out, that university students applying for exchange programs in foreign countries already have a specified scientific training even without having "graduated" from university, because there is no such graduation-degree as a B.A. For exchange programs with Japan this fundamental difference in the structure of university training some-

that in cases of outstanding intellectual achievement, it is possible to change from one of the less demanding school-types to the "Gymnasium" at an later age or even after having finished one of those schools with excellent results. But in reality this is impossible to achieve without extra tutoring from the side of the "Gymnasium", because of the differences in requirements in the different school-types and the ensuing disadvantages of the graduates from "Real- or Hauptschule". As the commitment of the "Gymnasiums" towards such thinking in terms of equal educational chances for the offspring of all stratas of society is developed differently, the rate of pupils who are successful in such a "late-switching" varies considerably. Educational policy being the responsibility of the state ("Bundesland"), the chance to achieve this—for obvious reasons—is statistically better in states with progressive majorities.

This graded system of school-education from a comparatively early age, on the other hand, has the advantage of offering intellectual training with high standards for the "chosen few" who are sent to the "Gymnasium" and are able to graduate after 9 years. In this context, it must be added, that—in contrast to the Japanese system—the process of selection is not restricted to the period of entering high-school or final graduating examinations. The whole period of schooling is highly competitive and selective (i.e. pupils can fail in any grade, and have to repeat the year, if their scores are too low. In case of repeated failure they are forced to leave the school and are sent back to one of the lower type schools).

The German University-System

After graduating from high-school by passing the "Abitur", students can enter any university without further entrance examination. Temporal restrictions ("numerus clausus") are in effect in a few disciplines where the number of students is too high in relationship to laboratory-capacities, e.g. in medicine, veterinary medicine or psychology. But in Japanese Studies there of course exist no such restrictions.

Most German universities are public (state universities) and generally it can be said that there does not exist a hierarchy of different levels of quality among them. Furthermore there are no fees for the students to pay. For students whose parents cannot afford to pay for their living expenses, there is even the possibility to get public funding for the time of university train-

From Japanology to Japanese Studies and Beyond: Trends in German Scholarship

Anna Maria Thränhardt

*Visiting Professor, International Research Center for Japanese Studies
(Visiting Professor, Catholic University of Louvain)*

The Road to University for German Students: Access for the "Chosen Few" only

Germany has a school-system which is not comprehensive but divides pupils at an early age (normally at the age of 10 years) into different types of schools which lead to very different levels of educational attainment. The first "Hauptschule" gives its students a general education, which ends at the age of 16 years and enables them to enter a training as a craftsman. The second track, the "Realschule", also lasts until the age of 16 years, but on a higher educational level. Attendance of further schooling ("Berufsschule") on a part-time-level accompanying the vocational training in a public system is compulsory until students have attained the age of 18 ("Berufsschule"). Only the third track, the "Gymnasium" (corresponding to the old "kyuu-koutou-gakkoo in pre-war Japan) leads its students to a demanding final examination ("Abitur"), which in principle enables them to enter any university without further passing an entrance-examination. According to official statistics the graduation-rates from "Hauptschule", "Realschule" and "Gymnasium" are 32%, 38% and 30% respectively¹.

So, as we see, the German system is rather elitist, dividing the children at the age of ten into separate schooling tracks according to their expected intellectual capabilities. At this age it is often more the attitude of the parents than the intellectual qualities of the offspring which is decisive for selecting the type of school where the children are sent and therefore the system lacks in openness of access to advanced educational opportunities for children of lower social strata. Part of this is compensated by the fact

¹ Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Köln (ed.), *Zahlen zur wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: 2000*, Köln 2000, table 125.

of gray rather than in black and white. And you know because I offered a little autobiographical information that I have had a fairly long experience in what business people like to call "the real world." It is difficult for me to feel comfortable with the kind of rhetoric that reduces all interpretations of relationships to power relations, or hegemonic relations, or the kind of analysis that insists that everything is (merely) discourse. Anyway, upon my reentry into academe, I find Japanese studies in the United States to be flourishing and diverse. Many very bright and well trained scholars are working on interesting topics, and more good work is being produced in English than I, at least, have time to read and assimilate. That's the positive side of my on-the-one-hand-this, on-the-other-hand-that conclusion. The negative side is this: At the same time I see Japanese studies as troubled and under attack from formidable critics on both the left and the right. The fields (plural) of Japanese studies are threatened from outside the academy by the opponents of multiculturalism (actually, opponents of an oversimplified, caricatured version of multiculturalism). They are also threatened from within, by academics who prize this or that theory but disprize what they dismissively regard as mere collection of data. I think people in Japanese studies occupations have to take the opponents of area studies seriously. They (and we also) cannot afford to behave, effectively, like ostriches, and occupy themselves (ourselves) exclusively with what is merely interesting.

on its head, and shows how this unity of language really only exists in our manner of representing translation."

I personally find that the thickness of the rhetoric and the emphasis on theory make Sakai hard to understand. I am not alone. I hasten to point out that others have only the highest praise for Prof. Sakai. Samuel Yamashita of the Claremont Universities, for instance, placed Sakai at the top of the heap of Japanese intellectual historians, in a famous survey review. But he has also been severely criticized, for example, by Herman Ooms and Harold Bolitho. Bolitho characterizes Sakai as a representative of an approach that ironically ends up treating Japan as "'the Other' (understandable only through the interpretive apparatus and with the vocabulary of Western postmodern theory." The effect of this, on some readers, is exactly the opposite of the author's intent: Sakai's intention is to interpret Japan and render it understandable, but the devices of rhetoric and theory end up interfering and making Japan seem more exotic and less comprehensible. Possibly extensive citations of such writers as Jacques Derrida, Jurgen Habermas, Phillippe Lacoue-Labarthe, Jean-Francois Lyotard, and David Pollack make Japan seem less foreign to a few specialists deeply versed in literary theory, but for the rest of us, they make Japan once again into an opaque "Other."

There are many more historians of Japan doing many different things in the United States today. What they show about Japanese studies in that country is, on the one hand, lack of a clear shared sense of priorities, lack of agreement, absence of common standards. At the same time, and more positively, they manifest great diversity and vigor. Unfortunately the time that I have been given for this talk is almost over, and there is no way I can begin to do justice to the many fine scholars (not to mention those with only ordinary talent) in the field. And I am aware that I have failed to mention the fields of political science, economics, linguistics and language teaching, sociology, art history, and religious studies. I regret, and apologize for, my superficiality.

Do I have a generalizing conclusion to offer you, a definitive statement about the condition and prospect of Japanese studies in the U.S.? Sort of. You may have caught on to me and observed that I have a tolerance for ambiguity and a tendency to see the world, including scholarship, in tones

interests and concerns within this field.

- In ancient history, Joan Piggott, a Cornell University professor, has worked her way forward in time and is now focusing on the Heian period. Earlier she studied prehistory through Nara, and the major product of that research was *The Emergence of Japanese Kingship* (1997), in which she speaks of Japanese rulers—both male and female—as "kings." Basically her emphasis was on institutional history, but the essence of her approach is to combine archaeology with intense examination of documents. For years she has had a strong relationship with the Historiographical Institute at the University of Tokyo (Shiryo Hensan Jo). It is not only as a researcher and writer but also as an educator that Prof. Piggott deserves the attention of people (not just Americans) in Japanese studies. As a teacher in one of the top American universities, she has grown extremely concerned about the nature of materials available to teach pre-1600 Japanese history to students who cannot read Japanese. To fill the gap she has been developing a collection of translations of original documents (mostly her own translations), and she uses these in her own classes. Believing that the most widely used textbook on premodern Japanese history, a thirty-year-old survey by John Hall, is badly out-of-date, she would like to see a new introductory book in English, and has been contemplating ways of getting scholars to collaborate on such a work.
- Another Cornell historian can be taken as representative of a different set of concerns. Naoki Sakai, who specializes in the intellectual history of Tokugawa and modern Japan (*Voices of the Past: The Status of Language in Eighteenth-Century Japanese Discourse*, 1991), and also writes on modern Japanese literature (*Translation and Subjectivity: On Japan and Cultural Nationalism*, 1997), is focused on a different range of issues from those that occupy Prof. Piggott. Prof. Sakai is one of the foremost exponents of applying postmodern cultural theory to the study of Japan. A gloss of his *Translation and Subjectivity* by his publisher University of Minnesota Press describes his approach: "An excursion across the boundaries of language and culture, this provocative book suggests that national identity and cultural politics are, in fact, 'all in the translation.' Translation, we tend to think, represents another language in all its integrity and unity. Naoki Sakai turns this thinking

writers: Izumi Kyoka (1873-1939), Enchi Fumiko (1905-86), and Nakagami Kenji (1946-92). Linked to archaisms and magical realms, the trope of the dangerous, spiritually empowered woman culls from and combines archetypes from throughout the Japanese canon, including mountain witches, female shamans, and snake-women."

Corneyetz, like Richard Okada, has given serious critical consideration to Yamada Eimi, whose writing some consider pornography and not literature. Schalow is one of several Americans who have focused attention on homosexuality in Japan, and brought discourse about homosexual sensibility into the mainstream of recent scholarship. Some significant examples of this work are Schalow's translation (with an introduction) of *The Great Mirror of Male Love* by Ihara Saikaku, published by Stanford University Press in 1990, and an introduction to *Partings At Dawn: An Anthology Of Japanese Gay Literature*, published by Gay Sunshine Press in 1996. Not restricting his attention to male homosexuality, Schalow also edited, with Janet Walker, *The Woman's Hand: Gender and Theory in Japanese Women's Writing* (1996).

History: Turning to my own field, history, I am fortunate to be able to begin with an observation by Carol Gluck of Columbia University—an observation that applies to studies of Japan and also to other areas of specialization. In an essay entitled "Paradigms Lost," Professor Gluck wrote, "The experience of politics and paradigms lost is not unique to Japan; it is a widespread advanced-country dis-ease. What has driven the dynamic of history elsewhere is not politics per se, but social empowerment. What I call the 'new new social history' in the West wields history to advance the cause of women, ethnic and gay minorities, and the whole multicultural gamut which seeks to relocate difference in the social, and therefore political, center, effacing the old center, which insisted on homogeneity and exclusion of difference. Whatever their success in their various causes, there is no doubt that these adherents, as well as their counterparts in the post-colonial world, have the fire in the belly that makes history worth writing and fighting for."

As you may know, history is the largest of all fields of Japanese studies in the U.S., as measured by numbers of specialists. The discipline offers great variety, as I have time only to hint. The briefest of descriptions of two historians at the same university might serve to suggest to you the diversity of

I should make a couple of remarks, at this point, to qualify what may sound like an unsympathetic portrayal of scholarly approaches that stress theory. It is, I realize, easy to caricature academic discussions. The New York Times, for example, regularly makes fun of the panel themes and paper titles at the Modern Language Association's annual meeting. To a lot of non-academics, paper titles at conventions of the Association for Japanese Literary Studies offer the same kind of targets for caricature. In fact, however, if one reads some of the articles published in the proceedings of this group's annual meetings, one finds not only lots of reference to theory, but also serious attention to texts.

The AJLS Eighth Annual Meeting, in November 1999, will benefit from the sponsorship of the Japan Foundation and the Northeast Asia Council of the Association for Asian Studies, in addition to local organizers the Center for Asian Studies at the University of Colorado at Boulder and the Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations at the same university. Professor Suzuki Sadami of this Center will be one of the keynote speakers at this November meeting. Such support and the participation of distinguished outside scholars such as Prof. Suzuki clearly indicate that the studies AJLS members are doing are recognized as important. A few of the titles of panel titles at the AJLS annual meeting will give you a sense of the range of these studies, a range that has political and theoretical as well as purely literary dimensions: "Outsiders on the Inside--Okinawan, Resident Korean, Colonial, and Buraku Literature and the Canon," "Genre, Poetics, and Modernity in Construction of Japanese Literary Tradition," "Concealment of Politics/Politics of Concealment," "Counterfeits, Cannibals, and Crusaders: Reinventing 'Classics' from the Inside Out," "Nuns, Farmers, and Chocolatiers: Adaptations of the Canon Across Time and Space in Japanese Poetry." I cite only a few.

A couple more scholars who might be taken as representing the changes in Japanese studies in the last fifteen years, Nina Cornyetz, now of New York University, and Paul Gordon Schalow, of Rutgers University, occupy themselves with gender and sexuality. Stanford University Press just this year brought out Cornyetz's *Dangerous Women, Deadly Words: Phallic Fantasy and Modernity in Three Japanese Writers*. This book is described as "a materialist-feminist, psychoanalytic analysis of a modern Japanese literary trope—the dangerous woman—in the works of three twentieth-century

Eimi and her exoticization of the black body and commodification of the "other." Professor Okada is highly attuned to Western literary theory and his work is well regarded by others who stress theory. Yet he also has expressed concern about the possibility for undervaluing and consequently giving too little attention to literature itself. What interests him most, he has made clear in conversations, is advancing our understanding of literature, and he is open to a variety of approaches for doing that and is not insistent on adherence to one brand of theory or one standard of political correctness.

- I have heard such views from several other scholars who have been identified in the '80s and '90s with studies that apply Western theory. Esperanza Ramirez-Christensen, a *waka* scholar at the University of Michigan and author of a fine study of the work of a fifteenth-century priest-poet called *Heart's Flower: The Life and Poetry of Shinkei* (1994), is another example. Now translating and annotating Shinkei's Sasamegoto and also writing a book on certain Buddhist concepts in what she calls the "symbolist poetry" of the 12th to 15th centuries in Japan, she has tried to incorporate postmodernist Western theoretical discourses into her research. Such theory, she has written, has an "uncanny affinity" to medieval Japanese thought. In her teaching and in her participation in meetings of the group of scholars now known as the Association for Japanese Literary Studies (AJLS), she has engaged heavily in a dialogue with current literary theorists. Though keenly interested in theory and active in applying it in her own work, she has gone on record as concerned that overstress on theory may not be appropriate for the field of Japanese literature outside Japan at this time. She wonders whether there may be "a critical time lag" in the study of Japanese literature, a lag caused by the necessity to spend many years in translating a sufficient number of basic (or canonical) works so that students can "analyze them with the confidence that they [are] not speaking in a total vacuum." Parallel to this, at the level of the individual student, the time needed for a Westerner to master a body of literature in Japanese almost inevitably brings him or her into an uncomfortably tense situation precisely because in many American universities today, there is a strong outside pressure to concentrate more on theory than on literature itself.

within the U.S. academy, not to mention only Japanese studies, over the last fifteen years. There has been a lot of discussion of, and application of, Western theory. There has been debate—and sometimes a bit of agonizing—over the degree to which it is appropriate or legitimate to analyze literatures from different ages and different cultures in terms of one's own present political concerns and political values.

- Norma Field of the University of Chicago has been one of the most influential scholars during this period, and I will begin my comments on the discipline of Japanese literary studies with her. Having begun her professional career as a student of classical literature, focusing on the Tale of Genji (*The Splendor of Longing in the "Tale of Genji,"* 1987), recently she has concentrated on modern and contemporary literature, and on theory. Her publications in the 1990s include an article on cultural studies co-authored with Naoki Sakai (in Shiso, 1992); "Beyond Envy, Boredom, and Suffering: Toward an Emancipatory Politics for Resident Koreans and Other Japanese" in *positions* (1994); and "Texts of Childhood in Inter-Nationalizing Japan" in *Text and Nation: Cross-disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities* (1996). For the last two years she has taught a course on Western theory in Japanese texts. Translator, two decades ago, of Natsume Soseki's *Sore kara*, she is now seeking to revise translation as a legitimate scholarly activity, seeing this as "part of an effort to gain historical self-consciousness about Japanese studies in the U.S." She is also examining "the relationships between various aspects of Japanese modernity and global capitalism." For all her own concentration on theory in recent years—and at the University of Chicago, there is considerable peer pressure to talk about theory—she has articulated a concern that some people in the field have prized theory so highly that they have undervalued reading literature itself. Moreover, acquisition of language skill, without which real understanding and appreciation of literature is impossible, has been underemphasized in some U.S. graduate schools.
- Richard Okada of Princeton University has interests that range from studies of Genji (*Figures of Resistance: Language, Poetry, and Narrating in The Tale of Genji and Other Mid-Heian Texts*, published in Duke University Press's Post-Contemporary Interventions series in 1991) through studies of comfort women and sexuality to studies of Yamada

examining sports and recreation culture. In a 1998 article, "Blood and Guts in Japanese Baseball" (in *The Culture of Japan as Seen through Its Leisure*, edited by Sepp Linhart and Sabine Fruhstuck [SUNY Press]), he contrasted Japanese and American practices and behaviors but offered a strong warning against "the national stereotyping of 'sporting styles.'" Such stereotyping, for instance in talk about U.S. baseball, Dominican baseball, and Japanese baseball, "is a pervasive and powerful rhetoric for reifying intersocietal differences . . . while masking intrasocietal differences of gender, class, ethnicity, and region," he said. Kelly has nearly completed a book on the Hanshin Tigers, a work that will appeal not only to baseball fans like me, but also to anyone seriously interested in Kansai popular culture.

- Anne Allison, an anthropologist at Duke University, has devoted most of her attention to matters related to gender and sexuality. Going a step further—or adopting a more extreme strategy—than Liza Carihfield Dalby (who served as a geisha in Pontocho in the seventies, and wrote well about the life she experienced), Allison worked as a bar hostess in Tokyo. Her observations of *mizushobai* became the basis *Nightwork: Sexuality, Pleasure, and Corporate Masculinity in a Tokyo Hostess Club*, published in 1994. Subsequently she has worked on comics, gazing at sexuality, gender roles, and incest (*Permitted and Prohibited Desires: Mothers, Comics, and Censorship in Japan*, 1996). Among other things, Allison discusses male homosexuality, a subject also taken up by several historians in the 1990s.
- Another subject for recent work in anthropology is sentiment and emotion. Chris Yano of the University of Hawai'i can be taken as representative of this. Another anthropologist with a historical bent, she has written "Shaping the Tears of a Nation: An Ethnography of Emotion in Japanese Popular Song," a book about the interwar period that is soon to be published by Harvard's Asia Council.

It is not quite the case that topics such as Robertson, Kelly, Allison, Yano, and their colleagues treat were not imagined or could not have been treated fifteen years ago. But they have gained prominence, indeed moved to the forefront, of American studies of contemporary Japanese culture.

Literature:

This is a field that offers much material for analyzing the controversies

in the U.S. in the last decade-and-a-half, however, it is enough to note that those culture wars formed the background, and they influenced the discourse.

With that in mind, let me move on to touch on some recent and current research themes in Japanese studies in the U.S. In the course of this I'll offer some further musings about the conflict over area studies and disciplinary theory-driven research.

Anthropology is certainly a field that illustrates the coming into the mainstream of topics and approaches that in the 1970s were marginal or unrepresented. Let me illustrate with reference to a few people to whom I have spoken, or whose work I have looked at, in the last few months.

- One influential scholar in the field is Jennifer Robertson, a professor at the University of Michigan. An anthropologist with a strong background in history and a sense of history, her earlier work was on *machizukuri* and identity, and in 1991 she published *Native and Newcomer: Making and Remaking a Japanese City*. Since then she has done a lot of research on gender, gender ambiguity, "gender-bending," and what she calls the politics of androgeny. Last year her book *Takarazuka: Sexual Politics and Popular Culture in Modern Japan*, won widespread attention and also a prize. Most recently she is researching colonialism and the culture of Japanese imperialism. She has organized a group that is looking at comparative non-Western imperialisms. In an important state-of-the-field essay published last year, Robertson argues forcefully that Japan has been ignored as a site of theory in social science research. This is regrettable and must be changed. Theory is parasitical, she observes; it depends on fact. There is no reason for evidence from Japan to be excluded as a source of theory-building in anthropology. Scholars working on Japanese anthropology should, she maintains, more assertively engage in theory construction. Any marginalizing, within the discipline, of field work on Japan as "mere fact collection" is a mistake.
- Another important anthropologist who is doing work that likely would not have been done in the '70s or early '80s is William Kelly. A Yale professor who earlier studied early modern social relations, what might be called "class" relations, and in 1985 published *Deference and Defiance in Nineteenth-Century Japan*, Kelly more recently has been